



# **Framing 9/11, 3rd Edition**

**Dr. Anab Whitehouse**

Copyright, 2018  
Anab Whitehouse  
The Interrogative Imperative Institute  
Brewer, Maine  
04412

All rights are reserved. With the exception of uses that are in compliance with the 'Fair Usage' clause of the Copyright Act, no portion of this publication may be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of the publisher. Furthermore, no part of this book may be stored in a retrieval system, nor transmitted in any form or by any means - whether electronic, mechanical, photo-reproduction or otherwise - without authorization from the publisher or unless purchased from the publisher or a designated agent in such a format.

Published by: Bilquees Press

Dedicated to De-framers everywhere!



**Table of Contents**

Preface – 7

1.) NIST, Junk Science, and 9/11 – page 25

2.) Rebel with a Cause – page 81

3.) Black Box Operations – page 129

4.) Beyond a Reasonable Doubt – page 149

5.) A Lesson in Skepticism – page 183

6.) A Pseudo-Interlude with Matt Taibbi – page 219

7.) New Rules for Bill Maher – page 241

8.) Conspiracy and Other ‘C’-Words – page 249

9.) A Swedish 9/11-Interview – page 275

10.) Keith, Howard, and Cordoba House – page 293

11.) An Open Letter to Imam Rauf and His Wife – page 299

12.) Explosive Questions – A Poem – page 309

13.) Letter to So-called ‘Leaders’, Present & Future – page 311

14.) Constitutional 911: 9/11 and the Constitution – page 317

15.) Unscientific America: 9/11, Harris, and Chomsky – page 349

    Peter Michael Ketchum – page 359

    Sam Harris and 9/11 – page 377

    Noam Chomsky and 9/11 – page 415

16.) Methodical Illusions and Deceptions – page 457

17.) The 9/11 Delusion and its Consequences – page 477



### **Preface**

Although I awoke to a voice from my alarm-clock radio stating that a plane, of some kind, had struck the World Trade Center, and although I viewed a bit more of the horror when I got out of bed and turned on the television set to try to learn what it was all about, I soon was forced to withdraw from those events since I had to go to work. From that point onward – and for much of the next four years – I was relatively out of touch with all the reports, stories, conclusions, and questions concerning 9/11.

Much of the aforementioned relative isolation was a direct result of a whole slew of life problems that, like a prolonged tsunami, overwhelmed my being. Among other things, this involved being out of work for most of the next four to five years, but, as well, there were a variety of other personal problems that populated my life at that time, and trying to sort all of this out, took a great deal of effort, resources, and energy.

Because of my age, the economically challenged character of my locality, lack of a vehicle, and a few other considerations, obtaining paid employment became a very difficult task. I tried to create my own Internet business, but this proved to be difficult to do in the absence of money.

For a relatively short time, I received unemployment insurance. I also managed to get a few temporary jobs here and there.

Even when I had been working full-time, I was just barely skimming by. When I lost my job, it wasn't long before my credit went into the dumpster ... and, soon, the very real possibility loomed on the horizon that the rest of my life – including dining arrangements -- might have to follow my credit into that repository as well.

In the interim period, one ramification from 9/11 did cross my path. A person I knew reported me to the FBI because they knew I was Muslim and felt that the circumstances of my life were rather suspicious (I was out of work, had a computer, and kept to myself ... go figure).

As far as I know, the FBI never visited me as a result of the foregoing report. Whether my phone was tapped or whether I went on a no-fly list, I am not sure. However, since I haven't flown in more than

a decade and since I very rarely use the phone, then in some ways, it doesn't matter whether they did, or they didn't do, either of the foregoing things to me ... although they did perform such acts in relation to many other individuals.

I found out about the FBI-reporting incident from a mutual friend who told me what the individual in question had done. This latter person confirmed the report at a later time.

During the subsequent confessional, the individual talked about a relative who worked at the Pentagon. During a post-9/11 phone call to that relative, the suspicions of the person who was confessing to me were related to the person at the Pentagon, and the individual from the military indicated that if I had done nothing wrong, then I had nothing to worry about and, so, why not go ahead and report me.

Interestingly enough, when I was informed about all of this sometime later, the person who had reported me to the FBI said that the relative in the military had a sort of strange experience while at the Pentagon on 9/11. More specifically, someone had given an order for personnel to assemble in the inner, open center-area of the Pentagon.

The relative in the military disregarded the directive and, instead, went somewhere outside of the Pentagon building. When that individual reported what had transpired to that person's commanding officer – a general of some kind – the general said that the person had done well not to have followed the directive.

At what point in the chaos of 9/11 the order was given, or what the identity was of the person making the announcement, or on whose authority the directive was announced I do not know. However, the nature of the order bears an eerie similarity to the character of the directive heard over the loudspeaker system in the South Tower indicating that people should now return to their offices ... just prior to the building coming down.

Later, I learned that the individual employed at the Pentagon went to Iraq and came back alluding to some terrible things that were going on in that country. Among other things, this included financial malfeasance of incredible proportions.

Because the person was afraid for career and family, specifics were absent in relation to such accounts. This is the same person who,



with such courage, was willing to toss me to the federal wolves for no more reason other than that I was a Muslim who was out of work and asserted that if I had done nothing wrong, then, I had nothing to fear. Unfortunately, all too many people tend to be fearless when it comes to putting other lives at risk but are very cautious when it comes to their own lives.

-----

Around the time of the 9/11 Commission hearings, I did manage to catch some of the testimony of Condoleezza Rice and Richard Clarke. In addition, on several occasions, I viewed the interaction between Chris Mathews and the four Jersey girls (Kristen Breitweiser, Mindy Kleinberg, Lorie Van Auken, and Patty Casazza) who each had lost a husband on 9/11 and who each had been instrumental in helping to create the sort of political pressure out of which the 9/11 Commission arose. However, this was about as far as my knowledge and understanding of 9/11 went.

I was impressed and intrigued with what the Jersey girls had to say and the sorts of critical questions they were raising. Although Chris Mathews was sufficiently media-savvy to invite the four women on to his program a number of times during the hearings, he later came to the conclusion that the Jersey girls were caught up in a sort of unresolved grief and that this prevented them from letting go of the issue since they continued to be dissatisfied with the "official conspiracy theory: -- namely, that on 9/11, 19 Arab Muslims hijacked four planes and flew them into: two buildings in New York, the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia, and a field in Pennsylvania ... a conspiracy theory that Chris, along with millions of others came to accept.

By accepting such a conspiracy theory, people like Chris Mathews, along with most other representatives of the media, helped to push America further into the darkness of oppression as well as further away from anything that, reasonably, could be referred to as democracy. The stalwart media types have boldly protected their own egos, reputations, and jobs, while placing everyone else in America at risk ... sort of like the brave soldier at the Pentagon who was prepared to sacrifice my life but was very cautious about placing himself or his family at risk.

Aside from the foregoing few juncture points, I had very little information, knowledge, or understanding of 9/11 for four, or so, years following the events of that fateful September. For a while, I slept on an office floor – my new home – and, as a result, I had no television and rarely listened to the radio. Furthermore, because I had little money, I didn't read any magazine accounts of 9/11.

My ignorance was not exactly bliss. However, it might have been a saving grace since I was not subjected to the constant barrage of indoctrinatory attempts to induce people to accept the official account of 9/11 ... the account that was forged: through the media blitz on 9/11; through the early Congressional hearings on 9/11; through the 9/11 Commission hearings and report; as well as through the various reports issued by FEMA, NIST, and the Pentagon.

When my personal life finally began to stabilize and, as a result, I started to have some time to begin reading and thinking about, among other things, topics such as 9/11, I did not come to the issue with any preconceived ideas about the what, how, who, and why of the matter. I was willing to look at the evidence and permit the data to direct my explorations.

After doing a fair amount of reading – starting in late 2004 – and reflecting on what I was discovering during this process, at some point in 2005 I started to put up a few facts concerning 9/11 on a website dealing with spiritual abuse that I had been running for a number of years. Later on, I made some entries on the subject in a blog focusing, for the most part, on the Sufi path that began in 2005.

I got some rather nasty and outraged responses for posting such material. However, there were two things that I noticed about such responses.

First, the people almost always bravely signed the posts in an anonymous fashion. Secondly, the arguments such people sought to make were either not backed up with anything substantive or their points were backed up with claims that easily could be critiqued and shown to entail problems of one kind or another.

In addition to the foregoing realizations, I also noticed that when I spoke to people about the 9/11-issue in a direct, face-to-face manner, two further themes became evident. To begin with, the people with

whom I talked were extremely emotional about 9/11 – emotional to such an extent that they frequently were unable to engage in any kind of reasonable discussion concerning 9/11 ... especially, if there were any arguments brought forth that tended to call into question the official theory about 9/11 to which they subscribed. As well, I noted that when pressed, almost none of these people had any real evidence or credible arguments to back up their opinions about what happened on 9/11.

I had come into contact with this sort of emotional, hostile, intransigence previously. This was in connection with my work on spiritual abuse.

People who have been spiritually abused and who have not come to the full realization that this is what had happened to them, such people often are very emotional and hostile in relation to anyone who brings forth evidence and arguments indicating that the so-called spiritual guide or teacher with whom those people have been associating for x-amount of time is a fraud or charlatan. When evidence threatens one's sense of existential orientation, there is a very strong tendency in human beings to either dismiss or attack such evidence because one feels the rip tide of dissociation beginning to pull apart one's ideas about identity, reality, truth, and purpose.

The condition of dissociation is extremely painful and destabilizing. People often will go to great lengths to try to ward off the undertow of dissociation that might be beginning to flow through one's life as a result of being presented with certain kinds of evidence and arguments that undermine one's sense of oneself or reality.

Almost from the very beginning, the government and media presented people with a narrative about 9/11 – a narrative that explained what had happened, and how it happened, and who had made it happen, and why the perpetrators did what they did. This narrative was pounded into the minds, hearts, and souls of millions of people day after day, month after month, year after year through television, radio, movies, magazines, papers, books, schools, and the government. Moreover, every September 11<sup>th</sup>, the whole narrative is reintroduced once again in the form of a booster shot... lest anyone might have begun to forget what the “truth” of the matter is.

The problem was that when one begins to consider the actual evidence, there is no part of the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 that is capable of withstanding critical scrutiny. The alleged “evidence” put forth through: the media, various governmental reports, and so on turns out not to be evidence at all but consists of a manufactured photo montage that is held together by a very special sort of frame.

In sociology, “framing” is a term that refers to the manner in which certain ideas, events, beliefs, values, and so on are presented. Framing occurs when only certain kinds of themes are rendered visible, while other features are hidden behind the frame.

Just as the frame for a picture can alter what one sees of a picture or how one views such a picture, so too, how one frames a given story or account or narrative or event will alter what will be seen and experienced in relation to the information, topic or issue that is being framed. There is an art to the process of “properly” framing a picture – whether in the form of a photograph or in the form of a painting.

For instance, if one frames 9/11 through the “official conspiracy theory” concerning the events of that day, then everything that is inconsistent with that theory is eliminated from consideration and hidden by that frame. This process of inclusion and exclusion does not necessarily have anything to do with the facts of a matter, but has entirely to do with the psychology and aesthetics of presentation ... it has to do entirely with what one will be permitted or encouraged to see, as well as what one will not be permitted or encouraged to see.

The frame through which a picture, subject, story, or event is viewed might be so dazzling and mesmerizing that it draws attention away from the theme(s) being framed and induces people to become preoccupied with the frame to the exclusion of that which is being framed. Or, the frame might be of such a construction that it tends to complement that which is being framed and induces the viewer to perceive the framed object as a harmonious and/or comforting whole – complete unto itself.

In either of the foregoing cases, one ends up with a visual/emotional experience that has been constructed and manufacture in accordance with intentions that are not necessarily a function of facts or truth. However, once one has been induced to

accept such a framing process, then anyone who comes along and begins to fiddle with the frame and raise questions about how the frame's construction might be hiding or excluding important things from consideration, then many people tend to become nervous and uneasy since they feel the presence of dissociative currents beginning to pull apart their current worldview of things, along with their sense of self and truth.

In other words, people tend to become emotionally invested in such frames. Thus, if you begin to dismantle the frame, those who have a vested interest in it, tend to become very emotional, angry, and hostile.

Framing in the foregoing sense is a sociological phenomenon. Framing is a psychological phenomenon. Framing is a political phenomenon. Framing is an ideological phenomenon. Framing is an exercise in controlling perceptions and access to information. Framing establishes the presuppositions thorough which one engages life.

In case I have not made it sufficiently clear in the foregoing, let me reiterate a central point: namely, frames have nothing to do with facts. Frames are all about the character of the portal through which one is induced or required to view something else – whether facts, ideas, images, events, theories, beliefs, values, and so on. Frames are all about how one wants other people to look at something ... what one wants them to see or consider or reflect on or remember. Framing is an exercise in control.

The official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 that is promulgated by the government, and/or via the media, and/or through education, is a frame. It does not consist of any facts or evidence, but, rather, constitutes a constructed process through which the events of 9/11 are to be viewed and through which “facts” are to be interpreted and evaluated. It is the hermeneutical filter through which everything concerning 9/11 is to be engaged, measured, and understood.

Just by saying that the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 does not consist of any facts or evidence is likely to disturb some readers. These individuals are likely to respond with some sort of incredulity such as: ‘Well, of course, the government’s theory is chock

full of all kinds of evidence ... what kind of conspiracy theorist are you to try to claim something that is contrary to the truth?

However, let's run a little thought-experiment. At the heart of this thought-experiment is a challenge – namely, I would like someone – say, you the reader – to demonstrate that the official conspiracy theory is true.

A person so challenged might begin with: 'Usama bin Laden. Everyone knows he is responsible for 9/11, don't they?

The problem here is that the FBI has indicated both in public statements and well as on their web site, that there is no evidence that ties bin Laden to 9/11. Moreover, the only people who have implicated bin Laden issued confessions after being tortured or water boarded many, many times and whose psychological/emotional condition was so fragile that not even people from the 9/11 Commission were permitted to directly examine them or ask them questions – and one might add that, apparently, the FBI does not consider such confessions to constitute evidence ... otherwise, the FBI would not have issued statements indicating that they have no evidence tying bin Laden to 9/11.

One also could point out that contrary to the habit of many terrorists who like to brag about their exploits and accept responsibility publically, bin Laden twice denied any involvement in 9/11. And, since he was already wanted for other alleged acts of terrorism, it wasn't like he felt that such a denial would, somehow, improve his legal position.

Well, if bin Laden cannot be cited as proof of the official conspiracy story concerning 9/11, a person might refer to the 19 hijackers. This is the same list of alleged hijackers with which the FBI came up with so quickly after 9/11 (within days) but that, apparently, they were completely unaware of prior to 9/11.

In any event, one must question the authenticity of such a list for a variety of reasons. For instance: none of the alleged hijackers' names appear on any of the passenger manifest lists of the four hijacked planes; nor were any credible videos of them taken on 9/11 that show them boarding the planes in question; nor has the inconvenient truth been properly resolved indicating that as many as six or seven of the

alleged hijackers are still alive (with photographic likenesses that match the photographs released by the FBI); nor has there been any explanation about why there were no genetic markers for Arab ethnicity that showed up on the autopsy report for the people allegedly killed in the airplane crash at the Pentagon; nor has anyone explained why or how eight commercial pilots were induced to give up control of their aircraft to four alleged hijackers within a matter of minutes without entering the transponder code - 7500 - to notify authorities that hijackings were in progress; nor has anyone explained how two of the passports of the alleged hijackers (one in New York and one in Pennsylvania) were able to survive intact from alleged plane crashes that supposedly destroyed jet engines, along with the rest of the aircraft; nor has anyone explained how they could have flown large commercial jets when all evidential indications were that they did not have the training, experience, or skill to do so.

Well if one cannot prove that bin Laden or the 19 hijackers were actually responsible for 9/11, what about the various reports issued by the government - from: FEMA, to: NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology), to the 9/11 Commission, and the ASCE (American Society of Civil Engineers) on behalf of the Pentagon. Surely, these all show what happened on 9/11.

Aside from the fact that few people actually have read the foregoing reports, one cannot assume that what those reports state is actually factually true. To determine this, one has to actually look at those reports and determine their credibility, if any, concerning the available evidence, and if one takes the time to do this, one will discover that much of what those reports conclude cannot be factually supported with respect to the destruction of the: Twin Towers, Building 7 of the WTC, or the Pentagon (and much of the present book engages in precisely this sort of discovery process).

Well, what about the media? They are all saying that the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 is true, so, why would they say this if it weren't so?

I have not come across anyone in the media who actually has done due diligence with respect to rigorously examining the data concerning 9/11. For example, most of them have not read the aforementioned reports very thoroughly, if at all ... and if they have

read them, they certainly do not seem to have done so with any degree of investigatory integrity.

By and large, people in the media just forward to the public what they are given in the way of handouts from the government and various alleged “experts”. The era of investigative journalism has all but disappeared in many respects ... but especially in conjunction with 9/11.

Most of the “names” in the media are just personalities, commentators and readers of the news. They do very little, if any, investigation of their own into issues like 9/11.

What about all the eyewitnesses? Well, what about them?

How many of the witnesses that are alluded to have been properly vetted? How many of the accounts they gave have been investigated thoroughly and proven fully credible? How many of those witnesses have been subjected to cross-examination? How many of their stories have been independently verified? How many of them had conflicts of interest in relation to their testimony? Can any of these witnesses – individually or collectively – provide a credible explanation of why three buildings came down on 9/11 or a credible account of what took place at the Pentagon on 9/11?

The news media reports on certain things they are told. Matters rarely go beyond this.

How much of what the media has been told or has been reported in relation to 9/11 can be proven to be factually correct? To what extent have the media properly verified its own stories and accounts?

Most people cannot answer the foregoing questions. So, one is left to accept – or reject -- such reports at face value with no idea about whether they actually reflect the facts of a matter ... in this case 9/11.

The government has framed the events of 9/11. The media has framed the events of 9/11. Most of academia has framed the events of 9/11.

Where is the truth of the matter? Perhaps, we need to begin to take a look at the framing process.

I refer to this process of critically examining the framing process involving 9/11 as “de-framing”. It consists of a critical examination of



the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 and whether, or not, that theory is capable of being maintained in a credible way.

De-framing is not a process of re-framing. I do not have any theory about who perpetrated 9/11 or why and, therefore, I am not trying to present the reader with a new kind of frame through which to filter the events of 9/11.

In a sense, de-framing is a form of de-programming. Just as the latter technique was used, for a time, in relation to cases of spiritual abuse in an attempt to help people break free from various religious, political, or other kinds of cults, so too, de-framing is intended to assist individuals to break free from the cult of the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 ... to help dissolve the bonds of undue influence that have been woven around the minds, hearts, and lives of so many people in America and elsewhere by the propagators of the official conspiracy theory for 9/11.

-----

In late 2006, I wrote a book entitled: *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>*. The work did not get released until early in 2007.

Almost from the time that the book was finished and published, I wanted to update it. Of course, any book is a sort of a time-sensitive portrait, and, therefore, since life keeps unfolding and if one uses that opportunity wisely, one continues to learn through that process of existential unfolding, and, as a result, one finds the need to change what has been written previously so that it might better reflect new events, facts, evidence, and ideas.

The current book – namely, *Framing 9/11* – is intended to serve as a complement to the *Essence* book. Both the first 9/11-book as well as the current project give expression to an underlying theme – to show that the 9/11 conspiracy theory promulgated by the government and the media – each for their own individual reasons and not necessarily as a conspiracy – is not tenable

Since the publication of the initial book on 9/11, a number of things have taken place. I have sought to address some of these issues in the new book on 9/11.

For example, at the time *Essence* was written and released, there had been no final report on the destruction of Building 7 ... although

NIST had published some preliminary ideas about Building. Now, however, NIST has released final reports concerning Building 7 (August and November of 2008).

Consequently, for nearly two years, I have wanted to write a critique of that new NIST material. Such an article is contained in the present volume ('NIST, Junk Science and 9/11').

In addition, after publishing *Essence*, there were several other books and articles on 9/11 that I came across which, I felt, warranted some sort of response. Matt Taibbi, of *Rolling Stone Magazine*, wrote a book called: *The Great Derangement*, and this work included several chapters about 9/11 ... chapters that, I felt, were fairly shallow and evidentially malnourished ... so, I wanted to respond in some way, and in the present book, I have taken the opportunity to do so ('A Pseudo-Interlude with Matt Taibbi, Or Matt Taibbi's Derangement of Truth').

I also came across a cover story article in *Skeptic Magazine* on 9/11. In my opinion, the quality of that article was on a par with the article and book put out through *Popular Mechanics* concerning 9/11 – that is to say, the quality of information and analysis were extremely poor in both the *Skeptic* article as well as the *Popular Mechanic's* material.

I had critiqued the *Popular Mechanic's* book: *Debunking 9/11 Myths* (based on an earlier article in that magazine) in *Essence*. Therefore, I wanted to take the opportunity to say a few things about one of the articles on 9/11 that appeared in *Skeptic* magazine, and, what I have said in that regard is contained in 'A Lesson in Skepticism' within the present book.

Two other pieces that are in the current book concern: the so-called Ground Zero mosque or Cordoba House that is being proposed for Manhattan. One of these new articles concerns my response to an exchange between Keith Olbermann and Howard Dean on the Cordoba House controversy. The second piece alluded to before is in the form of an open letter to Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf and his wife Daisy Khan that explores certain possibilities in conjunction with the proposed Cordoba Initiative building project versus the desire of some people to have the project moved to some other location outside of Manhattan.

Beyond the foregoing new material, toward the end of *Framing 9/11* there is a relatively long article entitled: 'Constitutional 911: 9/11 and the Constitution.' Among other things, that article explores a variety of constitutional issues concerning both the 9/11 Commission, as well as the NIST investigations.

One of the features of the aforementioned article that is, in passing, important to note involves the way in which the article explores a variety of themes that might be crucial to making democracy viable. 9/11 was not just an attack on innocent people, but it also marked the beginning of a concerted assault on the U.S. Constitution ... an assault that continues to this day and one that has, essentially, decimated the democratic process and imprisoned the potential of the Constitution.

I also have included a very short item titled: 'New Rules for Bill Maher'. From a point shortly after the occurrence of 9/11, Bill Maher has – through his own unique way of doing things -- been a proponent of the basic premises at the heart of the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11, and as I result, I think he is in deep need of some 'New Rules' (cf. a recurring feature of his HBO television series) with respect to his approach to 9/11.

In addition, I have added some new material in relation to the Pentagon. This sort of material is something that I have wanted to do for a while and believe such new material helps to complement things that I already have said in *Essence*, with respect to the Pentagon facet of 9/11.

The present work contains quite a few pages for that are intended to provide something of an overview for Judy Wood's work on 9/11. I believe her work is very important for gaining a proper insight into some of the events of 9/11 ... but her ideas also are very controversial and have been attacked from many different directions -- both from among the proponents of the official conspiracy theory as well as from those who reject the official conspiracy theory.

Finally, *Framing 9/11* contains an introduction to, and overview of, some of the ideas of Morgan Reynolds, a former employee of the George W. Bush presidency. The essay is entitled: 'Beyond A Reasonable Doubt', and it explores some possibilities and questions concerning the actual nature of the events at the World Trade Center –

events that most people believe they know ... but, maybe, after all is said and done, people might not know as much as they believe they do.

I am sure that several years from now, a great deal more material could be added to the present work – that is, *Framing 9/11*. Hopefully, as one gets older, one learns more, and what I have tried to do with both *Essence* and *Framing 9/11* is share some of what I have learned about the issue of 9/11 over the last five or six years.

Both of the foregoing works are quite different from most other books that deal with the issues of 9/11. More specifically, in neither of my books on 9/11 is any time spent on trying to figure out who perpetrated 9/11 or why.

On the other hand, a great deal of time and care is taken to critically explore the ‘what’ of 9/11. My contention is that when one does this properly, one comes to understand that the ‘official conspiracy theory’ promulgated by most people in government, the media, and academia is not tenable.

Sometimes coming to understand: what is not the case in relation to a given issue – in this case 9/11 -- is a very important preliminary step with respect to working toward an understanding of what actually did happen. Therefore, much of the material that is in this book is a critical examination of claims made in conjunction with the official conspiracy theory ... a critical examination that is done in the light of evidence and arguments that demonstrate how such a theory is not credible as a viable account of many aspects of the ‘what’ of 9/11.

I do not consider the manner in which government officials, media representatives and academics have improperly handled the issue of 9/11 to be evidence of a vast conspiracy. To illustrate what I mean here, consider the following scenario.

When I taught psychology in both Canada and the United States, many students failed the tests that I gave. I did not consider their failure to be a conspiracy on the part of students.

There were many reasons why students didn’t exercise due diligence with respect to preparing for the exams. For example, some of the young men and women didn’t belong in higher education. This was not necessarily because they weren’t intelligent, but, instead, was often because they were not mentally, intellectually, socially, and

emotionally prepared to commit themselves to the challenges and requirements presented by an academic environment.

Many of the students had never learned -- or never been taught -- how to study or how to break down a textbook or how to take notes or how to critically read material. Many students skipped classes because they were bored or hung over or tired from working a job or from raising children or because their immune systems crashed under the stresses of college/university life and they got sick a lot.

A number of students suffered from test-taking anxiety. As a result, they couldn't translate their hard work into a decent test score.

Other students were just not interested in psychology and didn't see the point of it. As far as they were concerned, it had nothing to do with their career plans, and they tended to resent having to take such courses ... and this resentment was reflected in their poor exam scores.

In short, there were many reasons why various students did not do well on the exams given to them by me. There was no conspiracy involved, but in every case there were a diverse array of obstacles that got in the way of generating a good performance and permitting students to exercise due diligence with respect to the material to be learned.

Similarly, there are many reasons why government officials, media representatives, and academics have dropped the ball on 9/11 that need not have anything to do with conspiracy. Some people just don't have the time to study the matter and have trusted the wrong people to provide them with an understanding of the issues entailed by 9/11. Some people are worried about their careers or keeping their jobs and, as a result, say nothing even if they see that the "official government conspiracy theory" does not make sense. Some people are bigoted with respect to Muslims and welcome any opportunity to blame Muslims for something irrespective of whether the evidence warrants this or not. Some people just don't care who did what to whom as long as they don't have to suffer. Some people are worried about their public image and are afraid to go speak out against the propagation of untenable theories because they worry about what other people will think of them. Some people are sociopathic opportunists and see 9/11 as an opportunity to secure various objectives -- politically, economically, militarily, and/or corporately -- that might not have been achievable

otherwise, and, therefore, they don't want to look at things too closely for fear that the opportunities will disappear. Moreover, as Stanley Milgram showed nearly fifty years ago, many people will accept, and comply with, almost anything they are told by individuals who are perceived to speak from a position of authority, and this remains true quite independently of whether, or not, that which is being asked of those people who are induced to be compliant is reasonable, moral, or factually warranted.

All I can ask a reader to do is to give an honest, sincere effort with respect to reading the material contained in this book and request them to critically assess whether, or not, I have been successful with respect to showing that the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 is not tenable or credible. If, after having read the book, you feel that I have not been adequately persuasive, then, it really is incumbent on you to show me – with evidence and well-structured arguments – where I am wrong.

Don't let the threat of dissociation prevent you from closely scrutinizing the manner in which many people in government, the media, and academia have framed the issue of 9/11. Become an advocate for de-framing the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 ... become an advocate for unleashing the real potential of the Constitution ... become an advocate for reclaiming democracy from the framing merchants of government, the media, and academia.

-----

The present, updated edition of *Framing 9/11* involves more than 140 pages of new material, and much of this is contained in the chapter of this book entitled: 'Unscientific America: 9/11, Harris, and Chomsky'. The penultimate chapter of this book also contains new material and provides an overview of the work of Rebekah Roth as presented in her *Methodical* trilogy and during a variety of interviews.

The final chapter of this updated edition of Framing 9-11 explores a variety of issues concerning the events of that fateful day from the perspective of a delusion rather than a conspiracy. Part of the aforementioned exploration involves an examination of the ramifications that have emerged as a result of the 9/11 delusion that dominates the thinking of so-many individuals in government, the media, and academia.

In addition, this second edition contains various corrections and a certain amount of reformatting of the first edition. Although I am sure that certain kinds of mistakes still grace the contents of the present work, nonetheless, I have endeavored – mightily -- to find and correct as many problems as I could in order to provide the reader with a more professional presentation.





### **1.) NIST, Junk Science, and Building 7**

In a November 29, 2001 *New York Times* article by James Glanz entitled: ‘Engineers Suspect Diesel Fuel in Collapse of 7 World Trade Center’, the reporter describes how a variety of structural engineering experts seemed to agree that finding a way to explain how WTC came down might “be much more important to understand” than understanding how the Twin Towers fell because “no ... modern, steel-reinforced high-rise had ever collapsed as the result of an uncontrolled fire.” There are several salient points inherent in the foregoing story.

First, there is an acknowledgment that “no modern steel-reinforced high-rise had ever collapsed as the result of uncontrolled fire.” Yet, on September 11, 2001, three buildings within several hundred feet of one another did come down.

The only explanation offered by technical experts in relation to the destruction of those buildings really reduces down to some sort of theory about the effects of fire. This is because the Twin Towers had been constructed in such a way that even if they were hit by something as big as a commercial jet loaded with fuel, the buildings would not have collapsed, and, therefore, the NIST theory concerning their fall is functionally dependent on fire being the primary culprit in the destruction of the two buildings. Moreover, since no plane hit Building 7, the only conventional suspect is, once again, some sort of theory involving fire.

A second point to notice in the aforementioned *Time’s* article is that the term “uncontrolled fires” is used. Now, while it is true that there have been four or five instances of actual uncontrolled fires taking place in different parts of the world (America, South America, Europe, and Asia) involving modern, steel-reinforced high-rise structures, nevertheless, the presence of uncontrolled fires in those buildings did not result in the structures coming down. Consequently, notwithstanding the contrary claims of some individuals, none of the buildings at the World Trade Center that did fall were subject to uncontrolled fires since there is ample evidence to indicate that all of those fires were of a manageable kind – that is: the fires were not extensive on the floors where they did occur; the fires had not spread to most of the other floors in the respective buildings, and none of the

fires were of a highly intense, impossible-to-put-out character that, as a result, lasted for an extended period of time.

Were there fires in each of the buildings? Yes, there were, but none of them could really be considered to be of an 'uncontrolled' or 'uncontrollable' nature, and I will come back to this point later in this chapter.

A third feature worth taking note of in relation to the aforementioned *Time's* article revolves around the headline for the news item. According to the engineers to whom Glanz talked, they suspected that diesel fuel might have played a primary role in serving as a considerable source of fuel for fires that broke out in Building 7 since there were a variety of large diesel fuel storage containers in different parts of Building 7 that were intended to supply back-up generators in case the main power supply for the building were cut off or disrupted in some manner. If, somehow, those storage containers caught fire, then this might explain why the fires in Building 7 allegedly became 'uncontrollable'.

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) had issued a report in May of 2002 - '*World Trade Center Building Performance Study*' -- which noted that the diesel fuel storage containers in Building 7 might have been a source that could have fed fires in that building for quite a long time. However, the report also indicated that such a possibility had a very low order of probability and finally concluded that the reasons for the fall of Building 7 were something of an unsolved mystery.

The diesel fuel idea was also part of the initial theory advanced by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) to explain why Building 7 came down. However, when NIST released its final report on Building 7, it had largely discarded the diesel fuel angle even as the Institute continued to maintain that it was uncontrolled fires that, ultimately, were responsible for the demise of Building 7.

So, once again, we are left with the mystery to which Glanz alluded in his article. Namely, given that no other steel-reinforced buildings anywhere in the world had ever come down even when uncontrollable fires were present, why did three buildings at the World Trade Center come down on the same day within hours of one another when no uncontrollable fires were present?

When the 9/11 Commission released its report in 2004, that report contained no discussion of Building 7. Building 7 was as much a mystery to the 9/11 Commission as it was to the structural engineers whom Glanz interviewed and to the engineers connected to both FEMA and NIST.

One of most mysterious features entailed by the demise of Building 7 is the issue of the near freefall character of the structure when it came down. Although various people attach slightly different times to the duration of the building's fall, all of those times are far more consistent with, and closer to, the properties of freefall than they are consistent with what one would expect if the building came down through some sort of conventional theory of collapse in which delays due to the conservation of momentum would have to be factored in and, as a result, the time required for the building to 'collapse' would be substantially higher than what was observed on 9/11 in relation to Building 7.

NIST even amended its final report concerning this aspect of freefall in conjunction with Building 7, when a high-school physics teacher, David Chandler, took NIST through the math and showed that there were at least several seconds of freefall that occurred when the structure came down. NIST made the correction but had no explanation to offer as to why or how the property of freefall was present in the demise of Building 7.

There really is only one way for such a period of freefall to be present. Somehow, one, or more, floors beneath a falling floor must be eliminated so that the falling floor encounters no resistance as it drops to the ground.

The question is: what eliminated the floors in question before the falling floor(s) reached the former location of the newly missing floors? Whatever explanation one comes up with to answer the foregoing question, it cannot be clothed in the garment of a pancake theory of progressive collapse in which each floor slams down on the floor below creating stresses that, in turn, lead to the failure of the lower floor, which, in turn, acts on the next floor below ... although, perhaps, somewhat more quickly since with each succeeding floor failure there is more mass moving in a downward direction to create increasingly severe stresses as one goes down the building.

The reason why the answer to the freefall mystery cannot be adequately addressed by any form of conventional collapse theory, is because at no time in such an explanation does a falling floor meet with anything but the floor below, and, consequently, this means that the issue of the conservation of momentum must always be factored into the calculations for determining the length of the time it would take for a structure to come down. There is never a period during such a conventional scenario in which a falling floor encounters nothing but empty space so that one does not have to continue to take into consideration the conservation of momentum principle.

As a result of the foregoing considerations, some people have advanced a theory that Building 7 was brought down by controlled demolition. Among the reasons for advancing such a thesis is the following: (a) there were elements of freefall present as the building came down; (b) the descent of the building was relatively sudden, symmetrical and straight down – none of which is consistent with a conventional gravity-driven collapse; (c) the destruction of the building was, more or less, total in the sense that there were no steel beams left standing – again, something that is unlikely to occur in any sort of conventional progressive collapse; (d) the debris pile was relatively small.

In relation to this last issue – that is, the size of the debris pile for Building 7 -- while that debris pile was, relatively speaking, fairly small, it was larger than the ones found in relation to WTC 1 and WTC 2. This is rather odd, since both of the Twin Towers were more than twice as tall as Building 7. So, where did the mass from the larger two buildings go in relation to the size of the debris piles for the Twin Towers relative to the size of the somewhat larger debris pile for Building 7? (This issue will be addressed in Chapter 2 of: *Framing 9/11*)

Notwithstanding the foregoing question, the fact of the matter is that the debris pile for Building 7 leads to a similar sort of question. Why didn't that debris pile reflect the amount of debris there should have been present from a 47-storey building? It was significantly undersized despite containing large amounts of mud – the presence of which has never been explained -- and, therefore, the idea of

controlled demolition might have difficulty accounting for the undersized character of the debris pile for Building 7.

Some individuals might counter the foregoing point by saying that the process of controlled demolition might have pulverized a lot of the concrete building material and, therefore, one would expect the debris pile to be smaller than anything that might take place through a conventional, gravity-driven. However, the extraordinary extent to which material was pulverized in all three buildings is not really consistent with the process of controlled demolition. Although controlled demolition does tend to lead to a break-up of materials, that process does not cause the pulverization or 'dustification' (Dr. Judy Wood's term) of such materials that is what occurred at the World Trade Center.

The degree of pulverization present in relation to Building 7 was not quite as severe as was the case with respect to WTC 1 and WTC 2. Nonetheless, the extent of pulverization of building materials in Building 7 was greater than one would have expected to see if that structure was brought down either by a conventional gravity-driven progressive collapse or via controlled demolition.

A second problem with the controlled demolition thesis is that the seismic readings that were recorded in relation to the fall of Building 7 were inconsistent with what one might expect if that structure came down as a result of either some sort of conventional, gravity-driven pancake theory or if the building came down as a result of controlled demolition. In other words, the seismic signature for the fall of Building 7 was not as great as one might anticipate in relation to such a massive structure coming down.

In fact, the seismic recording was not much different than normal background rumblings that are produced by the work-a-day world of a major metropolitan area ... and, to an extent, this fact tends to, once again, raise the question of what happened to the considerable mass contained in Building 7? Why wasn't the fall of such a large mass reflected in the seismic recordings for the 9/11-event?

Both the proponents of the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 as well those individuals who do not accept the official government theory concerning 9/11 bring in their dueling experts (whether engineers or explosive experts) to say that,

respectively, (1) Building 7 did not come down as a result of controlled demolition or that (2) Building 7 did come down as a result of controlled demolition. However, as the foregoing paragraphs indicate, there are problems entailed by both theories of what happened to Building 7 ... problems that neither of the two perspectives that attempt to explain what happened to Building 7 can adequately resolve.

NIST has issued a number of interim progress reports concerning its study of the Building 7 issue. All of those reports have implicated fire – in one form or another – as playing a major role in the destruction of Building 7, but those interim reports also implicated the role that falling debris from the North Tower at the WTC might have played in the eventual fall of Building 7.

As reported by the magazine, *Popular Mechanics*, the lead NIST investigative engineer, Shyam Sunder, spoke of a huge gash in the side of Building 7 facing the North Tower that ran about 10 stories and that had scooped out approximately 25 percent of the depth of the building. This statement was part of the evidence NIST was putting forth as support for a working hypothesis that, somehow, the structural damage (such as the huge gash noted above) that supposedly had been created by debris falling from the North Tower was connected to fires allegedly raging out of control in Building 7 – presumably fed by pressurized fuel gas lines connected to a variety of fuel storage tanks-- that eventually led to the progressive collapse of that structure around 5:20 PM on 9/11.

There are, however, a number of problems inherent in the foregoing hypothesis. The North Tower was more than three hundred and seventy feet away from Building 7, and if the fall of that building was via a gravity-driven progressive collapse --supposedly due to a combination of structural damage caused by plane impact and extensive fires (a theory that is neither credible nor proven) – then how did some thing, or things, massive enough to cause a 10 story gash that scooped out 25 percent of the depth of Building 7 get thrown laterally from the North Tower – especially given that the fall of the North Tower was largely symmetrical and straight-down?

Of course, there is some evidence (both visual and physical) to demonstrate that, in point of fact, there were multi-ton steel beams

that were hurled from the North Tower, and, conceivably, one, or more, of these hurling masses might have struck Building 7 causing the gash described by Sunder. On the other hand, the existence of such hurling masses is entirely inconsistent with a gravity-driven progressive collapse because there is no excess energy left over from the collapsing process to be able to rip such multi-ton slabs from the building and, simultaneously, propel them hundreds of feet into surrounding buildings.

Sunder, apparently, wanted to both keep and eat his technical cake. Nonetheless, if he wants to propose – as he did -- that the Twin Towers came down as the result of a conventional gravity-driven progressive collapse, then, such a proposal cannot explain how multi-ton slabs were ripped from those buildings and, then, hurled between 300 and 500 feet in a, more or less, lateral direction. However, if Sunder wishes to claim – as he did -- that the structural damage to Building 7 was caused by debris from the North Tower, then he is going to have to jettison the idea of a conventional, gravity-driven progressive collapse of the North Tower because ‘falling’ (rather than explosively propelled) multi-ton slab beams are not likely to have reached Building 7.

Sunder can have -- theoretically speaking -- a conventional gravity-driven progressive collapse of the Twin Towers (which NIST was never able to plausibly demonstrate) with no multi-ton steel beams being hurled laterally some 300-600 feet, or he can have multi-ton steel beams being hurled laterally some 300-600 feet without a conventional gravity-driven progressive collapse. But, he can't have both, and, yet, Sunder claims – without any real plausible explanation for how it was possible – that both events occurred at the same time.

The foregoing considerations notwithstanding, they are all somewhat – but not entirely -- moot because in its final report on the destruction of Building 7 that was released in 2008, NIST indicated that the considerable structural damage to one face of Building 7 played a very limited and marginal role in the fall of that structure. Instead, NIST argued (and I will come back to this issue) that the fall of Building 7 was entirely the result of fires that weakened a key structural component of the building and when this key component failed, this led to a progressive, gravity-driven collapse of the building.

As a passing observation, one might note that to a large extent, both *Popular Mechanics* and *Skeptic* magazines based their accounts of what happened to Building 7 on the early working-theory of NIST that involved a combination of two main factors: (1) structural damage caused by debris from the North Tower, working in conjunction with (2) fires fed by broken, pressurized fuel lines linked to a number of diesel storage tanks in the building. In its final report on Building 7, NIST indicated – without saying it directly – that the accounts of both *Popular Mechanics* and *Skeptic* magazines were in error since NIST’s final report, issued in November of 2008, claimed that neither structural damage caused by ‘falling’ debris nor fires fed by pressurized diesel fuel lines had much to do with the fall of Building 7.

NIST held a press conference in August 2008 in which Shyam Sunder stated in his opening remarks that: “WTC 7 collapsed because of fires fueled by office furnishings.” Sunder also indicated in his statement that NIST had discovered a new phenomenon – namely, that is possible for fire, and fire alone, to “induce a progressive collapse” in a modern, steel-reinforced high-rise building – something that had never occurred previously even though there had been 4 or five instances in various parts of the world in which such steel-reinforced buildings had burned with uncontrolled fires for many hours without collapsing.

The ‘new’ phenomenon to which Sunder was referring involved the idea of “thermal expansion”. While the concept of thermal expansion was quite well known to engineers prior to 9/11, what was new, according to Sunder, involved the way in which structural aspects of Building 7 were allegedly affected by thermal expansion to such an extent that the building was induced to have a progressive collapse ... a fire-induced progressive collapse – the first in history.

According to Sunder’s press statement, debris from the North Tower: “started fires on at least ten floors of the building. The fire burned out of control on six [7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13] of these ten floors for about seven hours.”

Aside from the aforementioned issue of wondering how multi-ton steel beams would have been able to travel more than three hundred and seventy feet to reach Building 7 if the North Tower was merely collapsing due to a gravity-driven progressive collapse, one also



wonders how fires were started on ten different floors of Building 7. The assumption that NIST and Sunder made is that something hot or on fire somehow reached Building 7 and eventually led to fires on at least ten floors.

However, the only things from the North Tower (NIST rejected the idea that anything from the South Tower would have been able to reach Building 7, some 675 feet away) that might have been hot or on fire would have come from just a few of the upper floors of the North Tower – the floors where a plane allegedly had crashed and started fires that, in fairly short order, were largely both oxygen deficient and starved of fuel prior to the point when they came down. More than 100 floors in the North Tower were not on fire, so what evidence is there that material which was on fire or that was supposedly hot enough to ignite fires from the few floors that did have fires in the North Tower had been able to make the journey of more than 370 feet to Building 7 and land in a condition that was hot enough to be able to start fires on multiple floors of Building 7?

The fact of the matter is there is no evidence in support of the foregoing idea. It is pure conjecture.

Of course, NIST might wish to counter with something along the lines of: “Well, if the fires in Building 7 didn’t start as a result of debris from the North Tower, then, how did they start? This is a good question for which I do not have an answer, but being unable to answer such a question, does not automatically make NIST’s assumption about how fires started in Building 7 correct.

NIST, itself, admits in its final report on Building 7 that the cause of fires is actually unknown. Nonetheless, NIST indicates that the idea that the fires in Building 7 were initiated by debris from the Twin Towers is, nonetheless, likely. Likely ... why?

What made it possible for hot/fiery material from the North Tower to travel more than 370 feet to Building 7? NIST doesn’t know but assumes that material “falling” from the North Tower sort of ‘fell more than 370 feet away ... an assumption that is rather implausible within the context of an allegedly gravity-driven ‘collapse’.

As indicated previously, NIST rejected the idea that any ‘falling’ material from the South Tower would have been able to reach Building

7. Why is it more reasonable to suppose that falling material would have been able to reach Building 7 from the North Tower some 370 feet away -- especially given that the North Tower came straight down.

What was the temperature of the material from the North Tower that hit Building 7? NIST doesn't know.

How can one be certain that such material was hot enough to start fires? NIST doesn't know.

How exactly did the material from the North Tower that supposedly hit Building 7 start fires? NIST doesn't know.

The contention that the fires in Building 7 started as a result of debris from the falling North Tower is considered 'likely' by NIST because that idea is crucial to its narration of events since without such an assumption everything that follows in its report is problematic. In effect, the NIST assumption about how the fires started in Building 7 is 'likely' because NIST's theory requires this to be the case and, therefore, it assumes the truth of its theory's 'likelihood' despite the fact there is little evidence to warrant describing such an assumption as 'likely'.

In short, the assumption concerning how the fires in Building 7 started is 'likely' because the theory that NIST wishes to put forward as an explanation of events needs that assumption to be likely. The reasoning is circular and not evidentially based.

According to the opening statement of Shyam Sunder, the fires, once started, burned out of control for about seven hours. Yet, the final report by NIST concerning Building 7 indicates that the first videographic or photographic evidence of fire in relation to Building 7 was recorded at 12:10 PM. At that time, two fires were visible on the southwest corner of the 22<sup>nd</sup> floor.

If this is the case, then, Sunder has no evidential basis for saying that fires burned out of control in Building 7 for about seven hours. There is no evidential basis for such a statement because the earliest piece of photographic evidence indicating fires were burning in Building 7 was at 12:10 PM and this was in conjunction with the 22<sup>nd</sup> floor.

If one assumes that fires started as a result of 'falling' debris from the North Tower, then such debris would have begun 'falling' around

10:28 AM, and if one assumes that uncontrolled fires started in Building 7 shortly thereafter, then NIST's contention that such fires could have burned for about 7 hours -- or until the structure fell at around 5:20 PM -- might be true. However, this is all a network of assumptions.

Two witnesses – namely, Barry Jennings, a former official of the New York City Housing Authority, and Michael Hess, the corporation legal counsel for New York City – indicated that they were trapped in the stairwell on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor of Building 7 for somewhere between: 1 ½ to two hours, and although they reported hearing and experiencing several explosions, neither one of them said anything about seeing fires. Information concerning their account of things is drawn from a number of sources including several NIST documents, interviews with BBC and Dylan Avery, as well as from a September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2001 article by Paul Vallely in *The Independent*, a British newspaper.

Rudy Giuliani was a friend of Michael Hess but was not present at the time the two men became trapped since the two individuals had gone to the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 to be with Giuliani at the Emergency Management Command Center but the Mayor was not where he was supposed to be, and it was at that point the two men began to descend the stairs because the elevators were not working. In a 2002 article in *Leadership*, Giuliani reported that the two men had been trapped by debris falling from the North Tower. Giuliani noted that the two trapped-men were fortunate that they were going down the north stairwell since the debris from the North Tower had been crashing down on the south side of Building 7.

Yet, if the two men were lucky that they were going down the north side stairwell because debris from the North Tower was raining down on the south side of Building 7, how did debris falling from the North Tower reach the two men on the back side of Building 7, more than 150 feet away from the south side of Building 7 – and this must be added to the more than 370 feet that separates the south side of Building 7 from the North Tower? How did the debris that allegedly was falling on the south side of Building 7 trap Jennings and Hess on the north, or back side, at the sixth floor of that building?

In contradistinction to what Giuliani said about the Jennings/Hess affair in the 2002 *Leadership* piece, the two individuals about whom

Giuliani was writing originally indicated that what trapped them was an explosion – not falling debris -- because the explosion had blown out the stairwell below the sixth floor (not from above as would have been the case if debris from the South Tower were raining down on them), and, as a result, they could not continue going down the stairs any further. The two worked their way back up to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor at which time Barry Jennings took a fire extinguisher and broke a window in the stairwell and was able to alert someone on the street below that they were trapped in the building.

Barry Jennings also testified that the explosion that trapped them occurred before either of the Twin Towers fell. He reports that once they had worked their way back up to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor stairwell landing and after he had been able to draw attention to their plight by breaking a window and calling out, there had been two separate occasions during which emergency personnel were about to rescue the two trapped men and each time the rescue teams were forced to flee due to the collapse of one, or another, of the Twin Towers. Their rescue did not occur until at least 30 to 45 minutes after the second tower fell.

In other words, the explosion that eliminated the stairway below the sixth floor landing was not due to falling debris. It was an event that was entirely unrelated to falling debris from the North Tower because it occurred prior to the fall of either of the Twin Towers.

The foregoing testimonies are interesting because Shyam Sunder of NIST indicated in his August 2008 press conference statement that fires were raging out of control on a number of floors – including the 8<sup>th</sup> floor. Moreover, Giuliani attempts to claim that the two individuals became trapped only after the North Tower came down, and, therefore, presumably – if one accepts the assumptions of NIST -- uncontrollable fires were “likely” to have begun shortly after the two individuals became trapped, and, yet, somehow, Jennings and Hess were able to survive for anywhere from an hour to more than an hour and a half under such circumstances.

According to NIST and Giuliani, two people were trapped in the stairwell of the 8<sup>th</sup> floor for an extended period of time when fires supposedly were raging out of control on 7, 8, and 9 and, yet, neither Jennings nor Hess gave any mention in their witness statements about

seeing fires. They did indicate that there had been some explosions unrelated to what was happening in conjunction with the Twin Towers and that there was a thick smoke all around them and, as well, they felt some degree of heat from, presumably, a fire burning in some undetermined location.

Explosions, yes! Fires, no!

Was the 'smoke' that the two previously trapped individuals mentioned in their account from a smoldering fire somewhere or was it from a raging fire? Or, was the 'smoke' merely dust created by the explosions that they both reported in relation to Building 7 prior to becoming trapped? Or, was the thick 'smoke' from the dust that arose following the fall of the South Tower ... something that, according to their initial statements, occurred after they had become trapped? Or, was it some combination of the three?

As someone who has been involved in an apartment building fire and stayed in the building long enough to go banging on doors trying to rouse people and to get someone to call 911, I know that my lungs and the lungs of someone whom I roused were sufficiently adversely affected by the smoke coming from the fire that I had trouble breathing for a bit of time after I got out into clear air. The fire was not that big and my exposure was not more than five or ten minutes at the most, but I don't think I could have gone on much longer without encountering some severe breathing difficulty.

While there might have been some smoke from a fire in what was swirling all about Jennings and Hess, one wonders how much of the thick 'cloud' was smoke from a fire and how much was dust from the explosions they had heard and felt prior to being trapped on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor and prior to the time when either of the Twin Towers actually fell and how much might have been dust from the fallen Twin Towers? According to the initial statements of the two men, they were trapped in the 8<sup>th</sup> floor stairwell before either of the Twin Towers fell, and, therefore, one wonders what the thick 'smoke' was from since - according to NIST -- no fires could have been started by 'falling debris' from towers that had not, yet, collapsed ... or was the report of thick 'smoke' something that arose only some time after the first tower collapsed?

Which of the foregoing possibilities might be the case is hard to determine based on what I have seen of their witness statements. Nevertheless, no matter in what direction one would like to proceed with respect to trying to understand what took place in Building 7, there are a variety of questions that arise in conjunction with the testimony of Barry Jennings and Michael Hess concerning the accuracy of the NIST narrative involving Building 7 ... especially in relation to the issue of how the fires in that building started or whether such fires actually were of the sort of uncontrolled nature claimed by NIST.

Moreover, if there were some fires on the 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 9<sup>th</sup> floors, and, yet, those fires were relatively small (and, possibly therefore, producing more smoke than fire), this would be consistent with the photographic and videographic evidence mentioned earlier. That evidence indicated that fires were not seen in Building 7 until 12:10 PM, and those fires were on the north side of the 22<sup>nd</sup> floor and not on the 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, and 9<sup>th</sup>, floors.

NIST assumes that fires starting – due to falling debris – on the south side of Building 7 eventually worked their way over to the north side of the building. However, they have no evidence to substantiate their contention concerning the spread of the fire since the first hard evidence of a fire burning in Building 7 is in relation to the 22<sup>nd</sup> floor on the north side of the building and not in relation to its south side.

In other words, NIST assumed that the fire started in certain places on the south side of Building 7, and, moreover, they assumed that those fires spread in a certain way to the north side of the building. However, they have no actual evidence to support either contention. It is all conjecture ... and not necessarily “likely” conjecture.

In a 2004 publication entitled: *Interim Report on WTC 7* (Appendix L) issued by NIST as well as in a 2005 NIST publication entitled: *The Emergency Response Operations*, an account, of sorts, is given concerning the Barry Jennings and Michael Hess experience of being trapped in Building 7 on 9/11. In certain respects, and for whatever reason, the authors of those two NIST accounts seek to paint a very different description of what supposedly took place on that day.

The NIST accounts tend to parallel the account given by Rudy Giuliani several years earlier. More specifically, the two

aforementioned NIST accounts try to indicate that Jennings and Hess became trapped by debris from the North Tower as it came down and that the reason why the two individuals had to go down the stairs in the first place was because the fall of the South Tower had knocked out the power to Building 7 thereby rendering the elevators inoperable.

Both Hess and Jennings gave statements indicating that they had received calls prior to 9:00 AM to go to the Office of Emergency Management Command Center for New York City – which was the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7 -- after the first plane had hit the North Tower but before the second plane had struck the South Tower. They indicated that the second plane hit the South Tower just after they arrived on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7.

When the two men arrived at the Emergency Management Command Center, they found the place empty. There were cups on some of the desks with steam still rising from the surface of the coffee, and, as well, there were some half-eaten sandwiches.

Jennings called several people trying to find out what was going on. One of the people he called told him to leave the building right away.

Consequently, the two men tried to quickly get out of the building. They attempted to take the elevators but found that the elevators, for some reason, were not operating.

According to the NIST account, the reason the elevators were not working was because the South Tower had fallen and knocked out the power. Jennings, on several occasions, has indicated that the foregoing scenario could not be true because only after they became trapped did the Twin Towers fall, and the reason why he knows this is because there were several occasions after the two men became trapped that emergency teams were about to rescue them but had to leave because on each occasion one of the Twin Towers fell.

In addition, the NIST account of the ordeal indicates, as did Giuliani's description several years earlier and as a subsequent BBC video piece tried to suggest -- that Jennings and Hess became trapped by debris from the North Tower falling on Building 7. However, the same problem arises in conjunction with the NIST account and the BBC story in this respect as was the case in relation to Giuliani's story

– namely, if Jennings and Hess were going down the north stairway on the side of Building 7 furthest from the North Tower and if they had reached the sixth floor, then, how did so-called “falling” debris from the North Tower not only travel more than 450 feet to reach the back side of Building 7 but, as well, was able to strike that backside of the building down around the sixth floor?

Again, not only is such an account contradicted by Jennings testimony on several occasions that neither of the Twin Towers fell until after they had become trapped in Building 7, but, as well, neither the NIST account nor that of Rudy Giuliani make any physical sense. How did debris falling from the North Tower travel more than 520 feet and, somehow, strike Building 7 on the side furthest away from the North Tower down around the sixth floor?

I find it rather perplexing why NIST and Giuliani – neither of whom was in Building 7 at the time of the Jennings/Hess incident and neither of whom was in the stairwell with Jennings and Hess at the time of the incident – should insist that their account of the event is correct and that Jennings was, somehow, confused about things. Jennings is providing direct experiential data of life events, and, at best, NIST and Giuliani are interpreting that data through the filters of their own theories about 9/11.

Since neither NIST nor Giuliani can account for the explosions that Jennings and Hess mention, they try to force fit (i.e., frame) the experience of those two men into a world view that not only insists, but needs, the explosion to which Jennings and Hess refer to be the result of falling debris from the North Tower. The story being advanced by NIST, Giuliani, and the BBC makes absolutely no physical sense, and, furthermore, that story is contradicted by Jennings’ account that not only places the explosion prior to the destruction of the Twin Towers but provides evidence indicating that the Twin Towers came down only after they became trapped.

In addition to the foregoing considerations, and quite inexplicably, both NIST and Giuliani leave out other parts of Jennings account of what transpired in Building 7 on 9/11. More specifically, Jennings indicates that when they were finally rescued, they were brought down into the lobby area, and according to Jennings, the lobby was in



such a devastated condition that the two had to be taken out through a hole in the wall rather than through doors.

Presumably, NIST might attribute the devastation to the effects of falling debris from the North Tower. However, Jennings reported that while they were trapped in the stairwell of Building 7, a number of explosions took place.

Was the destruction in the lobby of Building 7 from falling debris or from explosions or a bit of both? If NIST were to put forward the former idea rather than the latter idea, it really has no evidence to support or substantiate such a perspective. All they have are assumptions and a number of unanswered questions such as: how was such extensive destruction brought about in relation to the lobby and where are the reports of steel beams from the North Tower being strewn about the lobby or penetrating into the lobby, and why didn't NIST discuss any of this?

There is another set of questions that occurs to me in relation to the rescue of Jennings and Hess. Since the stairwell landing on floor 6 had been blown out, how did Jennings and Hess get to the lobby?

Presumably, they were taken to another stairwell. However, to get to such a stairwell, one might suppose that they had to enter one of the floors of Building 7.

Yet, out of control fires supposedly were burning on 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13 in Building 7. So, how did they cross over to another stairwell? Or, did they have to cross over? Were they, perhaps, somehow lowered down or assisted to climb down through the hole where the sixth floor landing was missing?

I have found no account of the actual rescue details with respect to their journey from a north-side 8<sup>th</sup> floor stairwell to the lobby of Building 7. If out of control fires were burning all around them, how did they get to the lobby?

By raising the foregoing questions, I am not questioning the story of Jennings and Hess concerning their ordeal. What I am wondering about is whether Shyam Sunder was accurate in his August 2008 Press Conference when he claimed that out of control fires were raging on floors: 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13 in Building 7 for a period of some seven hours, and one might suppose that under such harrowing

circumstances, something might have been said by someone about the difficulties of being able to find a way down to the lobby.

Maybe, there are reasonable explanations for the foregoing set of questions. However, if there are, NIST certainly hasn't supplied them.

In fact, NIST not only left out any account of the foregoing aspect of the rescue but, as well, completely left out the facet of the experience when the two men finally reached the lobby after being rescued and Jennings remarked how astonished he was with respect to the extent of the damage that had been inflicted on the very large area that, among other things, had contained escalators when Jennings had come to Building 7 around 9:00 in the morning. One wonders why NIST left out the foregoing aspects from Jennings account of his experiences.

Another part of Jennings account that NIST left out was the dead bodies (possibly) that Jennings came across in the lobby of Building 7 ... dead bodies that Jennings had to step over on the way to the hole in the wall of the lobby that was to serve as an exit to the street outside. Again, one wonders why NIST left this detail out of its account.

NIST repeatedly has said that no one died in Building 7 on 9/11. Perhaps it left out the portion of Jennings account about possible dead bodies and a destroyed lobby because it doesn't want to have to deal with inconvenient facts that run contrary to the way NIST is trying to frame the events of 9/11 – a process of framing rooted in assumptions and problematic data gathering rather than actual evidence.

Later, in a BBC program called 'The Conspiracy Files: 9/11 – The Third Tower', Jennings indicated that he never saw any dead bodies – only that he felt like he was stepping over them as he made his way to the hole in the side of the lobby of Building 7. On the other hand, Jennings previously reported that a firefighter who was with them and guiding them toward the hole repeatedly said: "Don't look down."

Now, why would a firefighter say such things? What was the firefighter trying to spare Jennings and Hess from seeing?

Were there any dead bodies in the lobby of Building 7? Jennings indicated that it felt like he was stepping over dead bodies as he made his way to the hole in the wall. On the other hand, he told the people behind the BBC program that he never actually saw any dead bodies.

Notwithstanding that fact, Jennings did say that he was warned by a firefighter with him not to look down as he made his way to the exit hole in the wall.

It is possible that both things could be true. In other words, while Jennings never actually saw any dead bodies, nonetheless, he might have had to step over them.

Moreover, Jennings was warned about not looking down as he made his way to the exit hole in the wall. Although Jennings was never told that the reason why he shouldn't look down is because there are dead bodies on the lobby floor, nonetheless, one is left wondering why else Jennings would be told not to look down.

As it stands, the dead body facet of things in the lobby of Building 7 is something of a mystery. NIST has no evidence to prove that there were no dead bodies, but, at the same time, the existing evidence only suggests the possibility of dead bodies in the lobby and does not constitute proof that such was the case.

Rather than leave the issue as an unresolved mystery, NIST tended to sanitize the data it collected and retained. Whatever was inconsistent with the theory NIST wants to push – such as much of the account given by Barry Jennings -- is discarded and left out of their reports ... in other words, NIST engaged in a process of framing the evidence.

NIST is willing to include assumptions that lack any evidential basis in its reports. Yet, NIST is unwilling to include ideas in its reports for which there is evidence but that, for arbitrary reasons, NIST wants to keep out of its reports.

A second BBC program about Building 7 was aired on October 26, 2008. In this program -- entitled: 'The Conspiracy Files – The Truth Behind The Third Tower' -- Michael Hess, the person who had been trapped on 9/11 with Barry Jennings in Building 7 was interviewed (Barry Jennings had passed away several months prior to the program's release), and, reportedly, the interview was the first that Hess had given since the eventful day.

Although in an interview given to UPN 9 News shortly after being rescued on 9/11, Hess mentioned having experienced and heard explosions in Building 7, in the 2008 BBC interview, Hess recants his

earlier testimony and says, instead, that there was no explosion on 9/11. In the latter interview, he recounts how although originally he believed there had been some sort of explosion in the basement, he knows “now this was caused by the northern half of Number 1 falling on the southern half of our building.”

The question naturally arises: How does Michael Hess “know now” what he claims to not have known on 9/11? If he was in a stairwell on the north side of Building 7 down near the sixth floor, he couldn’t possibly have seen debris from the North Tower raining down on him. So, what is the basis of his newly found ‘knowledge’?

On the basis of his previously reported experience on 9/11, he indicated that he heard and felt an explosion from below that knocked him back and that destroyed the landing for the sixth floor stairwell on the north side of Building 7. He knew that he could not continue down the stairs because there were no stairs to continue down, so he went back up the stairwell.

After Barry Jennings broke one of the windows in the 8<sup>th</sup> floor stairwell, he waited near that window for rescue to arrive. Finally, he was rescued and, somehow, he, along with Barry Jennings, were brought down to the lobby and helped to exit through a hole in the lobby wall.

What new facts does Hess have that now makes him certain that the ‘explosion’ experienced on 9/11 was actually the sound of debris from the North Tower striking the south side of Building 7? Actually, he has no new facts, but he has been presented with something that is new: a framing of events by NIST, Giuliani, and others that has induced Hess to re-interpret his original experience.

Hess’ new perspective on things cannot answer the following question. If what he heard on 9/11 was not an explosion but merely falling debris from the North Tower, how did that falling debris destroy the 6<sup>th</sup> floor landing on the back side of Building 7 furthest from the North Tower, more than 520 feet away from North Tower? And, given this question, how can Hess “know now” that the whole thing was the result of falling debris?

Hess cannot plausibly and credibly answer the foregoing question any more than NIST or Giuliani would be able to answer it. The fact

that portions of a north side landing and stairwell leading down to the street were destroyed – a fact that led to their being trapped – undermines the picture that NIST, Giuliani, and BBC (each for their own individual reasons) is trying to paint concerning the nature of the experience undergone by Hess and Jennings on 9/11.

Hess, Giuliani, NIST, and BBC have no independent evidence to support their interpretation of events. Furthermore, there is a crucial question concerning physical evidence that none of them can answer in a plausible or credible way.

In addition, none of them has any evidence to contradict Jennings testimony that the explosion that took out the 6<sup>th</sup> floor landing had to occur prior to the fall of either of the Twin Towers and that only after they had become trapped did the Twin Towers fall. Jennings indicates that twice, emergency workers had tried to rescue the two trapped-men only to be stymied by the fall of the Twin Towers at two different points during the protracted rescue attempt.

-----

On page 341 of NIST NCSTAR 1-9 (National Construction Safety Team Act Report), NIST indicates: “there was no evidence of floor-to-floor fire spread.” Thus, on the ten floors where fires, according to NIST, were believed to be (six of which were supposedly uncontrollable – namely, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13), those fires were independent of one another, and this means that one needs to come up with an explanation for how fires started on ten different floors and why those fires became out of control on some floors but not others.

Now, since earlier I indicated that NIST admitted that the answer to the question of how the fires started is unknown, then, this means that NIST has to make ten assumptions that, somehow, debris from the North Tower started each of the fires in Building 7. Or, to say the same thing in a slightly different way, NIST is just making one assumption, but they are applying that assumption to ten situations that they believe to be independent of one another. I’m not sure that the underlying assumption becomes more credible if one parses the situation in one of the foregoing ways rather than the other.

In any event, NIST goes on to maintain that each of the fires worked its way from the south side of Building 7 to the northeast side

of the structure. Once the fires reached the northeast sector of the building, they are alleged to have burned long enough and with the requisite degree of intensity to bring about thermal expansion in a certain key, structural component and that this, in turn, led to a progressive collapse of the building.

There are a number of questions that can be raised in relation to the foregoing theory. (1) Did the fires spread in the way that NIST claims? (2) Did the fires burn for a sufficiently long period and with sufficient thermal intensity to bring about thermal expansion? (3) If thermal expansion occurred, would it have been capable of initiating a progressive collapse?

There is a sequence to the order in which some of the evidence for fires was reported in relation to Building 7. This evidence involves the capture of visual images.

As previously noted, the first photographic indication of fires in Building 7 was acquired at 12:10 PM in relation to the southwest corner of the 22<sup>nd</sup> floor. Prior to 2:08 PM, there were only three photographs that provided evidence of fires in Building 7. These photographs involved the aforementioned 22<sup>nd</sup> floor, as well as fires on both the 29<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> floors.

According to NIST, around 2:00 PM, and shortly thereafter, images of fires were captured in relation to the 7<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup>, and 12<sup>th</sup> floors. Another fire was photographed in conjunction with the east side of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor at approximately 2:30 PM. Further fires were photographed on the 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> floors at, respectively: 3:40 PM, 4:00 PM and 5:00 PM.

If fires supposedly were started in Building 7 by materials falling from the failing North Tower at around 10:28 AM, then why have only three fires shown up prior to 2:00 PM, some 3 ½ hours later? Moreover, why did it take so long for the fires that only appeared after 2:00 PM to show up?

Just as importantly, with respect to whatever visible fires showed up after 2:00 PM – which is most of them as far as photographic evidence is concerned – there is no evidence that any of those fires had been burning out of control for the seven hours that was indicated by Shyam Sunder in his August 2008 NIST Press Conference. On the basis

of photographic evidence, the very most that NIST might claim that the fires burned would be not much more than a little over three hours ... and, this assumes that those fires did burn consistently throughout that three hour period, and NIST has no evidence that is capable of substantiating such a contention.

NIST claims that there were some eyewitness accounts that suggested that fires were ongoing before any of the aforementioned photographic evidence indicates. For instance, on pages 298-299 of its document NIST NCSTAR 1-9, NIST talks about a security officer who: "saw a fire on the west side of the Floor 7 that he attempted to put out with an extinguisher, but was unable to do so." The foregoing is said to have happened shortly after the North Tower came down.

A number of questions could be raised in relation to the foregoing. Did the security officer have any idea of what started the fire? If the fire was sufficiently big at a little after 10:28 AM to not be able to put out with an extinguisher, then why did it take until after 2:00 in the afternoon for photographic evidence to become visible since the fire supposedly had been burning for 3 ½ hours? Or, is it possible that the fire on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor was never really raging but worked its way through the inflammable material on the floor in fits and starts, thereby never really becoming visible until much later in the day?

On page 380 of NIST NCSTAR 1-9 NIST states: "At 12:15 PM when the cubicle fire had been observed on Floor 7, people being led from Floors 7 and 8 out of the building reported no fires, heavy dust, or smoke on Floor 8. Between 12:15 PM and 2:30 PM, fire activity on Floor 8 was observed at the south face by eyewitnesses near the southwest corner of the building." Floors 7 and 8 were two of the floors where there were out of control fires allegedly raging for nearly seven hours according to Shyam Sunder of NIST.

Yet, at 12:15 PM – nearly two hours after the fall of the North Tower – there are no eyewitness reports of any fires or smoke on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor. There are, on the other hand, alleged – but unidentified -- eyewitness reports in relation to the 8<sup>th</sup> floor concerning the occurrence of fire somewhere between 12:15 PM and 2:30 PM.

NIST – as I earlier indicated – stated that there was no evidence to indicate that the fires in Building 7 traveled between floors. The fires were alleged to be relatively independent of one another.

If there was no sign of fire or smoke on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor at 12: 15 PM, and if all fires were supposedly started by falling debris from the North Tower, and if fires did not spread between floors, then why were there no eyewitness reports of fires prior to 12:15 PM? More importantly, how did the fires start on the 8<sup>th</sup> floor given that there were no reports of fires or smoke prior to 12:15 PM?

Furthermore, if, according to NIST, fires were supposedly raging out of control on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> floors of Building 7 for 7 hours, how were people still able to survive on those floors at 12:15 PM? In addition, if people were on those floors for nearly one hour and forty-five minutes following the fall of the North Tower, why was there no mention of structural damage to those floors through which debris from the North Tower would have been introduced to start fires, and if such debris was present, but merely unmentioned by eyewitnesses, why hadn't fires started by 12:15 PM, and if debris from the North Tower had crashed into those floors, why were those individuals still in the building?

Matthys Levy, a structural engineer, indicated in a documentary entitled: *'9/11 Conspiracies: Fact or Fiction'* that was aired on the History Channel in 2007 that he believed fires actually had been burning in Building 7 since at least 9:30 AM.

Levy supported the official theory about what happened on 9/11 at the World Trade Center and, apparently, was trying to build a case for increasing the amount of time that Building 7 was exposed to fire and, thereby, make the idea that fires could have brought down Building 7 more plausible by indicating that the fires were very long-lasting -- nearly eight hours. This is an hour longer than Shyam Sunder claimed fires were raging in Building 7.

There are, however, some problems with respect to both Levy's perspective and the position of NIST in relation to the demise of Building 7. First of all, if NIST claims that the fires in Building 7 all started as a result of debris from the North Tower that fell on the south face of Building 7, then, how did the 9:30 AM fires start?

Secondly, if fires actually started at 9:30 AM as Levy claims and if they were raging for eight hours -- one more hour than NIST claims, then, why wasn't there any additional photographic or eyewitness testimony to this effect? On what was Levy basing his claims



concerning the 9:30 AM fires and what independent evidence is there which supports his claim and why didn't NIST acknowledge that claim in any of its reports?

Levy's assertion concerning the existence of 9:30 AM fires is somewhat consistent with the initial reports of Jennings and Hess that there were fires, of some kind, in Building 7 prior to the fall of the North Tower – fires that might have been connected to the explosion that cut off their north stairwell exit at the sixth floor. However, if one accepts what Levy has to say, then obviously, NIST is quite wrong about a number of the things that it claims concerning fires and Building 7.

On the other hand, if Levy is correct with respect to the 9:30 AM part of his statement, he has no evidence to indicate that the fire(s) to which he refers actually sustained themselves for more than eight hours as he claimed to be the case in the History Channel documentary. This is merely his non-evidentially based inference.

-----

According to NIST, although there was photographic evidence to indicate the presence of fires on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, and 30<sup>th</sup> floors of Building 7, the fires were short lived. NIST claims that such fires were of relatively brief duration due, primarily, to a sprinkler system that was functional on 9/11 ... at least, the system was functional above the 20<sup>th</sup> floor while a separate sprinkler system servicing Building 7 from the 20<sup>th</sup> floor down was not operational since, according to NIST, it had been knocked out of commission when the Twin Towers fell.

Despite the absence of a functional sprinkler system for floors 1-20, NIST claims that after roughly 1:00 PM, there was no photographic or videographic evidence of fires anywhere above the 14<sup>th</sup> floor. Prior to 1:00 PM, there had been photographic evidence of a fire on the 19<sup>th</sup> floor, but this fire died out for reasons that NIST was unable to explain (see NIST NCSTAR 1-9, page 78).

One might reasonably ask: if a fire (the one on the 19<sup>th</sup> floor) that was large enough to be captured by camera could die out despite the absence of a sprinkler system, why isn't the same scenario possible in relation to other floors below the 21<sup>st</sup> storey – the floors where the sprinkler system was not operative? Moreover, if fires allegedly were

burning out of control on 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13 for seven hours – in part, presumably, because of the absence of a working sprinkler system – then why didn't these fires spread to floors 14 through 20?

NIST had stated there was no evidence of fires – once they started -- migrating from one floor to another ... either upwards or downwards. However, as far as I have been able to determine, NIST provides no evidentially based explanation for why this would have been the case.

In other words, NIST, by its own admission, doesn't really know how any of the fires in Building 7 started. It doesn't know why a fire on the 19<sup>th</sup> floor appeared to die out despite the absence of a sprinkler system. NIST doesn't seem to know why fires failed to spread from one floor to another. Moreover, the only photographic evidence that NIST has of fires in relation to floors below the 14<sup>th</sup> floor comes after 2:00 PM.

Yet, NIST claims that fires were burning out of control for seven hours in Building 7. Why should anyone accept such a claim?

There is a further mystery concerning fires in Building 7. Earlier I noted that in one of its reports (NIST NCSTAR 1-9, 2008), NIST had described (pages 298-299) the account of a security officer who had tried to put out a fire on the 7<sup>th</sup> floor but was unable to do so.

The account given by NIST with respect to the security officer also describes how that individual had been searching various parts of the upper floors of Building 7 for people who might still be in the building after the fall of the South Tower. While engaged in his search, the security officer reports that the building shook with the fall of the North Tower, but the security officer's account gives no indication that the building was being hit by debris from the North Tower as he was working his way down the building – and remember, NIST has tried to indicate that the force that knocked out the sixth floor landing on the back side of Building 7 that trapped Barry Jennings and Michael Hess (the side furthest away from the falling North Tower but the same side as the security officer was on) was a function of debris from the falling North Tower.

The security officer indicates that he continued his descent down the stairs. When he reached the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor, he checked to see if anyone

was present on the floor and reports that the floor was filled with smoke.

The 23<sup>rd</sup> floor housed the Office of Emergency Management for New York City. This is the office to which Barry Jennings and Michael Hess had come in order to meet up with Mayor Giuliani but found no one there.

The office was specially constructed. Among other things, the windows were supposedly blast proof and bullet proof.

One wonders, therefore, what started the fire on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor that was creating the smoke seen by the security officer when he checked for the possible presence of personnel on the floor. One might reasonably have assumed that if the specially reinforced floor was blast proof that it would have been able to withstand the assault of falling debris – and one might keep in mind that in the NIST account the security officer gave no indication of there being any such impacts -- and if the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor was able to survive being hit by falling debris and if all fires in Building 7 were only started by falling debris from the North Tower, then there is an unanswered question concerning the origins of the possible fires on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor that were generating the smoke that filled that floor and that allegedly was witnessed by the security officer.

One might also note in passing, that the NIST account of the security officer's experience on 9/11 with respect to Building 7 does not give expression to any indication that the sprinkler system was operating on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor despite the fact that the floor was filled with smoke suggesting that somewhere on the floor there was enough of a fire to generate such smoke. In addition, the NIST account of the security officer's odyssey does not provide any indication that the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor had been destroyed – either partially or extensively -- by falling debris from the North Tower.

-----

There is nothing in the NIST reports on Building 7 -- except assumption -- that supports the idea that fires were burning out of control on floors 7, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 13 for seven hours. There is no photographic evidence to support such an idea – and, in fact, much of the photographic evidence indicates that most of the fires in Building 7

did not appear until a little before mid-afternoon and that those fires were of limited duration. Furthermore, there is no reliable eyewitness testimony capable of demonstrating that any fires in Building 7 lasted for seven hours ... or even two or three hours.

NIST created theoretical models for fuel loads to support the idea that on a number of the floors in Building 7 where the fires were supposedly raging for extended periods of time there would have been a sufficient amount of fuel to be able to maintain fires for seven hours at high levels of thermal intensity. Those fuel load models were rooted in a variety of arbitrary assumptions about what was the case with respect to the amount of combustible materials in the work-a-day business world of the companies and organizations (for example, American Express and the Security and Exchange Commission) where NIST believed the fires had raged for some 7 hours.

In the NIST NCSTAR 1-9 report released in August of 2008 that invited public comment, NIST claims American Express managers indicated that the amount of combustible material in their southwest section of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor was 'high'. According to NIST, those managers said that there was a "no clean desk" policy in play at the time, and as a result, files and folders might be found out in the open – on desks, book cases, cabinet tops, and the like.

In its final report on Building 7 released in November 2008, NIST changed the foregoing. In the later report NIST indicated that managers from the SEC – not American Express -- had told NIST that the amount of combustible material on the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors was described as high. American Express occupied only one sector on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor, and the SEC occupied the rest of the floor space on 12 and 13.

The term "high" is not a quantitative or an exact term. It is a qualitative estimate made by people who do not think in terms of fuel load or, for that matter, who do not necessarily have much of an idea of what things might be like in other companies and organizations in Building 7.

Does 'high' mean relative to everybody else in the building? If so, one still really doesn't know what 'high' means until one establishes what the amount of combustibles are for other floors of Building 7, and one is actually able to verify that, yes, the amount of combustibles on

such floors is 'high' relative to the number of combustibles on other floors.

Does 'high' mean relative to what is the case at other times of the year in the offices on a given floor? If so, one still would need to establish some sort of bench mark for the rest of the year against which one can measure the amount of combustibles and, thereby, lend some sort of sense to what the term 'high' might mean.

Even if one accepts the descriptor 'high', this says nothing about the distribution of the material across the floors. Were some offices worst than others? Were some areas relatively free of such combustibles? Was the amount of combustibles pretty consistent across the floors? If fires started in one section of such a floor, would the fire necessarily have a consistently high-density pathway of combustibles to enable the fire to migrate across the floor, or is it possible that there were areas of the floor that despite the overall average fuel load for the floor might, nonetheless, still have helped to prevent the fire from migrating very far? What if a fire started in an area that did not have a high-density fuel load? After all, it really doesn't make any difference what the average fuel load for a floor is if the place where a fire starts is significantly below that average and, therefore, incapable of enabling a fire to sweep across the floor.

NIST came up with an average fuel load of 32kg/m<sup>2</sup> to give quantitative expression to the qualitative descriptor 'high'. This estimate was more than half again higher than the fuel load average (20kg/m<sup>2</sup>) that NIST had invented for the Twin Towers.

The foregoing fuel load estimate for the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors of Building 7 is completely arbitrary. There are several points that can be made to indicate just how arbitrary the NIST figure is in relation to the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors of Building 7.

First, NIST set the fuel load figure for floors 7 and 8 of Building 7 as equal to the fuel load average for the floors in the Twin Towers – namely, 20kg/m<sup>2</sup>. NIST did this despite the fact that American Express occupied the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> floors of Building 7 – as well as the southwest sector of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor – and had a 'no clean desk policy' just as SEC did. Yet, in the latter case, NIST came up with a figure of 32kg/m<sup>2</sup> with no real evidential basis for arriving at a figure that was more than half again as large as the estimate for the American Express offices in

Building 7, whereas in the case of American Express NIST used a much lower figure despite the presence of a “no clean desk” policy similar to that of SEC.

Secondly, on page 376 of NIST NCSTAR 1-9, NIST stated: “The density of combustibles on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor was varied and not well known. The average value was assumed to be the same as the 12<sup>th</sup> floor.” In other words, with little or no evidence to back up its contention, NIST made a wholly arbitrary assumption concerning the nature of the fuel load figure for the 13<sup>th</sup> floor.

In fact, one could argue that the estimates of fuel load for the 13<sup>th</sup> floor of Building 7 that was made by NIST is not just arbitrary but completely misleading – and, possibly, deliberately so. More specifically, on pages 56 and 57 of NIST NCSTAR 1-9, there is a description of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor that talks about a variety of testimony rooms that occupied considerable space on the floor that “were sparsely furnished, with just a table and a few chairs.” Furthermore, by its own admission (noted earlier), NIST indicates that it does not know much about the amount of combustible materials on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor.

On what basis, therefore, can NIST make the assumption that the fuel load for the 13<sup>th</sup> floor of Building 7 would have been the same as the fuel load for the 12<sup>th</sup> floor? Indeed, in light of its own previously noted description of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor, there really is no basis whatsoever for making such a high estimate with respect to the fuel load for the 13<sup>th</sup> floor, and, as a result, the very most that one can say for the NIST process for estimating fuel loads on both the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors is that it was highly arbitrary, misleading, and, maybe, just wrong.

The process of making assumptions and estimates is a part of science. However, such a process is not very scientific or rigorous when the assumptions and estimates that are made are, more or less, pulled out of a hat because of their completely arbitrary nature and because they have been selected in order to help bolster the theory one is pushing.

Consequently, when NIST makes statements such as: “In the computation, the fire on the 12<sup>th</sup> floor, and thus the derivative fires on the 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors, generated significantly higher more heat than the fire on the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> floor [and] this was in large part due to the higher fuel load in the simulations” (NIST NCSTAR 1-9, page 386), one

has no reason for supposing that such simulations accurately reflect what might have gone on in Building 7 on 9/11. In fact, unless NIST can provide substantial independent evidence that its simulations accurately reflect the conditions in Building 7 on 9/11, there really is no reason for accepting such simulations as having anything of value to say ... they are just arbitrary simulations with no proven evidential connection to actual events in Building 7.

It would be like trying to say that because one has established that two plus three is five, therefore we are entitled to say that the value of pi is 'x'. One really has nothing to do with the other, and when one begins to throw around totally arbitrary and unwarranted assumptions and estimates as NIST does in the foregoing, then the simulations that are rooted in such an arbitrary process really have little, or nothing, to do with accurately informing the public about the actual character of that which the model purports to model.

-----

When a lot of fuel is available in one place, fires tend to burn slowly and might be capable of pushing temperatures up. When there is not much fuel available, fires tend to move – to the extent they move at all rather than die out -- from place to place rather quickly and with much lower thermal intensity as long as there is sufficient fuel available to permit the fire to migrate.

The photographic evidence in relation to Building 7 tends to indicate that whatever fires were visible from mid-afternoon onward were relatively fast moving and not long lasting. NIST ran some fire flow computer simulations which suggested that fires were longer lasting and traveled less quickly than the photographic evidence indicated, and, therefore, such fires (i.e., the hypothetical fires that are not supported by photographic evidence) might be able to account for the sort of sustained elevated temperature that would be necessary to support the idea of thermal expansion weakening certain structural portions of Building 7.

The problem with the foregoing computer simulation is that they don't reflect the available physical evidence. NIST admits as much in NIST NCSTAR 1-9, on pages 382-383, when it describes how the computer simulations it ran for floors 11, 12, and 13 ran longer than is suggested by any of the photographic/visual evidence.

When simulations don't reflect physical evidence, this is an indication that one must rework the model. Until a model is capable of accurately reflecting the physical events it is supposed to be modeling, then the model is problematic, and NIST was never able to come up with a computer simulation that accurately reflected what was going on physically in Building 7 – that is, based on photographic and eye witness reports.

The computer simulation models devised by NIST might have been bedeviled by overestimations of fuel load on the various floors, and, as previously discussed there is considerable evidence to indicate this might have been the case. Those same simulation models might also have been betrayed through problematic assumptions concerning: where fires allegedly started, or how they started, or when they started, or what the fuel-load conditions were like in the spots where such fires started, or how fuel-loads were distributed across a given floor and, therefore, capable of shaping the way in which fires would migrate (if they did so at all) across any given floor.

However, in relation to a disconnect between actual physical evidence and the computer simulations it created to model such physical evidence, NIST adopts a different point of view. More specifically, NIST claims: "The observed fire activity gleaned from the photographs and videos was not a model input, and thus one would not expect a perfect correspondence between predicted high temperatures and observed fire activity," (NIST NCSTAR 1-9, page 378).

This is like claiming that reality is at fault for not reflecting the predictions of the computer simulation. The computer simulation predicts high temperatures in its description of the spread of the fires, but the photographic evidence suggests that such high temperatures would not have been present, therefore, according to NIST one shouldn't hold the computer simulation accountable for its failure to model reality ... and, indeed, according to NIST, one would expect as much, since reality was not part of (i.e., it was not a model input for) the computer simulation's structural character.

For example, according to a simulation study conducted by NIST, temperatures in the northeast section of the 12<sup>th</sup> floor were predicted to have been in the range of between 500 and 1000° C. around 5:00



PM. Yet, according to NIST's own admission, photographic evidence indicates that the fire on 12 had burned out by 4:45 PM.

There is additional photographic evidence that is inconsistent with the NIST simulation study for the 12<sup>th</sup> floor. Photographs taken just before 3:00 PM, as well as approximately thirteen minutes past 3:00 PM, indicate that the northeast section of that floor showed no indication of the presence of a fire ... perhaps having burned out at some earlier, undetermined time. Moreover, a photograph taken just before 4:00 PM indicates that the only remaining area of fire on 12 was in the northwest corner of Building 7. Finally, none of the photographs of Building 7 show a fire on the north side of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor at this time.

The 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors are two of the floors with respect to which NIST claimed that out of control fires of high intensity had been raging for seven hours. Yet, the aforementioned photographic evidence does not really support either the claim by NIST or its fire simulation study of with respect to the alleged existence of high-intensity, seven-hour fires on the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors.

The absence of any fire in the northeast section of the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> floors involves more than just another demonstration that there is a substantial disconnect between the simulation models used by NIST and the actual character of physical evidence for Building 7. The northeast section of Building 7 is where steel column 79 is located, and that beam is at the heart of the theory being promulgated by NIST since long-lasting fires of high intensity were supposed to have weakened horizontal beams and floor slabs connected to 79 through a process of thermal expansion and thermal weakening that, in turn, led to the buckling of Column 79, the failure of several floors, and, eventually, the progressive collapse of Building 7.

Unfortunately, for the NIST theory, the photographic evidence does not really provide very much, if any, evidence, to indicate that fires were either long-lasting or of high-intensity with respect to the critical northeast section of Building 7 ... critical, that is, for the theory being advanced by NIST.

NIST also attempted to use the uncertainties inherent in the idea of a margin of error to bolster its case. In other words, NIST decided to consider three cases in relation to the fires that occurred in Building 7.

A middle case was based on the actual computations generated through its use of its Fire Dynamics Simulator. However, since the NIST engineers decided that the fires could have been, within a margin of error of 10 degrees, either slightly hotter than their FDS indicated or slightly cooler than its simulation indicated, they decided to use Case B – the one that was slightly hotter – as the source of computations for calculating what supposedly went on Building 7.

The choice of Case B was entirely arbitrary and there were absolutely no evidential considerations to indicate that Case B ought to be the scenario of choice. After all, what does it say about the confidence one has in the quality and accuracy of its Fire Dynamics Simulator when NIST indicates that it is going to reject the results that are generated through that process and arbitrarily add 10 degrees to the temperatures that are predicted by the simulation model.

Earlier, I indicated that the simulations produced by the FDS process that were used by NIST did not even remotely reflect the photographic evidence concerning conditions in Building 7 on 9/11. If anything, the actual physical evidence indicates that both the duration and intensity of fires in the simulation model should be significantly lowered, and, yet, NIST believes that because of margin of error uncertainties, it is entitled to, arbitrarily – that is, without evidential support – increase the predicted temperature of fire intensity by 10 degrees.

There is an old adage in computer science that states: “Garbage in! Garbage Out.” Apparently, some of the people at NIST are not very familiar with the concept for they often became trapped in the problems entailed by such a maxim.

When arbitrary choices concerning margins of errors are added to arbitrary assumptions about the start, spread, duration and intensity of fires, then one tends to end up with nothing but arbitrariness. Arbitrariness is a characteristic of junk science; arbitrariness is not a characteristic of real science, and in fact, the more arbitrary one’s investigation is, then, the more distant from truth and reality will one likely journey.

-----

According to NIST, a combination of thermal expansion and thermal weakening of various horizontal beams and floor slabs led to the rise of a set of forces that came to bear on Column 79, and this set of forces eventually caused that column to fail and, thereby, initiated a progressive collapse of Building 7. Thermal expansion occurs at temperatures in the vicinity of 400° C (750° F.), while thermal weakening takes place at temperatures above 500° C. (931° F.)

What evidence does NIST have that temperatures necessary for either thermal expansion or thermal weakening would have been present in Building 7 on 9/11? The answer is none because at no point did NIST actually examine any physical specimens – i.e., in the form of steel beams -- from Building 7 even though such data did exist as a result of some metallurgical studies conducted at Worcester Polytechnic Institute by Jonathan Barnett, Ronald Biederman, and Richard Sisson, Jr. in conjunction with beam material from both the World Trade Towers and Building 7.

The entire theory of NIST concerning thermal expansion and thermal weakening is rooted in speculation. This is not because such things as thermal expansion and thermal weakening do not occur, but, rather, this is because the NIST theory consists largely of arbitrary: assumptions, calculations and simulated models about what was going on in Building 7, and, therefore, is basically conjecture and speculation unsupported by actual physical data.

NIST claims on page 53 of NCSTAR 1A that temperatures of certain areas of the beams supporting the 8<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> floor exceeded 600° C. What is this claim based on? It is based on results from its Fire Dynamics Simulator.

What is the FDS based on? The FDS is based on a variety of arbitrary assumptions made with respect to: when fires started, where fires started, what the fuel load of a floor was, how long such fires lasted, how hot those fires became, and for how long such temperatures were sustained.

Was there any physical evidence to support such assumptions?  
No!

Was there any photographic evidence to support such assumptions? No!

Was there any eyewitness testimony to support such assumptions? No!

On pages 395 and 396, of NIST NCSTAR 1-9, NIST claims that the temperatures of many the northeast corner floor beams were above 675° C., or 1,250° F. and that many of the floor beams in the southeast half of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor reached more than 600° and were sustained at that temperature for more than an hour.

Earlier it was pointed out that NIST, by its own admission, did not know what the fuel density or fuel distribution was on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor. Now, however, NIST is claiming that temperatures of 600° C, or more, would have been reached and sustained for more than an hour on that floor. Furthermore, photographic evidence – which, again, is supplied and discussed by NIST (and which I have cited previously) – does not support the theory being advanced by NIST that the northeast corner floor beams were likely to have reached close to the temperatures – and temperature duration -- claimed by NIST.

Everything that NIST is claiming in the foregoing is based on a plethora of arbitrary assumptions about: when and where fires started, what the fuel load for floors were, how long fires burned and at what intensities. NIST set up a simulation based on such arbitrary assumptions and seeks to claim that this sort of arbitrary process does, indeed, represent an accurate record of what took place on 9/11 in Building 7. In fact, the simulation is so accurate that NIST is prepared to resort to the uncertainties inherent in the margins of errors surrounding its simulation to arbitrarily increase temperatures by 10 degrees.

There is not one piece of data in the NIST estimation of temperatures that is tied to the actual examination of a steel beam from Building 7. At least, if NIST had undertaken a metallurgic examination of actual steel beams drawn from Building 7, then it might have some data capable of supporting the idea that the temperatures being thrown around by NIST have some degree of rootedness in something other than arbitrary assumptions. But, sadly, this is not the case.

Could what NIST is claiming be true? If one is talking in terms of the realms of physical possibility, then, yes, what NIST is claiming might be true.

However, to say that something is possible does not make that something either plausible or probable. Plausibility and probability require much more in the way of hard evidence than NIST has to offer in conjunction with Building 7.

Yet, NIST wants readers to believe that whatever is possible is, automatically, also plausible and probable. This is not a very credible way of proceeding ... especially when NIST has offered little in the way of hard evidence that would incline someone to accept their 'possibility' as something more rigorous and evidentially grounded than is the case.

In fact, even the photographic evidence that NIST puts forward to support its theoretical position actually doesn't accomplish what NIST believes it does. Indeed, the photographic evidence actually tends to undermine the theory being promulgated by NIST.

In 2007, at a meeting of the National Construction Safety Team Advisory Committee, Shyam Sunder of NIST indicated in response to a question that one needed to keep in mind that it was not just the movement of fires or the duration of fires in any one spot that was critical to consider, but, rather, one had to understand that as the fires moved from spot to spot, the air temperature would continue to rise.

Of course, Sunder is assuming in the foregoing scenario that little, or no, heat was lost as the fires were moving from place to place. However, there only would have been little or no heat loss if the building were airtight and if no heat were transferred to other parts of the building, neither of which was true in relation to Building 7. Because the building was not airtight and because of the heat sink properties of the building, heat would have escaped or been transferred away through walls (especially if there were holes in them due to falling debris from the North Tower), ceilings, floors, windows (especially if they were broken), and down elevator shafts.

Furthermore, if the building had been airtight, then whatever fires were burning on those floors would soon deplete the available air and become oxygen-starved fires. Such fires would either be very low-intensity fires producing more smoke than thermal intensity or they would have burned out altogether.

NIST also argues that heat would have been trapped by the insulation that was protecting the vertical and horizontal beams, as well as the floor panels. According to NIST, such trapped heat in conjunction with the rise of air temperatures could have brought about the sort of high-intensity temperatures that were cited earlier.

However, assumptions are being made in the foregoing about how: insulation, the amount of heat trapped by insulation, and heat transfer (or escape) would have interacted with one another at different locations across any given floor. Not only does insulation offer some degree of retardant protection to the steel that it covers, but whatever amount of heat might be trapped by the insulation (and there is a limit to just how much heat any given amount of insulation can trap), this heat is likely going to be radiated away within what is a very substantial heat sink (i.e., the structural character of the building) and, therefore, heat would not necessarily have the opportunity to increase the temperatures of either floors or ceilings to the degree that NIST needs for its theory to work.

The final report from NIST on Building 7 said on page 617 that: “Fires for the range of combustible contents in WTC 7 – 20kg/m<sup>2</sup> on floors 7 to 9b and 32kg/m<sup>2</sup> on Floors 11 to 13 – persisted in any given location for approximately 20 min to 30 min.” Elsewhere in the same report (pages 589 and 597), however, NIST indicated that 3 ½ hours “was not sufficient to cause an initiating event that would have led to global collapse.”

Thus, one of the challenges that NIST faces is to be able to plausibly connect the issue of fuel density to the idea of sustained high-intensity temperatures of more than 3 ½ hours. Unfortunately, other than in arbitrarily constructed computer simulations that are at odds with what could be demonstrated through actual physical evidence with respect to the conditions in Building 7 on 9/11, NIST cannot show in any rigorous, non-arbitrary fashion that the fuel loads it has assumed to have existed in Building 7 on 9/11 would likely, if not probably, have created fires that produced long-lasting high-intensity fires for more than 3 ½ hours in relation to either Column 79 or any of the horizontal structures connected to, or in the vicinity of, that column that plausibly would have given rise to the sort of necessary stresses that would lead, first, to the failure of column 79, the

failure of which would, in turn, have initiated a progressive global collapse of Building 7.

-----

NIST accounts for the fall of Building 7 in the following manner: “Fire-induced thermal expansion of the floor system surrounding Column 79 led to the collapse of Floor 13, which triggered a cascade of floor failures. In this case, the floor beams on the east side of the building expanded enough that they pushed the girder spanning between columns 79 and 44 to the west on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor” (p. 22 NIST NCSTAR 1-9). A short while later, the NIST report continues with: “This movement was enough for the girder to walk off of its support at Column 79. The unsupported girder and other local fire-induced damage caused Floor 13 to collapse.”

As was pointed out earlier, Floor 13 is a location for which NIST allegedly did not have much information with respect to the nature of its fuel load (i.e., combustible materials). Arbitrarily, NIST set the fuel load of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor equal to that of the 12<sup>th</sup> floor – namely, 32kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

Furthermore, as I noted previously: “Photographs taken just before 3:00 PM, as well as approximately thirteen minutes past 3:00 PM, indicate that the northeast section of that floor showed no indication of the presence of a fire – perhaps, having burned out at some earlier, undetermined time. Moreover, a photograph taken just before 4:00 PM indicates that the only remaining area of fire on 12 was in the northwest corner of Building 7. Finally, none of the photographs of Building 7 show a fire on the north side of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor at this time.”

In other words, the NIST theory concerning the failure of the 13<sup>th</sup> floor is a house of cards. There is absolutely no physical or photographic evidence to indicate that what NIST claims took place in relation to the 13<sup>th</sup> floor actually took place – especially in conjunction with the northeast sector of that floor.

Column 79 is of crucial importance to NIST because NIST wants to be able to account for several features of the fall of Building 7 that were captured on video and that occurred just before the demise of the structure. According to NIST:

“Due to the buckling of Column 79 between floors 5 and 14, the upper section of Column 79 began to descend. The downward movement of Column 79 led to the observed kink in the east penthouse and its subsequent descent.” (NIST NCSTAR 1-9, pages 22-23).

In a sense, the theory that NIST puts forward is an attempt to account for visible, hard evidence – namely, the video recording that showed the east penthouse of Building 7 beginning to descend prior to the fall of Building 7. Working backward from the video evidence, NIST developed a theory that purported to account for such evidence.

The problem with the foregoing, however, is that NIST has no evidence to support such a theory. Operating on a double standard, NIST wants to take credit for coming up with a theory that might account for the observed behavior of the east penthouse of Building 7 prior the structure’s destruction, and, yet, NIST doesn’t want to be held accountable for the fact that it has produced no physical evidence that is capable of supporting such a theory ... in fact, the photographic evidence argues against the theory that NIST is espousing.

NIST has no evidence to prove: when fires started, where they started, how they started, how long they lasted, where they migrated, how intensely they burned, or how much thermal weakening and/or thermal expansion of structural components went on, if any, in relation to those fires. NIST has taken photographic evidence and made interpolations and extrapolations of that data that are entirely arbitrary (since there is no evidence to lend credence to such interpolations and extrapolations) in an attempt to support its Column 79 /13<sup>th</sup> floor theory.

If things did not occur as NIST claims is the case with respect to its Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> floor theory, then NIST has no explanation for why a the east penthouse began to descend when it did just before Building 7 fell. If this is the case, then NIST really has no explanation for why Building 7 fell.

According to NIST: “The cascading failures of the lower floors surrounding Column 79 led to increased unsupported length in, falling debris, impact on, and loads being re-distributed to adjacent columns, and Column 80 and then column 81 buckled as well. All the floors



connections to these three columns, as well as to the exterior columns failed, and the floors fell on the east side of the building. The exterior façade on the east quarter of the building was just a hollow shell.” (p. 23, NIST NCSTAR 1-9) The foregoing quote is stated as an assertion, but, in reality, it is a completely hypothetical network of ideas.

Archimedes is once reported to have said with respect to the physical principle underlying the capacity of a lever to move objects: “Give me a place to stand, and I will move the earth.” The statement has a hidden set of presuppositions in as much as having the right place to stand would not be enough to enable someone to move the Earth. One also would need a lever of the right length and, as well, one would need to be able to establish an appropriate fulcrum point through which to leverage the Earth’s movement.

The theory that NIST is putting forth in relation to Building 7 is akin to what Archimedes promised. The only difference is that not only does NIST possess no solid ground on which to stand but, as well, it has no lever or fulcrum through which to move its theory any credible amount of distance.

NIST has no evidence to support its claim that the reason why the east penthouse began to descend was because of what NIST claimed happened in its theory of the fall of Building 7. NIST has no evidence to support its claim that Columns 79, 80, and 81 buckled as a result of forces set in motion by thermal expansion and thermal weakening in and around those columns. NIST has no evidence to prove that “all the floor connections to these three columns, as well as the exterior columns failed.”

What NIST has done is to: invent a hypothetical place to stand, create a hypothetical lever mechanism, and imagine a hypothetical fulcrum point through nothing but creative imagination. More specifically, (1) if fires started at a certain time (shortly after 10:28 AM – and for which NIST has no evidence), and (2) if fires lasted for longer than 3 ½ hours (for which NIST has no evidence), and (3) if the fuel-load on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor were 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (for which NIST had absolutely no evidence), and (4) if the fires reached a sustained temperature of 400° C. for a sufficiently long enough period of time in order for thermal expansion to occur (for which NIST has no evidence), and (5) if thermal expansion gave rise to certain forces that came to bear upon

Column 79 (for which NIST has no evidence), and (6) if the fires reached a sustained temperature of 500° C. for a sufficiently long enough period of time in order for a certain kind of thermal weakening to take place (for which NIST has no evidence), and (7) if such thermal weakening caused certain kinds of damage (for which NIST has no evidence), and (8) if columns 79, 80, 81 and related floors failed in the way NIST believes occurred (for which NIST has no evidence), and (9) if the failure of Columns 79, 80 and 81 led to the failures of Columns 76, 77, and 78 in the way NIST believes is the case (for which NIST has no evidence), and (10) if the foregoing collective failures could have led to a progressive global collapse (for which NIST has no evidence), then, QED, NIST has an explanation for the fall of Building 7. All one has to do is permit NIST to assume its way to such a conclusion without any independent evidence being required to warrant such assumptions.

One can prove or demonstrate virtually anything if one is permitted to derive one's conclusion through purely hypothetical constructs. In fact, this is what NIST did. It showed that when one constructed a hypothetical construct with the right set of properties, then certain things might – hypothetically -- happen.

NIST showed that its virtual model had the potential to lead to certain conclusions if one granted NIST all of its many unwarranted assumptions. What NIST did not show, demonstrate, or prove – due to a complete lack of evidence -- is that its simulations and virtual models reflected what actually went on in Building 7 on 9/11.

Some people might want to argue that NIST has demonstrated a 'proof of concept' with respect to Building 7. In other words, what NIST had done is to show that Building 7 could have fallen in the way NIST claims, if certain conditions had existed in that structure on 9/11.

However, I could just as easily say that if someone gave me a million dollars, I would be a millionaire. Presumably, by stating the condition under which I might become a millionaire, I have established a 'proof of concept' with respect to the underlying hypothesis.

Nonetheless, unless I can demonstrate that those conditions are likely to be satisfied, then, in truth, I have demonstrated nothing at all with respect to the real world and my being a millionaire. Similarly, unless NIST can demonstrate that the conditions it needs to be fulfilled

for its hypothetical framework to become a reality were, in fact, present in Building 7 on 9/11, then, NIST has shown, proved, and demonstrated nothing at all, and NIST has not been able to do this.

Alternatively, someone might wish to ask: if the NIST theory is not true, then, what did cause Building 7 to fall on 9/11. The implication of the foregoing question is that if one cannot come up with a plausible alternative hypothesis, then, by default, one should stick with the one that NIST proposes.

This sort of approach to things is somewhat akin to the following example. If a person, 'B', proves that someone -- say: 'C' -- did not kill a given individual, 'A', then, unless B can prove who actually did kill A, then one must continue to suppose that C is the killer.

By showing that a culprit – namely, Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> floor – has not been proven by NIST (due to lack of evidence) to: have brought about the fall of Building 7, one is under no obligation to continue to support such a contention merely because one doesn't know what actually did cause Building 7 to fall. In fact, this is one of the reasons why the investigation into various facets of 9/11 needs to be re-opened since a plausible explanation for the fall of Building 7 has not been established.

Yet, in effect, NIST is arguing that there is no need for further inquiry because even though its own theory actually fails at almost every point, nonetheless, in the absence of any other proven candidates, one, nevertheless, should stick with what NIST has proposed. Such an argument makes absolutely no sense.

In its investigation into the Twin Towers, NIST found that only three of the columns it examined showed any indication of having reached temperatures of approximately 250° C. or 482° F. ... even temporarily, let alone having shown evidence of sustained thermal intensity. Most importantly, the foregoing finding was in relation to having studied actual steel beam material from the Twin Towers.

In relation to Building 7, NIST concluded that temperatures in Building 7 reached – for sustained periods of time – between 400° and 500° C. However, NIST failed to examine any actual structural components from Building 7 to be able to support its conclusion concerning thermal intensity. Moreover, none of the photographic or

eye-witness testimony produced by NIST was capable of lending any credence to its claims concerning the level of thermal intensity that NIST alleged had been reached in Building 7 for sustained periods of time – that is, between 3 ½ and 7 hours.

-----

When members of NIST are reminded by critics that steel-framed buildings such as: One Meridian Plaza and First Interstate Bank did not collapse despite being consumed by fire for sustained periods of time and, yet, NIST is arguing that WTC 7 collapsed due to fires, then how does one account for the oddity of Building 7, NIST has responded along the following lines: “... the reason for the different outcomes likely lay in differences in the structural systems and in the details for how the steel frames were constructed. “ (p. 341, NIST NCSTAR 1-9 Draft) The phrase “differences in the structural systems and in the details for how the steel frames were constructed” is an allusion to the claim of NIST that shear studs had not been used to connect girders to floor slabs in Building 7, whereas they probably were used in conjunction with the steel-framed buildings that had been consumed with fire and, yet, had remained standing.

According to NIST, if shear studs had been present to connect girders to the floors, then the presence of thermal expansion would not likely have led to the problems of failed columns and floors that NIST believed occurred in Building 7 on 9/11. NIST contends that when floor beams expanded and brought about the failure of shear studs and, this, in turn caused girders and floor slabs to become disconnected from the critical Column 79 ... a key ingredient that helped to maintain the structural integrity of the building was lost.

There are a number of problems that arise in conjunction with the foregoing perspective. First, with respect to the steel-framed buildings that were able to remain standing despite being consumed by fire, NIST admits that at least one of those buildings did not have shear studs that connected the girders to the columns and, yet, the building remained standing. Consequently, one cannot necessarily argue that if a steel-framed high-rise does not have shear studs, it will collapse.

Secondly, the steel-framed buildings that remained standing despite the presence of sustained fires were all different from WTC 7 in a very important way. There is no proof that WTC 7 was ever

consumed by fire or consumed by fire for any sustained period of time, and, yet, despite the lack of proof concerning such fires in conjunction with Building 7, the latter structure fell while the other buildings that did have proven long-lasting fires of high thermal intensity did not come down.

Thirdly, even if one were to concede the point – which I don’t – that the reason why Building 7 fell is, in large part, due to the absence of shear studs, NIST has failed to demonstrate a necessary component of the related theory. More specifically, NIST has not shown that a temperature of 400° C. was ever reached or ever reached for a sustained period of time in Building 7 on 9/11 in conjunction with Column 79 and associated horizontal girder and floor connections.

Of course, at one point, NIST claims that: “The first failures observed were of the shear studs, which were produced by axial expansion of the floor beams, and which began to occur at [the] fairly low temperature of 103° C” (p. 352, NIST NCSTAR 1-9). If shear studs fail at such a low temperature, then why did NIST indicate elsewhere that differential thermal expansion – one of the primary culprits cited by NIST in its theory -- requires that temperatures of 400° C. be reached and sustained?

One possibility, of course, is that while it might be true that a few shear studs might fail at the lower temperature – perhaps due to imperfections introduced during the time of manufacture (and provided that temperatures were sustained for a sufficiently long period of time) -- the vast majority of shear studs are likely to hold until one reaches the 400° C. mark, and, then, only if the latter temperature is sustained over a period of time. To say that shear studs fail at 103° C. is misleading and inconsistent with the bench mark that NIST itself established with respect to the temperature that must be reached for a sustained period of time – namely, 400° C. – in order for thermal expansion to occur ... which, according to NIST, is one of the primary culprits (along with thermal weakening) indicated in the alleged failure of shear studs.

On the other hand, David Proe, a research fellow at the Centre for Environmental and Risk Engineering at Victoria University in Melbourne, disputed the statement by NIST that claimed shear studs would fail at temperatures as low as 103° C. He informed NIST that he

had never witnessed such a phenomenon during his research and inquired about the underlying physical mechanism.

Apparently, NIST did not respond to Proe' inquiry. In fact, as far as I have been able to determine, NIST does not provide any explanation in its reports concerning Building 7 as to why some shear studs might fail at low temperatures while others only fail at a much higher temperature.

Fourthly, in an interim report on WTC 7 that was issued in 2004, NIST states: "Most of the beams and girders were made composite with the slabs through the use of shear studs" although "studs were not indicated on the design drawing for many of the core girders." (L-6-7 of the *Interim Report on WTC 7*)

As independent researchers such as Chris Sarns have pointed out, the critical girder connecting Columns 79 and 44 is not a core girder but is part of the eastern section of Building 7 (the section beneath the penthouse that began to descend prior to the fall of Building 7). Therefore, according to the foregoing statement of NIST that is contained in its interim report on Building 7, the aforementioned girder would, in fact, have been connected to the floor slab by shear studs.

NIST contends that although girders were not connected to floor slabs by shear studs, nonetheless, steel floor beams were so connected. However, when thermal expansion caused the latter shear studs to break, then there was nothing to maintain lateral rigidity or structural integrity and, thereby, prevent columns from beginning to buckle.

Nevertheless, aside from contradicting itself with respect to the existence of shear studs in relation to non-core girders, the above position of NIST still presumes that fires with sustained temperatures of 400° C. were burning in the vicinity of Column 79 despite photographic evidence (previously cited) indicating otherwise. So, once again, NIST really has nothing more to support its theory other than assertion -- namely, because NIST says this is the way it was in Building 7, then, this is the way it was ... no evidence is needed.

In addition, even if one were to accept the contention of NIST that although girders were not connected to floor slabs by shear studs, but steel floor beams were connected to the floor slabs by shear studs, one

could raise the following question. How many of the 140, or so, shear studs connecting the five steel beams to the floor slabs would need to fail – and in what places and in what sequence -- before the floor would fail? I have not discovered an answer to this question in the NIST documents.

Fifthly, while NIST wishes to maintain that thermal expansion would cause shear studs to break, NIST doesn't really offer any proof of this. NIST maintains that the differential thermal expansion between the steel beams and the concrete floor slabs will lead to the failure of the shear studs as a result of the torque forces that come to bear on the shear studs through that differential.

For the foregoing claim of NIST to be true, the linear expansion coefficient for steel and concrete would have to be substantially different. However, the linear expansion coefficient for steel and concrete are, respectively, 1.24 and 1.20.

NIST has provided no evidence that such a small disparity in linear expansion coefficient for steel and concrete would lead to the kind of torque forces that would supposedly be generated by differential thermal expansion NIST claims is at the heart of its theory with respect to the failure of shear studs. When steel is exposed to heat it expands and so does the surrounding concrete that is being exposed to the same heat source. Indeed, reinforced concrete has structural integrity precisely because the steel and the concrete do have very similar linear expansion coefficients and, therefore, are not likely to be affected appreciably in a differential way with respect to temperature changes in the environment.

The fact of the matter is NIST admits that in relation to the simulations it ran that it heated steel beams without heating concrete floor slabs – in other words, NIST states: “No thermal expansion of material degradation was considered for the concrete slab as the slab was not heated in this analysis” (p. 352, NIST NCSTAR 1-9).

How can one demonstrate that there would have been differential thermal expansion when one studies only one of two necessary components that are needed for the purposes of comparison? NIST heated the steel beams in its simulation, but NIST did not heat the concrete floor slabs, so whatever thermal expansion differential NIST claims to be present in such an analysis is purely an assumed one.

-----

As was the case with the Twin Towers, NIST never actually accounts for why the fall of Building 7 occurred in the way that has been observed – namely, in a largely symmetrical fashion with elements of freefall. NIST claims that its “explanation” – if one can call it that – only extends to events surrounding the initiation that, supposedly, led to the alleged progressive global collapse of Building 7. On pages 599-600 of NIST NCSTAR 1-9, NIST admits that: “Once simulation of the global collapse of WTC 7 was underway, there was a great increase in the uncertainty in the progression of the collapse sequence, due to the random nature of the interaction.” On page 44 of an earlier version (NIST NCSTAR 1A), of the aforementioned report (NIST NCSTAR 1-9) NIST makes the same point in the following language: “The simulations do show the formation of the kink, but any subsequent movement of the building is beyond the reliability of the physics of the model.”

The foregoing perspective of NIST is like someone claiming that they have developed a model that can predict who the first batter of a particular baseball game will be, but from there, the dynamics of the game fall outside the capacity of the physics programmed into the model and, therefore, since once one goes beyond the first person in the lineup stepping into the batter’s box, uncertainty rules the manner in which that game will progress. Could one say that what happened in the game followed from the initiating event – i.e., the first batter? Yes, one could, but being able to say this really does not provide any sort of credible explanation for what happened during the game or why the score ended up the way it did.

What impact did the first batter have on the rest of the game? One doesn’t know.

What impact did the alleged failure of column 79 have on the fall of Building 7? NIST doesn’t know but assumes – and by its own admission, NIST has no evidence to support its assumption -- that such a failure led to everything that was observed.

The problem facing NIST is actually worse than the foregoing baseball analogy suggests. The simulation model proposed by NIST with respect to Building 7 identifies what it believes is the initiating event for the fall of Building 7, but NIST doesn’t really even have a



convincing case to put forth that its theory about such an initiating event is likely to have occurred.

To return to the baseball analogy, let us suppose that someone has a theory that predicts that Jacoby Ellsbury will lead off for the Red Sox at an away game with the Yankees. However, what happens to such a theory: if Ellsbury is injured prior to the game; or, the Red Sox manager, Terry Francona, decides that Ellsbury needs to rest a hamstring that has been acting up; or, Francona decides to drop Ellsbury down in the order to take some pressure off him that the manager believes has been adversely affecting Ellsbury offensive performance; or, Ellsbury comes down with food poisoning before the game begins; or, the game is postponed due to rain; or, the Yankees decide to forfeit the game in order to protest the fact that someone tried to bury a David Ortiz jersey in the new Yankee stadium when it was being constructed? There are many factors that might affect whether, or not, Ellsbury actually does lead off in the game against the Yankees.

Alternatively, what happens if the game does begin with Ellsbury leading off, but Ellsbury is hit by the first pitch and has to leave the game? What is the relationship between that event and the outcome of the game?

What if Ellsbury goes 0 for 5? What impact did that have on the rest of the game?

What if Ellsbury goes 3 for 5? What impact, if any, did that have on the rest of the game?

Given the foregoing considerations, why should one suppose that even if one were to concede – which I don't -- that NIST had successfully identified the initial event that preceded the destruction of Building 7, then therefore, such an initial event is actually what caused the building to fall? NIST was incorrect with respect to its first theory about the fall of Building 7, and, there is nothing that says NIST couldn't be wrong with respect to its second theory about Building 7 ... in fact, there is a great deal of evidence (much of which has been noted previously in this essay) to indicate that NIST is wrong with respect to its second theory about Building 7.

Maybe there are possibilities that NIST has not considered which might explain the fall of Building 7. Perhaps some of those alternative possibilities might have involved Column 79, in some fashion, so that although NIST could have been correct with respect to identifying the initial event in the destruction of Building 7 – which I don't believe is the case -- nonetheless, NIST might be incorrect with respect to how Column 79 was connected to the actual character of the building's destruction. Maybe some of the alternative possibilities have nothing to do with Column 79 and the 13<sup>th</sup> floor.

Unless NIST can demonstrate – through evidence and not assumption or assertion – that its Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor theory is causally connected to the destruction of Building 7, then the theory being put forth by NIST is not an explanation of much of anything other than that it gives expression to one possibility that might – and, I would emphasize the words: “one possibility” and “might” -- have taken place prior to the fall of Building 7. The connection that NIST claims exists between its Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor theory and the fall of Building 7 is all a matter of assumption, and NIST acknowledges as much when it points out – as previously quoted – that explaining the character of the fall of Building 7 is really beyond the physics of its simulation model.

Despite the foregoing considerations, NIST has the audacity to say:

“Given the complexity of the modeled behavior, the global collapse analyses matched the observed behavior reasonably well,” and, then, proceeds to state: “The global collapse analysis confirmed the leading collapse hypothesis which was based on the available evidence” (p. 44, NIST NCSTAR).

In what credible sense did the global collapse analysis of NIST confirm the leading collapse hypothesis? In what credible sense did the global collapse analysis of NIST match “the observed behavior [of Building 7] fairly well”?

The answer – although it is hardly credible -- to the foregoing two questions is actually the same in both cases. NIST believes that its ‘Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor’ theory accounts for why a kink forms in the

roof of Building 7 and for why the east penthouse began to descend prior to the fall of the rest of the building.

The 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' theory being propounded by NIST can account for nothing else – not the symmetry of the fall of Building 7, and not the freefall elements inherent in the destruction of Building 7, and not the missing mass in the debris pile, and not for the fact that seismic readings for the fall of Building 7 were not much different from background seismic activity for New York City. So, again, one might ask: How does the NIST theory revolving about the Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor idea, reflect what was observed via video footage “fairly well”? Or, how does the NIST theory concerning 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' confirm “the leading collapse hypothesis” ... especially when the leading collapse hypothesis is actually presupposed by the analysis that NIST did ... so, in effect, the global analysis that NIST did is little more than an elaborate elaboration of what NIST believes would have had to have happened if its preliminary hypothesis is to be correct.

The computer simulation run by NIST is nothing more than its own hypothesis writ large. As such, the NIST analysis simulates nothing more than its own hypothesis and has little to do with reality in relation to Building 7.

In fact as has been pointed out previously, NIST cannot plausibly or convincingly demonstrate that its 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' theory is supported by evidence that shows that: fires would have started in Building 7 in the way NIST claims, or that the fuel loads on different floors would have been what NIST claimed they were, or that those fires would have migrated in the way NIST claims, or that those fires would have burned with the thermal intensity that NIST claims, or that such fires would have been sustained for even 3 ½ hours, let alone 7, hours as NIST claims, or that fires would have caused the sort of thermal expansion and thermal weakening in relation to Column 79 as NIST claims, or that the presence or absence of shear studs would be a deciding factor as NIST claims, or that shear studs would have failed in the way NIST claims.

The only thing that NIST has done is to come up with a theory – the 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' idea – that is consistent with what was observed in relation to some aspects of the roof of Building 7, but that theory is not consistent with anything else that was observed in

conjunction with the destruction of Building 7. Moreover, there is nothing in the way of actual evidence that would indicate that the events that supposedly brought about the 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' scenario is rooted in anything more than a whole set of questionable assumptions that have been noted previously.

-----

One glaring problem with the NIST 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' theory is that it cannot account for the largely symmetrical fall of Building 7. Everything in the NIST theory indicates that the fall of Building 7 should have been asymmetrical because Column 79 was beneath the east pent house that was observed to descend, somewhat, first, and, yet, after that, the fall was not asymmetrical but almost entirely symmetrical ... from the roof line down.

Thus, rather than confirm the NIST theory, the observed symmetry in the fall of Building 7 disconfirms the 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' hypothesis. If the NIST hypothesis had been true, then not only would one expect to see the observed kink and slight descent of the east pent house, but one also would have expected to see a cascading series of asymmetrical destruction that was set in motion by the initial asymmetry, but this is not what one observes.

NIST tries to obscure the manner in which its hypothesis is actually inconsistent with a major piece of observed data – namely, the issue of symmetry – by mentioning that too many dynamical uncertainties entered the picture following the failure of Column 79 and the 13<sup>th</sup> Floor and, therefore, such uncertainties were not capable of being handled by the physics programmed into its computer simulation. However, if there were so many dynamical uncertainties that entered the picture beyond the horizons of its 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' idea, then why was the fall of Building 7 almost entirely symmetrical? How did all those non-linear uncertainties come together to generate a symmetrical fall?

NIST has no answer to any of the foregoing questions. In fact, the NIST 'Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor' idea would have led to an asymmetrical fall of Building 7, and this did not occur, so either the theory being propounded by NIST is entirely wrong or that theory requires some sort of fundamental re-working because as it stands, it not only cannot account for what clearly has been observed to happen in relation to

Building 7 by millions of people when it fell, but the NIST position would have predicted an entirely different, asymmetrical result.

Another glaring inconsistency between the NIST theory and what was observed to take place in relation to Building 7 concerns the issue of freefall. In a technical briefing given on August 26, 2008 by Shyam Sunder of NIST, Sunder claimed there was no element of freefall during the descent of Building 7 and, then, said: "... you had a sequence of structural failures that had to take place. Everything was not instantaneous." A little before saying the foregoing, Sunder talked about the presence of "structural resistance" that would not be all that unusual during a progressive collapse such as Building 7 underwent.

In other words, from the perspective of NIST, there could not have been any element of freefall in the descent of Building 7 because the NIST theory required a sequence of column failures involving structural resistance (i.e., the principle of conservation of momentum in action). This meant that the fall of Building 7 could not have been instantaneous.

In effect, Sunder is implicitly acknowledging that if there had been any element of freefall in the descent of Building 7, then the NIST perspective would have been incorrect, but since Sunder is assuming that the progressive collapse thesis is correct, then ipso facto, there cannot have been any element of freefall present in the descent of Building 7. In effect, Sunder is assuming his conclusions by saying that his theory precludes any possibility of freefall, and, therefore, by assuming that his theory is true, the element of freefall has been eliminated, in an a priori manner, from the discussion ... at least, this is the case as far as Sunder is concerned.

In the NIST technical briefing, Sunder argued that the measurements made by NIST indicated that the building came down in a time that was roughly 40% longer than would have been the case if freefall had been in effect. David Chandler, a high school physics teacher, critically examined the analysis of NIST and indicated that NIST had made several mistakes.

Chandler pointed out that the first mistake committed by NIST was that it selected an arbitrary starting point for its measurement of the descent of Building 7, and by selecting such an arbitrary starting point, that choice made the actual descent of Building 7 seem longer by

1.5 seconds than actually was the case. The second mistake committed by NIST that was pointed out by Chandler is that NIST used an average acceleration figure to represent the rate of descent of Building 7 from the time used by NIST to mark the beginning of the descent (which is earlier than it should have been) until the roof line of the building disappeared.

Together, the two foregoing mistakes permitted Sunder and NIST to claim that the duration of the descent of Building 7 took 40% longer than would have been the case if any element of freefall had been present. By pointing out such errors, Chandler demonstrated that, in fact, elements of freefall were inherent in the descent of Building 7.

On page 607 of the final report by NIST on Building 7, NIST, once again, asserts that the duration of descent for the top 18 stories of Building 7 was 40 % longer than the presence of freefall would have required. However, NIST then goes on to say that, in point of fact, there was a: “freefall descent over approximately eight stories at gravitational acceleration for approximately 2.25” seconds.

NIST gives no explanation for the presence of such an element of freefall in the descent of Building 7. Undoubtedly, NIST might wish to argue that the hollow shell that NIST claimed had been created in relation to portions of floors 7 through 13 in the northeast sector of the building as a result of the failure or buckling of a number of columns in the vicinity of Column 79, could have created conditions of freefall for those 7, or so, stories. However, even if one were to concede that this sort of a hollow shell existed beneath the northeast section of the building – and, there is absolutely no evidence to indicate that this was the case – such a concession would not explain why the entire set of eight floors (involving 24 interior columns, 58 perimeter columns, and numerous horizontal girders, steel beams, shear studs, and floor slabs) suddenly fell at freefall velocities rather than just the portion of the northeast section of the building that was alleged to be a “hollow shell”.

Finally, the ‘Column 79/13<sup>th</sup> Floor’ theory advocated by NIST cannot explain why the debris pile for Building 7 is only two stories tall and largely contained within the original horizontal dimensions of the building – or footprint (Building 7 was a trapezoid whose dimensions were: 150 feet on both the east and west sides, 329 feet on

the north side, and 247 feet on the south side). More specifically, while the height of Building 7 was 610 feet, and therefore there were 24 core interior columns that ran the height of the building, NIST argues that there were multiple column failures of core columns between the 7<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> floors as a result of the damage done by the fires via thermal expansion and thermal weakening. Therefore, if what NIST claims is true, then one might expect to see sections of core columns measuring almost 430 feet long (thirteen feet for each story, and there were 33 stories above the 14<sup>th</sup> floor), and, yet, there was no evidence of this. There also was no evidence that any of the perimeter columns were anywhere near the foregoing length of roughly 430 feet. Moreover, one wonders why no such sections fell on nearby buildings such as the office buildings for New York Telephone or the Federal Reserve.

The presence of freefall, the symmetry of the fall, and the size and character of the debris pile in relation to Building 7 all serve to disconfirm the NIST hypothesis or theory concerning the destruction of Building 7. Yet, NIST wants to argue – as previously noted – that its analysis has confirmed its theory and that theory measures up “fairly well” and “reasonably well” with what was observed in conjunction with the destruction of Building 7.

What NIST has done in conjunction with its “analysis” of Building 7 is mostly a function of junk science. It is the same kind of “science” that all too many: tobacco, chemical, and pharmaceutical companies continually try to foist off on the public.

During the commission of junk science, people with degrees in medicine, science and engineering are used to lend an aura of “expertise”, “rigor”, and “competence” to a given study or investigation. However, the actual character of the investigation involves much that does not reflect such expertise, rigor, or competence ... in fact, what junk science gives expression to involves quite another set of activities.

NIST assumed almost all of its conclusions in relation to its “explanation” of what happened to Building 7 on 9/11. NIST advanced conclusions that were not supported by verifiable evidence. Again and again, NIST used arbitrary criteria to shape its use and interpretation of its methodological activity, and, from time to time, NIST just fudged data (as was the case in the issue of freefall).

Last, but not least, NIST did not go through any sort of independent peer review process – either in conjunction with its “investigation” of the Twin Towers or in relation to its analysis of events with respect to Building 7. Calling for public comments on interim reports that one is free to ignore is not a process of peer review, although like much of the rest of its analytical, methodological, and investigatory activity, NIST tries to give the impression that something rigorous and scientific is happening when such is not the case.

All of the foregoing considerations are indicators for the presence of junk science, but junk science does not mean that someone is necessarily incompetent. Rather, what the presence of junk science indicates is that someone who engages in such a process is immoral and has allowed the quality of science to be corrupted by something other than a rigorous search for truth based on verifiable evidence that can be subjected to an independent review process that actually can alter the character of what is done and claimed in relation to the available data by means of a critical feed-back process.

The NIST report on Building 7 is steeped in junk science. The people at NIST -- and elsewhere in government, the media and academia -- who have permitted this to happen, are guilty of nothing less than moral turpitude.

To be guilty of moral turpitude does not necessarily mean such a person has engaged in a conspiracy. Rather, it means such an individual has failed as a human being within the frame of reference that is circumscribed by such junk science.



## **2.) Rebel with a Cause**

The discussion with which this chapter begins is not about the “rebel with a cause” to which the chapter title alludes. That rebel has the name: Dr. Judy Wood.

Rather, the following discussion helps set the stage for an overview of Dr. Wood’s work that ensues from the opening discussion. Indeed, this initial discussion constitutes one of the many problems with which Dr. Wood has had to contend and against which she has argued during the course of her investigation into the events of 9/11.

The overview of Dr. Wood’s perspective concerning 9/11 has been drawn from a variety of sources. These include: several video presentations in which she is featured, together with a number of radio interviews that were done over a period of three years, and the material encompassed by a web site dedicated to this issue.

Her research will appear in a not-yet released book entitled: *Where Did the Towers Go?* The book is scheduled for publication in late 2010 or early 2011.

Judy Wood earned a B.S., Masters, and Doctorate from Virginia Tech. Her doctorate – which is mechanical engineering -- involved the development of an experimental method to study the effects of heat on joints and structures that are made of different materials.

Her area of expertise is Moray Interferometry. This involves studying the nature of optical messages and the manner in which electromagnetic waves in the visual range can interfere with such messages.

Dr. Wood previously taught a variety of courses as professor of engineering. In addition, she has conducted research in: experimental stress analysis, structural mechanics, deformation analysis, optical methods, as well as material characterization of bio-materials and composite materials. She is a member of the Society for Experimental Mechanics.

-----

### **Starting Point**

Mark Basile, a chemical engineer who graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute appears in a soon-to-be-released (2010) documentary entitled: '9/11: Explosive Evidence – Experts Speak Out' that is produced by Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth. Mr. Basile has been working in the chemical industry for some 25 years with a primary focus on performing analytical work in relation to materials of different compositions.

In the video, he talks about becoming interested in 9/11 through certain problems that occurred to him in relation to the R. J. Lee and FEMA reports – two early reports that analyzed various data concerning the World Trade Center. Mr. Basile became especially interested in Appendix C of the FEMA report that contained some metallurgical analysis by two professors at his old school, WPI, in relation to several steel beams from the debris pile at Ground Zero.

The samples analyzed had melted at some point during, or while in, the debris pile. These samples showed signs of melting, as well as other signs of having been exposed to high heat such as: being thinned and having Swiss cheese-like holes in certain portions of the metal.

The scientists at Worcester Polytechnic Institute who performed the analysis that, eventually, was written up as Appendix C of the FEMA report found that the steel had been attacked by a eutectic mixture of: iron, iron oxide and iron sulfide. When sulfur is added to an appropriately proportioned mixture of aluminum and iron oxide, the mixture is known as thermate. The addition of sulfur helps lower the melting point of whatever one is trying to melt.

Thus, for example, instead of needing to bring steel up to 1500° centigrade in order to be able to melt it, one could use the right kind of eutectic mixture that contained sulfur. One of the products of such a reaction is iron sulfide, and iron sulfide was found in the WTC samples studied by the scientists at WPI.

Under the conditions (insufficient oxygen and quantities of combustibles) existing in the WTC on 9/11, Mr. Basile believes that jet fuel could not have generated the kind of heat that would have been necessary to be able to melt steel in the Twin Towers. So, this raises the question of what could have melted the steel that was found in the

samples studied by the researchers at WPI and that whose report on such steel became Appendix C in the FEMA report.

A number of years later (2007), Mr. Basile attended a conference in Boston at which Steven Jones was going to be speaking about his work involving iron-based microspheres and some “red-gray” chips that Dr. Jones reportedly had found in some of the dust samples he examined that, allegedly, were from the World Trade Center.

Mr. Basile indicates that after the talk he approached Dr. Jones and expressed interest in being put in touch with the individual who served as the source for the dust samples Dr. Jones used in his studies. Mr. Basile wanted to do some independent analysis of the dust samples in order to be able to confirm or de-confirm the findings that have been released by Dr. Jones.

In January of 2008, he received his first package of dust from Jeanette McKinley -- who lived across from the WTC on 9/11 and who had supplied Dr. Jones with his dust samples. Mr. Basile began analyzing the dust and found both the iron-based microspheres and the red-gray chips that had been mentioned by Steven Jones in the latter individual’s talk at the aforementioned conference.

Mr. Basile said that he had wanted to do further studies on the “red-gray” chips but could not get access to a Differential Scanning Calorimeter. Consequently, he set about setting up other kinds of experiments that might help him to elucidate some of the properties of the red-gray chips in the samples.

When he ran his experiments, he found that the red layer of the chips was thermitic – that is, it has the properties of thermitic and, therefore, consists of both aluminum powder and iron oxide. When activated, he got iron microspheres as a by-product.

He also discovered the red-gray chips in another sample of allegedly WTC dust that he was able to obtain independently of Jeannette McKinley. This sample came from a museum located in New York that has requested anonymity in the matter.

Mr. Basile emphasizes in the video that he believe the thermitic material he found in the samples provided to him did not come from a chance conglomeration of aluminum from the aircraft and/or from other sources of aluminum and iron from the WTC buildings. He is of

the opinion that they are not materials that would have naturally and spontaneously formed at the World Trade Center on, or shortly after, 9/11.

He says that the samples he studied consisted of nano-sized aluminum particles that were uniform in size and shape and were embedded in a silica-based matrix that held the reactants together. When the materials are ignited, the iron droplets that are formed eat through the silica-based matrix and, in the process, create a set of large voids in the residue of the chip whose interior portions are coated with iron films.

However, if a person sections the chips before igniting them, one finds: no iron microspheres, no iron particles; and no iron films. The foregoing features are found only after the chips are brought up to their ignition point that initiates a thermitic reaction that, as a result, generates liquid iron with a concomitant release of energy.

He goes on to indicate in the video that the red-gray chips he studied do not constitute what might be called “normal” thermite. Normal thermite, consisting of aluminum powder and iron oxide powder is something anyone could put together with a little bit of knowledge about how to combine aluminum and iron oxide in proper proportions to produce a thermitic reaction.

Normal thermite consists of a combination of aluminum and iron oxide that are mixed together in what are referred to as stoichiometric proportions. Such proportions ensure that the right numbers of atoms of each component are present to enable the reaction to go forward efficiently.

Aluminum is very reactive. When it meets with iron oxide, it removes the oxygen from the iron oxide and forms aluminum oxide and, in the process, liberates iron and generates a substantial quantity of heat energy.

The amount of heat being released takes place within a very short time frame, and the quantity of heat is so large that both the aluminum oxide being formed during the reaction, together with the iron being that is being liberated, are in a molten state. Iron melts at approximately 1500° Centigrade, and the melting point for aluminum oxide is above 2,000° Centigrade.

According to Mark Basile, the ingredient he found that tends to indicate the anomalous nature of the thermite in the samples he studied is the nano-aluminum that is present in the dust. Nano-aluminum is a controlled substance. The government places limits on how much of the material any individual, lab, organization, or institution can purchase.

Moreover, he stipulates that nano-aluminum is very difficult to produce in any appreciable quantities. It is not something that the average person could manufacture on his or her own.

The presence of nano-aluminum in the samples he studied indicated to Mark Basile that the thermite didn't come from some cave in Afghanistan. Only a sophisticated process of engineering could have manufactured that material.

Mr. Basile notes that thermite does not explode. It reacts, and as it reacts it produces certain molten by-products and a great deal of heat energy. This heat energy not only melts the components of thermite, but such heat energy also is capable of melting almost anything else that is fairly proximate to the reaction that is producing that heat.

He indicates that thermite, in the form of thermite grenades, can be used in decommissioning certain equipment or rendering such equipment useless if it should have to be left behind on the battlefield. Mr. Basile further indicates that thermite can be used in processes of controlled demolition and speaks about a patent from 1984 that involved thermite cutter charges that used the molten iron created in a thermitic reaction to, within a matter of milliseconds, cut through the steel in a building's structural core and frame.

Mr. Basile is of the opinion that thermite was used in the destruction of the Twin Towers on 9/11. He believes the presence of nano-thermite – a government controlled material --in the dust samples he studied strongly suggests that someone else other than, or in addition to, the 19 alleged hijackers played a role in the tragedy in New York and elsewhere on 9/11.

Good science requires replication of results. Mr. Basile took several samples of dust, and independently of Steven Jones, confirmed that he found the same sort of red-gray chips as Dr. Jones reported. He further confirmed that the chips he analyzed were thermitic in nature,

and when he raised the chips to an appropriate temperature of ignition, this brought about a thermitic reaction that formed molten iron, molten aluminum oxide, and released substantial quantities of heat energy.

Mark Basile further indicated that he found nano-aluminum in his samples. Nano-aluminum is a material controlled by the government, is difficult to manufacture, and under normal circumstances should not have been in the dust samples from the World Trade Center.

Dr. Judy Wood and others have raised questions about the provenance of the dust samples. In other words, did the samples studied by Mark Basile and Steven Jones really come from the World Trade Center dust debris? Were those samples tampered with by anyone along the way? Could the red-gray chips in the dust samples merely have gotten into the dust at, and around, the WTC as a result of the activities of some of the teams that had been commissioned to clean up the debris pile at the WTC?

In a very important way although the question about the provenance of the samples that were provided to Basile is a legitimate one, there is an important sense in which the question is irrelevant. And, this is so for reasons that go much more to the heart of the position that is being advocated by Dr. Wood.

Many people in the so-called 9/11 Truth Movement believe that the Twin Towers and Building 7 at the World Trade Center were brought down by controlled demolition. Thermite and thermate are theorized to have played a role in such alleged demolitions by cutting through the structural beams of a building in a controlled sequence of explosions that injects molten iron (produced by the thermitic reaction that was initiated by the explosion) into the structural beams of a building -- cutting through them in a matter of milliseconds -- thereby bringing about the simultaneous collapse of all parts of the building being brought down in such a controlled fashion.

NIST, among others, has indicated that it found no evidence of explosives being used in relation to any of the buildings of the World Trade Center. As it stands, the foregoing statement is quite true, especially since NIST never really looked for such evidence.

However, there have been a large number of reports by a variety of people – including first responders – who have testified that they heard explosions. William Rodriguez, who was on the custodial staff at the Twin Towers on 9/11, has indicated that he – along with a number of other employees – experienced and saw the after-effects of huge explosions in the sub-basement of the Twin Towers that took place before either of the Twin Towers was allegedly struck by commercial jets. Barry Jennings, who was in Building 7 on the morning of 9/11, also reported a massive explosion in Building 7 hours before that building came down – it was an explosion that almost cost him his life.

Could such explosions have been connected to a process of controlled-demolition? The findings of individuals like Steven Jones and Mark Basile have fueled the fires of such considerations.

-----

### **Listening to the Evidence**

Unfortunately, there is a fairly sizeable fly in the ointment in which these kinds of theories are embedded. More specifically, the Twin Towers did not just come down, they were pulverized – even Governor Pataki remarked on this pulverized dust issue when he was being interviewed near Ground Zero shortly after 9/11.

A number of individuals from some of the clean-up crews remarked how little debris there was from such massive (110 storey, 500,000 tons) buildings. Other individuals commented how one did not find any: office equipment, toilets, phones, or computers in the debris pile ... everything had been pulverized to a fine dust.

Dr. Wood notes that the part of Building 6 – an 8-storey structure – that was still standing on 9/11 loomed over the debris pile for Building 1, a 110-storey tower. Building 7 -- which was a much bigger building than Building 6 (47-stories versus 8-stories) -- had a debris pile that is larger than that of Building 1 – although the debris pile for Building 7 was still substantially less than one might suppose should have been the case in relation to a 47-story building – although Building 7 is less than half the height of Building 1.

To be sure, there were some steel columns that formed part of the debris piles at Buildings 1, 2 and 7 (the three buildings that people saw come down on 9/11), and I will have more to say on this point a little later. Moreover, although one might anticipate that one should find concrete slabs, office equipment, and so on broken apart due to the weight of collapsing materials helping to slam things into the ground, nonetheless, one would not expect to see roughly 80 % of each of the Twin Towers and approximately 90% of Building 7 – including buildings and contents -- reduced to dust (just one file cabinet with folder files was reportedly found in the debris pile).

Neither thermite nor thermitic is capable of bringing about such a degree of pulverization. Mark Basile, himself, indicated during his interview that thermitic reactions do not explode. They melt things. And, while thermitic reactions might be initiated through explosions, the explosions do not pulverize materials but merely help to inject molten iron into steel columns and, thereby, permit those columns to be cut in a very short time frame (milliseconds).



Consequently, for purposes of argument, one does not need to find fault on the basis of such issues as provenance with those who speak about the presence of thermite and thermate in the dust from the debris pile at Ground Zero. One can acknowledge the likely presence of those materials in the dust samples, and one can agree that their presence is anomalous and needs to be explained, and one can concede, as well, that there is a need to explain how the controlled material, nano-aluminum, got into the dust samples studied by Steven Jones and Mark Basile.

However, conceding the presence of super-thermite (which contains nano-materials) in the dust from the WTC does nothing to explain a number of other issues – such as the degree of pulverization that occurred at the WTC on 9/11. Furthermore, there are other issues – which will be addressed shortly -- that cannot be adequately explained simply by admitting the presence of thermite, super-thermite, or thermate at the WTC.

If two 110 storey, 500, 000-ton buildings collapsed to the ground (whether through controlled demolition or through some sort of a conventional, progressive collapse that involved a pancaking of floors one on top of another), one would expect to find 220 stories of material on the ground. Yet, photographs of Ground Zero on the morning of 9/11 (one can see the not-yet destroyed Building 7 in the background) show that after the two towers had disappeared, there was not much more than piles, here and there, of 12 to 14 stories worth of steel on the ground.

Some people have argued that the reason why there is so little debris above ground at Ground Zero is because the weight of the “collapse” drove all that material down into the sub-basements. However, Dr. Wood has found “official” photographs demonstrating that the tunnels, rails, and cars for the Path Train that ran under the WTC showed only minor damage. Moreover, there was no debris from the towers down in the Path Train tunnels.

In addition, many of the stores in the concourse beneath the Twin Towers were not damaged. One of Dr. Wood’s favorite photographs in this respect is a picture of a store in the concourse with a window full of famous Warner Brothers dolls – such as Bugs Bunny, Foghorn

Leghorn, and the Road Runner – yet, the store (and this was true of many other stores) was not damaged.

Even more significantly, the World Trade Center was built over a section of concrete foundation that was poured over bedrock. The poured concrete is referred to as the 'bathtub' and it is intended to protect Lower Manhattan from being flooded by the Hudson River.

The bathtub-structure is, in some respects, fairly fragile. This was problematically demonstrated when some of the earth-moving equipment that had been brought in to help with the clean up process at Ground Zero were responsible for cracking the bathtub structure in a number of places.

Yet, one is led to believe that the collapse of 2, 110 storey, 500,000-ton buildings did not even a dent in that bathtub structure. Cranes weighing only a fraction of what the Twin Towers weighed could crack the bathtub structure, but the mammoth Twin Towers could not accomplish this. Surely, this is an anomaly that begs for critical reflection.

There is another problem surrounding the attempt to explain the destruction of the World Trade Towers either through a conventional progressive collapse due to fires or due to controlled explosions. More specifically, the seismic signal associated with the demise of the two towers was significantly less than one would expect to be associated with the 'collapse' of two such weighty buildings.

This was especially evident in the demise of the 47-storey Building 7. The destruction of this building had a seismic signal of .6 and was barely distinguishable from normal background noise for an average workday in Manhattan.

The seismic signal associated with the destruction of Building 1 was 2.3. The seismic signal for the demise of Building 2 was 2.1.

Those readings are comparable to the seismic reading associated with the Seattle Kingdom when it was brought down through controlled demolition. The difficulty here, however, is that the height and weight of the Twin Towers should have given expression – but did not -- to a potential energy that was some thirty times greater than the potential energy possessed by the Kingdome when the latter energy was released upon destruction.

There is an additional problem surrounding the length of the seismic signal according to Dr. Wood. For example, the length of the seismic signal for the South Tower's demise was about 8 seconds.

Most proponents of the controlled demolition idea with respect to the Twin Towers (and Building 7) often mention that all three buildings came down at close to free fall speeds. A conventional, progressive collapse (e.g., as in the pancake theory in which upper floors come crashing down on lower floors in a sequential manner) cannot be reconciled with such near free-fall speeds and would require much more time to crumble to the ground due to the resistance that each floor puts up before succumbing to the forces being exerted on those individual floors by the collapsing upper floors ... this is the principle of the conservation of momentum in action.

However, the idea of controlled demolition cannot account for why, say, the South Tower was destroyed at a rate that is faster than free fall. Yet, the roughly eight- second seismic signal associated with the destruction of the South and North Towers indicates that those events took less time than would have been the case if one dropped a bowling ball from the roof of the 110-storey structure unimpeded by air-resistance (approximately 9.5 seconds ... and factoring in air-resistance would slightly lengthen the duration of free fall for such an object).

Instances of controlled demolition approach near free fall velocities because buildings are rigged with cutter charges in such a way that the support columns are knocked out in a sequence that removes any resistance to the falling floors. Consequently, in such cases, the time it takes for a designated building to come down is like dropping an object to the ground from the top of whatever building is being demolished through such controlled demolition.

For a building's destruction to register a seismic signal whose length indicates a time that is shorter than free-fall speeds suggests something is going on in that process of destruction other than controlled demolition. A seismic signal of such short duration might indicate that the building is not just falling freely through space (notwithstanding air-resistance) but is being propelled downward by some force.

On the other hand, a seismic signal of such short duration also might indicate that some kind of force had destroyed the building in such a way that eight, or so, seconds was all it took to register what was left of the building plus its contents with respect to impacting the ground. For example, if – for the sake of conversation – one were to hypothesize that some sort of force reduced a large number of floors to nothing more than dust and that such dust dispersed in a cloud over a large area, then the length of the seismic signal for such an event would be like dropping an object off a much shorter building, and, therefore, the time of free-fall would be much less than one would expect for a taller building.

I'll be coming back to this theme of a force or set of forces other than controlled demolition a little later in this chapter. At the present time, however, I would like to take a quick look at some other issues that tend to argue against the idea of controlled demolition being the cause of the destruction of the three steel-framed towers at the World Trade Center.

I will pursue these issues not with the intention of trying to argue that thermite and thermate might not have played some role in the destruction of those buildings. Rather, my belief is that whatever role they might have played, it was not a central one ... or, more directly, controlled demolition is not the primary cause for the destruction of those three buildings.

To begin with, during the press conference that marked the release of its initial, final report on Building 7, NIST indicated that the destruction of Building 7 was “whisper quiet”. NIST – through its spokesperson, Shyam Sunder – used that description in conjunction with the demise of Building 7 in order to respond to a question about the possible use of explosives (in the form of controlled demolition) with respect to the destruction of Building 7.

Some might wish to argue that, by saying what he did, Sunder was merely lying in order to try to hide evidence pointing to the presence of explosives and controlled demolition. However, by saying what he did about the fall of Building 7 being “whisper quiet”, Sunder actually was undermining the position of NIST.

NIST claimed that Building 7 came down as a result of a progressive collapse that had been initiated through the way fire

caused girders to expand and, in the process, generate torque forces on a key core beam and, thereby, led the beam to buckle. However, if Building 7 came down due to a progressive, pancake collapse, then, there should have been a lot of noise associated with such a collapse as one floor slammed into the next and, in addition, successive core beams and floor assemblies buckled and came apart.

However, if the demise of Building 7 was “whisper quiet”, one is not talking about a conventional progressive collapse of the kind to which NIST subscribed. No noise, no conventional, progressive collapse.

By saying what he did in the press conference, Sunder is not only ruling out controlled demolition and explosions, he also is ruling out his own theory. So, if Building 7 came down “whisper quiet”, then, one needs to find some other explanation for how that building came down.

In support of Sunder’s “whisper quiet” comment, Dr. Wood indicates that some people were doing a video with Building 7 as a relatively distant backdrop. The building was coming down so silently that none of the participants realized what was going on until the building was already part way down.

A second point to consider in relation to the possible role of explosives or controlled demolition in bringing down three buildings at the World Trade Center revolves around the following anomaly. On five different occasions the Earth’s magnetic field shifted during 9/11.

The times of these abrupt shifts in the magnetic field correspond very closely with five events at the World Trade Center. The first shift in Earth’s magnetic field occurred precisely at the time when whatever struck the North Tower created a hole in that building. A second shift in the magnetic field took place at the exact time when the South Tower was impacted by something ... most people believe a commercial jet was implicated with respect to the holes in the Twin Towers. Three further shifts in the magnetic field happened at the precise time that Building 1, Building 2, and Building 7 came down.

Controlled demolitions could not have caused such shifts in the Earth’s magnetic field. Conventional progressive collapses cannot account for such abrupt shifts either.

The shifts in the Earth's magnetic field were recorded through the magnetometer site in Alaska. The site consists of a number of different stations, and the shift recordings were drawn from six of those stations.

In each of the foregoing cases, the magnetometer indicated that for a period of time the magnetic field signal started going down prior to a given event at the World Trade Center (i.e., being struck by something or coming down). When the five aforementioned events took place, the magnetic field signal began to rise again.

Of course, one might wish to argue that the correlation between the two sets of data – one set in Alaska involving magnetic field readings and one set in New York involving three, steel-framed, high-rise buildings – was purely coincidental. And, if such a correlation occurred with respect to just one of the five events in New York, but not in the other four, a person might be inclined to accept such a possibility, but when the abrupt shifts in the magnetic field occur on five different occasions and are tied to specific times at which events in New York transpired, then one might be wise to start looking for some other explanation.

A third area of contention concerns the question of whether, or not, molten metal was present in the World Trade Center debris. Although there were a number of eyewitnesses who reported seeing what they believed were pools and streams of molten metal deep in the debris piles at the WTC, there are some counter considerations that must be taken into account before reaching any conclusions on the matter.

The United States Geological Survey people conducted a number of satellite studies that, among other things, recorded thermal temperatures in relation to the World Trade Center following 9/11. Five days after 9/11, one set of such recordings indicated a range of temperatures ranging from: 801° Fahrenheit (427° Centigrade), to: 1,377° Fahrenheit (747° Centigrade).

There were various hot spots at, or near, the upper range of the foregoing temperature scales in the South Tower, the North Tower, Building 7, and in the vicinity of the towers. Various parts of the debris pile were being sprayed with water. There also had been a rainstorm.

Yet, the debris piles continued to produce high temperatures. The question is: what was behind such high temperatures?

There were news reports about how the soles of the steel-toed boots of some workers seemed to be disintegrating or falling apart. Some people attributed this to the presence of molten metal in the debris pile.

If the boot damage of the workers were due to high heat, one would have expected to hear reports of lots of workers suffering burns to their feet. However, there are no such reports. Whatever was causing the boots to come apart was something other than heat.

There is an official FEMA picture of a grapppler at Ground Zero that is picking up an object of some kind that appears to be glowing with a yellow-orange hue. Some people have interpreted this "object" to be a piece of molten steel/iron.

If that object had been a piece of glowing, molten steel/iron, the temperature of the object would be in the vicinity of 1200° Centigrade (2700° Fahrenheit). However, Brendon Casey, a hydraulics engineer for some fifteen years who has written a well-respected book on hydraulic systems, indicates that the maximum temperature to which a hydraulic system can be exposed before permanent damage is done to the system is 82° Centigrade.

There were no reports of grapplers breaking down at Ground Zero because their hydraulic systems were failing due to exposure from molten metal. So, whatever the yellow-orange glowing object was, it wasn't molten metal.

Dr. Wood has spoken and written about a water main on West Street that broke on the afternoon of 9/11 in an area of Ground Zero that according to the USGS was registering temperatures of some 800° Fahrenheit. The broken water main created a small lake.

She notes the existence of official photographs showing a firefighter who was wading knee deep in the 'lake' water. Yet, despite the high temperature for the area being recorded by USGS, the water was not boiling, giving off steam, nor was the firefighter wading in the water injured.

Dr. Wood also indicates that there are official photographs depicting a person who is going down a hole that leads to one of the

sub-basements of a WTC tower. The area being inspected by the worker is, according to the USGS temperature data, one of the hottest areas in the entire World Trade Center area, and, yet, the worker is unaffected.

There is a substantial disjoint between the different sets of data involving, on the one hand, the USGS temperature readings and, on the other hand, what was being photographed and observed on the ground. If the USGS recorded temperatures were due to the presence of molten metal, one would have expected: fire hoses to have melted, or firemen to have burned their feet, or people wading in the 'lake' on West Street to have been boiled alive, or workers inspecting holes leading to the sub-basements of one of the towers to have been severely burned, or for there to have been Chernobyl-like steam explosions as water came into contact with the molten metal, and, yet, none of this took place ... so, whatever was causing the high recorded temperatures must be due to something else beside molten metal.

The high temperature readings for Ground Zero persisted for months. What was causing them?

If the three buildings had come down through a conventional progressive collapse brought about by the effects of fire, there would have been limited oxygen and combustibles in the pile to be able to generate the sort of high temperatures that were recorded five days after 9/11. Furthermore, remember, clean-up crews indicated that they found little, or no, office equipment or furnishings in the debris pile, and, more importantly, the debris piles were not only relatively small, they did not extend down into the sub-basements.

The foregoing considerations have led some to maintain that the reports of: molten steel, streams of molten metal and high USGS temperature readings indicate the possibility of something like thermite or thermate being present at WTC. This idea is given some credence when one factors in the research of people like Dr. Steven Jones and Mark Basile who have found evidence of nano-thermite in the dust samples that allegedly have been drawn from in and around the World Trade Center destruction, and the thermite idea is also given additional support when one learns that thermite reactions can proceed in the absence of oxygen.



Both the conventional pancake account of the WTC destruction, as well as the super-thermite (nano-thermite) explanation of that destruction, suffers from the same weaknesses. Whatever eyewitnesses claimed to have seen in relation to the possible presence of molten metal in the debris piles at the WTC, the physical evidence tends to run against such eyewitnesses reports.

If molten metal had been present in the debris pile – whether created by conventional burning of combustibles or due to the presence of thermite reactions -- fire hoses would have burned, and the feet of firefighters and cleanup crews would have burned, and people wading in the 'lake' on West Street would have been cooked alive, and there would have been numerous steam explosions as water came into contact with molten metal, and the hydraulic systems of grapplers would have ceased up, and the people inspecting holes leading into a sub-basement tower that, according to the USGS data, was more than a thousand degrees Fahrenheit, would have been severely burned. However, none of the foregoing incidents took place.

Whatever was causing the high temperature readings that were recorded by the USGS officials in relation to Ground Zero, the physical evidence at the WTC indicates that it was not molten metal that was generating the heat. Moreover, despite eyewitness testimony suggesting the presence of molten metal at Ground Zero, none of the physical evidence at the WTC supports such an interpretation of what was seen ... in other words without denying that people saw something that they interpreted to be molten metal, the physical evidence at Ground Zero indicates that such an interpretation is not warranted.

Furthermore, just as one needs to raise questions about the plausibility of trying to claim that there were sufficient amounts of combustible elements (and oxygen) in the debris pile to fuel conventional fires for months (the fires weren't completely put out until early in 2002), one must also raise a similar question in relation to the issue of super-thermite. More specifically, how much super-thermite, regular thermite and thermate would have had to have been present in the debris pile to be able to generate temperatures of hundreds of degrees Fahrenheit for months on end?

Super-thermitic, thermitic, and thermate reactions are all very rapid processes. Such materials would be consumed at a fairly high rate so one might suppose that the amount of thermitic material that would be necessary would have had to have been enormous.

I'll leave the foregoing calculation as a homework exercise. However, the supporters of the controlled demolition/thermite hypothesis in relation to the cause of not only the destruction of three towers at Ground Zero but, as well, the continued high temperature readings at Ground Zero that were present for months following 9/11 will have to explain where so much thermite/thermate came from and how it got into the Twin Towers, and why there was very limited, if any, physical evidence at Ground Zero suggesting the presence of such large quantities of thermite or super-thermite or thermate following the fall of the three towers at the WTC (that is, as pointed out earlier, there should have been certain kinds of injuries and problems that would have arisen at Ground Zero if molten metal had been present, but none of these problems were in evidence).

There are a number of other factors that should be mentioned in conjunction with events at the WTC that cannot, necessarily, be explained by either a conventional, progressive collapse approach to the destruction of the Twin Towers and Building 7, nor can such data necessarily be explained by a thermite/controlled demolition approach to such destruction. For example, many people reported hearing explosions on 9/11 in and around Ground Zero prior to any of the buildings coming down, and the proponents of controlled demolition maintain that such explosions demonstrate the existence of the sort of sequential explosions that take place in conjunction with controlled demolition.

Dr. Wood states that not everything that explodes is the result of explosives. For instance, many of the Scott packs, or oxygen containers, used by the first responders were exploding while sitting on the fire trucks at street level. In addition, when Building 2 was being destroyed, a number of eyewitnesses reported that cars which were parked several blocks from Ground Zero were bursting into flames due to some form of spontaneous combustion or explosion – that is, they had not been hit with any kind of debris.

The issue of cars that inexplicably burst into flames or exploded leads to another issue. There were more than 1400 cars that were a number of blocks – down under FDR Drive near the East River -- from Ground Zero and that had to be towed away because of the damage to those vehicles – but the damage was not from falling debris.

Dr. Wood uses the term: ‘toasted’, to refer to such cars ... toasted in the sense of being inoperable and not functional. These cars exhibited a variety of anomalies.

Many of them were missing engine blocks and door handles. In some cases, half the car’s exterior enamel somehow had been removed even as the rest of the car had a shiny enamel finish. Most of the vehicles were rusting even though whatever had happened to them had just happened to them. Some of the cars were flipped upside down while other cars immediately adjacent might have been untouched and undamaged. The windows on some of the cars did not appear to have burst as with car fires but were missing – along with their frames -- from the vehicles altogether. Rubber done to the belts would be missing from some tires but not others.

A conventional, progressive collapse cannot account for such damage. A theory based on controlled demolition and thermite cannot adequately explain the foregoing sorts of anomalies either.

For example, due to the phenomenon of heat conduction, if a car has been burning, one won’t find areas of that car that are completely burned over to a precise line of demarcation, and, then, all of a sudden, have a another point one nanometer over from that line that is in pristine condition. If the cars burned as a result of falling debris from a conventional, progressive collapse or burned from nano-particles of thermite that, somehow, were ignited in relation cars that the nano-thermite had fallen on, one would not have observed the foregoing sudden transition in effect from one point to the next ... heat conduction wouldn’t permit this to occur.

Dr Wood also found it strange that although cars spontaneously burst into flames or were ‘toasted’ in the strange ways noted above, there was loose paper all about those cars that remained unburned. Cars burned, but paper near those cars did not burn.

Another anomaly that requires something beyond what a theory of conventional, progressive collapse or a theory of controlled demolition might be able to adequately explain concerns strange holes that were found in many of the remaining buildings at Ground Zero, as well as in and around grounds of the WTC. For example, Building 6 – an 8-storey structure -- has a huge, round hole in the center of the building – one couldn't see it if one were walking by at ground level -- that goes from the roof right down to the bottom of the building and from which about 50% of the buildings mass has been removed, and, moreover, adjacent to where Building 2 used to be, there was a big hole in Liberty Street that appeared to be about 60 feet deep – and, yet, neither the hole in Building 6, nor the hole in Liberty Street, ever contained any debris that would have created such a hole.

These holes – and Dr. Wood notes that there were many of them all around Ground Zero – are about 24 feet in diameter. In fact, the circular hole in Building 6 appears to have been created through a conglomeration of a number of such holes.

The aforementioned holes were not created by falling debris because there is no debris in them. They are just circular holes of a somewhat uniform size. So, what caused them?

Early in my own investigations into 9/11 – and, prior to even learning about Dr. Wood's research – I remember seeing a video clip of a portion of the North Tower that still remained standing after the rest of the structure had collapsed. Building 7 appears in the foreground of the video.

Building 7 is 47-stories tall. The massive core columns of the North Tower that are being focused on in the video clip stand about 15 stories, or so, above Building 7.

At the beginning of the video, a number of core columns are shown as a freestanding structure. These columns stood for roughly 20 seconds to half a minute before anything began to happen.

In other words, those columns appear to be quite rigid, and, therefore, are, presumably, still strong in order to be able to stand so straight. If the several columns were flexible due to being exposed to some sort of heating or melting process, the columns would not have been so straight under the weight of those 60-stories worth of steel.

Within about 20-30 seconds of the start of the video clip, the columns move slightly and, then, before your eyes, turn to dust. They disintegrate.

The columns don't bend over or rotate as they disappear before one's eyes. The mammoth columns (and it is easy to forget just how huge these columns are when being videoed from a distance) just turn to dust and fall to the ground. Dr. Wood refers to this phenomenon as "dustification".

How does one go from straight, rigid and strong at one moment to being disintegrated into dust at the next moment? Neither a scenario of a conventional, progressive collapse nor a theory involving thermite-based controlled demolition will account for what happened to the "spire" -- as it has been dubbed -- in the video clip to which I am alluding.

Another building at Ground Zero that Dr. Wood finds interesting is Building 3, a 22-storey structure. Most of the building is missing from the same sort of vertical, cylindrical holes that exist in Building 6, but what she finds to be of even more interest is that there is no debris pile to speak of associated with Building 3 ... it is pretty much at ground level but little of the 22-storey structure is to be found.

One finds similar sorts of anomalies in the case of Building 4, a nine-storey structure. The main perimeter of this building was close to Tower 2. However, only the north wing of Building 4 remains standing, while the rest of the building is completely missing

It is almost as if the main portion of Building 4 had been surgically removed from the rest of the structure. The mass is just missing.

A conventional, progressive collapse cannot lead to this. A thermite-based controlled demolition cannot produce this ... "this" refers to the relative absence of a debris pile.

Another anomaly entailed by 9/11 has to do with the individuals who died at the World Trade Center on that day. Of the nearly 3,000 people who lost their lives at the World Trade Center, there were approximately 1100 bodies that were never recovered -- not even in trace amounts.

If a building came down through a conventional, progressive collapse or if it came down through a thermite-based controlled

demolition, one would expect to be able to locate all of the bodies. To be sure, the bodies would have been subjected to all manner of forces during such a tragedy, but those bodies still would have survived in whole or in part ... even if they suffered severe burns.

Cremating a body and reducing it to dust requires a body to be exposed to a heat of about 3000° Fahrenheit for more than three hours. Where are the 1100 missing bodies?

Another anomaly connected to the WTC victims is that some of those people jumped from the Towers – apparently feeling that jumping was a better option than whatever was taking place in the towers. Difficult to explain, however, is the fact that some of these people were found 3-400 feet from the building. How did they get that far from the buildings?

In addition, Dr. Wood indicates that she has pictures of a rather grisly and disturbing nature concerning the condition of some of these ‘jumpers’, and, so, she has kept such photographs off of her web site. However, Dr. Wood indicates that the condition of these bodies is difficult to explain.

There have been stories of people whose parachute did not work and who hit the ground at a high rate of speed. Some of these people even survived, but in the case of those who did not survive, their bodies were still intact ... although, obviously, possessing a great many internal injuries.

Similarly, if one is driving along at 80 miles per hour and strikes a deer, the deer will die from the numerous injuries caused by the impact. Nonetheless, the body of the deer remains intact.

This was not the case for some of the ‘jumping’ victims on 9/11. The least grisly thing one can say is that some of their bodies were like a puzzle of pieces that had to be reassembled to be able to yield a recognizable human being.

Another anomaly of 9/11 at the World Trade Center involves the presence of the phenomenon of ‘fuming’. This is a generic term Dr. Wood has coined to refer to the mists, vapors or fumes that were seen to arise from various parts of the area of Ground Zero.

The fumes are not connected with fires. People are seen walking in and around the fumes, and they do not get burned.

More puzzling still is that the fumes disappeared for a time after being watered, and, then, began to rise again once the watering ceased. This is quite different from what happens when one waters materials that are burning – that is, which tend to send up smoke when they are watered and stop doing so when they are not watered.

The fumes do not seem to rise up like smoke. Rather, they appear to just hover over the area that is fuming, and Dr. Wood believes this aspect of hovering or looming is an indication that some sort of reaction is still taking place.

Possibly connected to the ‘hovering/reactive’ quality of the fumes is the way those fumes have persisted for many years from various parts of Ground Zero. For example, there are portions of the area on which Building 4 stood that have continued to fume for more than seven years following 9/11.

When Dr. Wood visited Ground Zero in January 2008 she saw a rather strange, repetitive process being carried out by cleanup crews. Dirt would be scooped up and removed from an area of Ground Zero. New dirt would be brought in to replace the old dirt. Then, the whole process would be repeated again ... many times.

She also notes how at the time this was all going on people in Hazmat suits were directing traffic in and around the area. Perhaps, the reason for the Hazmat suits was because oftentimes when the grapplers dug into the old dirt to remove it, a white powdery ‘something’ would wisp up into the air.

More puzzling still is that the fumes disappeared for a time after being watered, and, then, began to rise again once the watering ceased. This is quite different from what happens when one waters materials that are burning – that is, which tend to send up smoke when they are watered and stop doing so when they are not watered.

The foregoing fuming issue might, or might not, be connected to some of the problems that have been encountered in the re-building of the Banker’s Trust structure that stands just across from where Building 2 once resided. The Banker’s Trust Building had a substantial gash – of unknown origins -- in its front side as a result of something that happened on 9/11. In addition, there was a beam in the damaged

portion of the Banker's Trust Building that was strangely shriveled up and one wonders how that occurred.

In time, the gash and other damage were repaired. Oddly, however, the construction crews had to dismantle the repairs and start again.

During the second reconstruction project, the contractors for the job had to remove several floors in order to gain access to what appeared to be the source of their problems. Apparently part of the steel had been turned into iron, because there was a rust-like residue on the beams. In addition, there was a considerable amount of degradation in the problematic steel beams ... a process of degradation that seems to be continuing to take place ... just like the fuming process.

The rusted beams in the Banker's Trust Building are reminiscent of many of the beams that were left over in some of the debris piles at Ground Zero after 9/11. The term that Dr. Wood uses in reference to the rust coating that was on those beams is "furry rust" because it looks like a sort of furry, orange colored coating has been applied to the beams.

One of the reasons for using steel in construction rather than iron is because steel is rust-resistant. Yet, within hours, if not days, of 9/11, many of the steel beams in the debris piles at Ground Zero gave showed substantial signs of rust.

Steel consists of 99% iron with 1% other additives such as carbon and a few additional smidgens of ingredients to help make the iron stronger and rust-resistant. Apparently, on 9/11 something took place that permitted the bonding between iron and the ingredients that permit iron become steel to dissociate in some fashion, thereby allowing the iron to rust ... but at a highly accelerated rate.

The conventional progressive collapse of a building will not cause such rusting to occur, nor will it cause the fuming process noted by Dr. Wood. The use of thermite-based controlled demolition will not lead to rapid rusting, nor will it bring about a fuming phenomenon that will last across many years.

-----



Neither conventional, progressive collapses nor thermite-based controlled demolitions can account for the phenomena of: 'dustification', 'fuming', 'furry rust', or 'toasted vehicles' that have been documented by Dr. Wood in relation to Ground Zero. Neither conventional, progressive collapses nor thermite-based controlled demolitions can account for the following facts: (1) the debris piles for Buildings 1, 2 and 7 are far too small and cannot be reconciled with the size of the structures through which those piles arose; (2) the degree to which 220 stories of concrete and office equipment from the Twin Towers were pulverized and reduced to dust; (3) the length of the seismic recording for the South Tower suggests that materials came down faster than free-fall speed; (4) the size of the seismic recording for Building 7 was almost indistinguishable from background noise; the destruction of Building 7 was "whisper quiet"; (5) the relatively fragile 'bathtub' foundation structure beneath the WTC was not damaged when the Twin Towers came down; (6) many of the stores in the concourse beneath the World Trade Center, as well as the Path train and tunnels beneath the WTC were not damaged as one would have anticipated when 2, 500,000 ton structures supposedly crashed down on them; (7) the bodies of 1100 victims at the WTC were never recovered; (8) the Earth's magnetic field abruptly shifted five times on 9/11 in precise synchronicity with five events at the WTC (the creation of two holes in the Twin Towers and the destruction of Buildings 1, 2, and 7); (9) while researchers for the United States Geological Survey organization were getting temperature readings of more than a thousand degrees Fahrenheit for a number of locations within the WTC following the events of 9/11, no physical evidence was ever found at the WTC that could plausibly account for such high temperatures or why they persisted for many weeks; (10) dirt was routinely removed and brought in at Ground Zero - and one might keep in mind that dirt is often used in processes of de-contamination; (11) Scott packs (oxygen tank apparatus) and cars were seen to explode inexplicably - that is, without being touched by any falling debris; (12) the faster than free fall destruction of the Twin Towers; and, finally, (13) the strange, roughly 24-foot diameter holes that populated many of the buildings and the ground in and around the World Trade Center.

There were other 9/11-anomalies that cannot be explained by either a theory of conventional, progressive collapse or thermite-based controlled demolitions in relation to the buildings of the WTC. For example, from 9/11 onward there were electrical outages ranging over a fairly extensive area in New York City that took more than three months to repair. Furthermore, despite a constant hosing down of the WTC area and notwithstanding the occurrence of a number of substantial rainstorms in Manhattan, fires persisted for, approximately, 100 days.

If neither conventional, fire-induced progressive collapses nor thermite-based controlled demolitions can plausibly and credibly account for any of the foregoing issues, what can? Judy Wood has a few ideas in this respect.

Dr. Wood is a strong proponent of a methodological principle called: listening to the evidence. She believes that if one will listen to what the evidence is saying – rather than try to force the data into preconceived theoretical categories -- the evidence, itself, will point one in the right direction to be able to work toward an understanding of how that evidence came to have the characteristics it does.

One of the first things that caught her attention in relation to 9/11 was what happened in conjunction with the demise of the South Tower – the first building to be destroyed on 9/11. The top 20-stories of the building began to fall sideways and rotate eastward relative to the rest of the building, and, then, all of a sudden was lost in a tremendous cloud of pulverized material.

Examining the photographs and videos of this part of the demise of the South Tower, Dr. Wood said that what she was seeing reminded her of what happens when water turns to steam and expands in volume by some 1600 percent. The tons of material in the falling, rotating, exploding top 20, or so, floors of the building seemed to be transitioning into molecules that were repelling one another.

What she was seeing was not like a conventional form of explosion. There was no sound associated with what was taking place in that rapidly expanding cloud of dustified material.

The cloud that had replaced the top portion of the South Tower was rapidly increasing in volume as steam does when water is

transitioned into a gaseous vapor. This is not what happens in the case of either a progressive collapse or a controlled demolition, for although dust would – to a degree -- be generated in both of the latter instances, the creation of dust in such cases would not remotely approach what Dr. Wood – and millions of others – were witnessing in conjunction with the initial phases of destruction of the South Tower.

Dr. Wood started to look for a force that might be able to bring about what she had witnessed in relation to the destruction of the top portion of the South Tower. Her research led her first to the Casimir Effect or, as it sometimes is known, the Casimir-Polder Force. Hendrick B.G. Casimir and Dirk Polder proposed the idea of such a force in 1948 while working at the Phillips Research Labs and, subsequently, the existence of the force was experimentally verified.

The Casimir-Polder Force occurs when one places two, uncharged metal plates a few millimeters apart within a vacuum that is devoid of an electromagnetic field. Under such circumstances and from the perspective of classical physics, one would not expect to see any electromagnetic field created between the two plates, and, yet such a field is observed.

There are different theories about why and how the electromagnetic field arises under the foregoing conditions. Some people talk about the exchange of virtual particles and some people talk in terms of the zero-point energy that is believed to exist in a vacuum.

The net charge observed in the Casimir-Polder Force can be either positive or negative. Which it is depends on how the two plates are juxtaposed in relation to one another.

The force has the capacity to both propel objects and levitate them. The propulsive possibility inherent in the Casimir-Polder Force reminded Dr. Wood of how what she calls “wheatchexs” – the sections of aluminum cladding that cover steel-assemblies that make up the exterior structure of the Twin Towers – seemed to be coming down – at least some of them appeared to be doing this -- at rates that were faster than free fall speeds. If whatever was causing the dustification of the top portion of the South Tower was also generating an explosive increase in the volume of the materials being dustified, then, this might explain why some of the “wheatchexs” appeared to be coming down at

faster than free fall speeds ... something that neither conventional collapses nor controlled demolition collapses can explain.

The Casimir-Polder Force was not the final stop for Dr. Wood in her journey to try to understand what had happened to the buildings in the World Trade Center. It was only the first way station of a longer journey.

Eventually, she came in contact with the work of a Canadian researcher by the name of John Hutchison. Hutchison had been following up on the work of the Serbian scientist, Nikola Tesla, who had been exploring the many phenomena that are linked to electromagnetic fields during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early-to-mid 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Among other things, Tesla and introduced alternating current technology to the world. However, the research of Tesla went far beyond such technology, and at a certain point Tesla was working to generate a wireless transmission of energy but backed away from that work due to his fears that it would become hijacked by individuals who might use it for destructive rather than constructive purposes.

Among the things that John Hutchison had discovered is that one can use different kinds of electromagnetic energy fields to interfere with one another in specific or directed ways. In essence, the Hutchison Effect – as it has come to be called – is what occurs when different kinds of electromagnetic fields are brought in contact with one another in ways that create interference patterns in those fields.

John Hutchison had produced various effects in the lab by using, first, a Tesla Coil and, then, a Van de Graaff generator. These devices generated electromagnetic fields that could be directed to interfere with one another, and during the process of interference, some rather astonishing phenomena arose.

Dr. Wood discovered that many of the anomalies associated with 9/11 were capable of being reproduced in the lab and John Hutchison – working without 9/11 in mind – had accomplished such things. The only difference was in the scale of the two sets of phenomena ... in other words John Hutchison was producing in his lab many of the kinds of phenomena on a small scale that had been observed on a much larger scale on 9/11.

The Hutchison Effect was capable of generating a wide array of results. Metal bars made of steel, copper, molybdenum, or aluminum could be twisted, jellified, or riddled with Swiss-cheese-like holes ... something that reminds one of some of the beams found at the WTC after 9/11. Such metals could be made to glow (that is exhibit luminescence) without being hot to the touch ... an effect that might account for why so many people believed they had seen molten metal at Ground Zero and, yet, there were no correlative physical effects to be found indicating the presence of such molten metal. Such metals could be disintegrated – something that might reflect the extensive dustification that occurred on 9/11, as well as the fact that the debris piles for the destroyed buildings was much smaller than one might have predicted, as well as the fact that the bodies of 1100 victims were never found at the WTC. Such metals could be levitated and flipped about ... something that might explain the flipped cars that were found at various locations – some quite a few blocks from the WTC -- on 9/11.

In addition to the similarities noted above between phenomena observed on 9/11 and what John Hutchison could produce in the lab, the Hutchison Effect might also explain why Scott Packs were exploding on 9/11 for no apparent reason. More specifically, if a container is subjected to a set of interfering electromagnetic fields in the right way, the metal in the container will disintegrate and at a certain point will become thin enough to lose integrity and, as a result, lead to an explosion as the pressurized gas inside the container breaks through and is released.

The foregoing considerations also might explain why so many explosions were reported in the Twin Towers. There were hundreds of pressurized containers on numerous floors of the Twin Towers that contained water to be used in tandem with toilets that regulated the amount of water that would be released when such toilets were flushed, and if the metal of these pressurized tanks loss their integrity as a result of being subjected to interfering electromagnetic fields of the right sort, those containers would explode.

The Hutchison Effect might also account for why cars inexplicably caught fire or why there were electrical outages over an extensive area in New York City that took weeks to repair. Both of the foregoing

effects might have given expression to some sort of electromagnetic pulse phenomena that caused the electrical systems of cars to explode and catch fire or caused the power to go out for such an extensive time and area in various parts of New York City.

Dr. Wood refers to what John Hutchison has done in the lab as a “proof of concept”. In other words, by being able to use electromagnetic fields to interfere with one another in a directed fashion and, thereby, produced many, if not all, of the sorts of anomalies that were observed in New York on 9/11, John Hutchison had demonstrated or proven that the concept of a ‘directed energy weapon’ is not only feasible but realizable.

Many critics of Dr. Wood’s research have wanted her to specify exactly how what was done on 9/11 was brought about. They want her to specify the precise nature of the ‘weapon’ and who manufactured it and where it was positioned on 9/11. Those critics want her to produce the calculations that indicate how much energy would be required to operate such a weapon and bring about such effects.

Dr. Wood doesn’t have an answer to those questions ... yet. However, in many ways, she doesn’t need to provide answers at the present time to those questions because the ‘proof of concept’ idea indicates that, in principle, the technological understanding already exists (in the person and work of individuals such as John Hutchinson) to be able to generate in the lab the same kinds of effects that were observed on 9/11.

More importantly, Dr. Wood points to something that is readily apparent when one actually listens to the physical evidence. Theories involving conventional, fire-induced progressive collapses and/or thermite-based controlled demolitions cannot explain any of the anomalies that have been noted by Dr. Wood’s careful observation of the physical data entailed by the events of 9/11 in New York City. Yet, nonetheless, the three buildings of the World Trade Center came down in ways that cannot be explained by those who champion either the official government conspiracy theory (which is based on, among other things, the idea of conventional fire-induced progressive collapses) or the anti-official government conspiracy theory (which is

based on, among other things, the idea of thermite-based controlled demolition scenarios).

In other words, irrespective of whether, or not, one can explain the precise nature of the weapon used to bring about the destruction of the World Trade Center, the fact of the destruction is undeniable. Moreover, the character of that destruction cannot be explained by either the idea of conventional progressive collapses or the idea of thermite-based controlled demolitions.

Dr. Wood notes that on 9/11, three buildings at the WTC didn't collapse. Much of the material of, and in, those buildings simply disappeared.

She believes that the molecular basis of matter in those buildings was disrupted. The relationship of molecules to one another in the buildings was profoundly altered and accompanied by an incredible release of energy that did not manifest itself in conventional ways, but, instead, the energy release was manifested in the form of the many anomalies (e.g., dustification, fuming, toasting, rusting, tortured metals, explosions, 24-foot diameter holes, spontaneous fires, problematically-sized debris piles, puzzling seismic readings, abrupt shifts in the Earth's magnetic field, and so on) that have been noted by Dr. Wood in conjunction with the destruction of the WTC on 9/11.

Dr. Wood doesn't necessarily claim that what went on at the WTC on 9/11 is the Hutchison Effect in action. However, she does believe that the underlying physics is essentially the same.

John Hutchison produced his effects with Tesla Coils, Van de Graaff generators, and microwaves. There are many other facets of the electromagnetic spectrum that could be used to produce similar, and/or more intense, results by directing those energy fields to interfere with one another in certain ways and under certain conditions.

-----

Dr. Wood notes another anomaly that is associated with 9/11. This anomaly might, or might not, have anything to do with what transpired on 9/11, but the anomaly is so anomalous that, at least in passing, it should be mentioned.

Not many people realize that on 9/11, there was a hurricane – Erin -- parked off the coast of New York City. For a time, as it headed up the east coast, it was classified as a Category 3 hurricane, but by the time it reached the New York area it had been downgraded to a Category 1 hurricane as it began to spread out and lose some of the energy associated with a tighter spinning low-pressure area.

However, it was still a potentially dangerous storm. The outer bands of the hurricane extended from the tip of Long Island on the West side, to Cape Cod on the East side and down as far as off the coast of Washington, D.C. on the south side.

The overall size of the hurricane was approximately 500 miles in diameter. It was about as large as Katrina.

Although there was a high-pressure area coming in from the Midwest that likely would prevent Hurricane Erin from coming ashore, there should have been considerable uncertainty about whether, or not, the hurricane might be kept relatively stationary for a period of time. If this were to occur, it would create storm surges along the New York, New Jersey coastal areas that could bring about substantial flooding, destruction, and, possibly, death.

Yet, no storm warnings, surge warnings, or flood warnings were given on 9/11 for the New York or New Jersey coastal areas. In fact, Dr. Wood indicates that not only did she check all of the weather reports for the major, local New York stations prior to the events of 9/11 and found that not one of those stations made any mention of Hurricane Erin, but, as well, she contacted the Meteorological Weather Service and was told that there had been no hurricane off New York City on 9/11 ... despite the existence of satellite imagery for that day depicting the presence of such a hurricane.

Hurricane Erin had been tracked and talked about on radio and television as it traveled up the east coast. Meteorologists had been expressing concern about the possibility of storm surges all along the Virginia coastline.

Inexplicably, however, the storm suddenly dropped off the radar of public awareness. In fact, one didn't hear about the storm again until it reached an area near Nova Scotia.



The fact that the existence of the storm off the coast of New York, together with its very real potential for generating dangerous storm surges in New York and New Jersey coastal waters (and remember, JFK airport is at sea level as is much of Manhattan) was not reported in the local media weather reports is, in and of itself, strange. However, the anomalous character of Hurricane Erin might be enhanced when one realizes that there are electromagnetic fields associated with hurricanes.

People's memory of 9/11 is of a bright, sunny day. However, all three airports in and around New York City (LaGuardia, JFK and Newark) reported thunder on the morning of 9/11.

Thunder and lightning are field effects that often occur ahead of a storm or beyond the perimeter of such a storm. In addition, there are many kinds of field effects that take place within the hurricane itself.

Hurricane Erin didn't have to be hovering over New York City for its electromagnetic field to be able to have an impact. The hurricane only had to be sufficiently close to New York City for the storm's field effects to be felt in that location.

Is it possible that the electromagnetic field energy associated with Hurricane Erin was interfered with in some manner on 9/11 by some other source(s) of directed electromagnetic field(s)? Dr. Wood doesn't know, but the anomalous character of the circumstances surrounding that storm does raise some questions ... especially when those anomalous circumstances are linked to the issue of the Hutchison Effect and the odd phenomena that can be produced when electromagnetic fields are induced to interfere with one another.

-----

On January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2007 an interview took place at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. The interview was sort of a rogue operation because the National Press Club had not sanctioned it.

The person conducting the interview was Dr. Greg Jenkins, a physicist. The person being interviewed was Dr. Judy Wood.

The time of the interview was quite late - around midnight or after. It occurred following a number of talks, together with ensuing discussion, that had transpired in relation to the issue of 9/11 and some of Dr. Wood's work in that matter.

Dr. Jenkins asked Dr. Wood if she would be willing to answer a few questions. Dr. Wood consented.

The interview began in a seemingly very friendly manner. Dr. Jenkins welcomes Dr. Wood on behalf of what he describes as the ‘rag-tag group’ of people that constitutes D.C. 9/11 Truth.

After some introductory remarks, Dr. Jenkins launches into some questions concerning the types of weapons that might have been used in conjunction with the destruction of the World Trade Center. He wants to know the form of the weapons that Dr. Wood believes were used on 9/11.

Dr. Wood replies with words to the effect that she doesn’t feel that: questions about the form of the weapon, is the best place at which to start. She believes one should start by taking a look at the evidence.

She continues on by saying that everyone has been given a story about 9/11 with respect to things like eyewitness accounts involving molten metal at the World Trade Center. She feels that people should leave the rumor mill behind and start looking for actual evidence of things.

Dr. Jenkins raises the issue of ‘dustification’ and mentions the vaporization of metals. He asks Dr. Wood if she has done any sort of measurements to determine the scale of energy that might be necessary to turn metal into dust.

Dr. Wood suggests that at this point in time such questions are more of a distraction than something of a constructive nature. Moreover, she rhetorically asks: when one looks at the debris piles at the World Trade Center, is there any question that the buildings have been pulverized?

The implication of her question is that irrespective of whether, or not, we know what the precise character of the weapon is that brought about such devastation, the very fact of the extensive degree of pulverization that took place on 9/11 in conjunction with the WTC is something that exists and cannot be explained through the ideas of either conventional fire-induced progressive collapses or thermite-based controlled demolition. Therefore, we need to search for some other form of explanation.

Dr. Jenkins returns to the question concerning the energy scale that would be needed to accomplish what Dr. Wood is suggesting. He wants to know whether, or not, there is anything that has been done in laboratories that shows that steel could be turned into dust.

One is only a few minutes into the interview, but there seem to be several questions that are hovering in the air. First, one wonders if Dr. Jenkins actually is listening to what Dr. Wood is saying. Second, one wonders if – despite his doctorate in physics -- Dr. Jenkins actually knows how to do science.

Dr. Jenkins is trying to get Dr. Wood to specify the weapons system that was used on 9/11. He also wants her to commit to particular figures with respect to the scale of energy that would be necessary to operate such a weapon.

Dr. Wood is indicating to Dr. Jenkins that such questions are premature. First, one needs to begin collecting data, and one of the most basic pieces of information one runs into if one actually looks at the evidence at the World Trade Center is that there are a number of issues – such as the extensive nature of pulverization present at the WTC – which cannot be explained by theories of: fire-induced progressive collapses or thermite-based controlled demolitions.

Following a discussion of the principles underlying microwaves, Dr. Jenkins comes back to his initial concern – namely, he doesn't know of any way to 'dustify' steel. The implication of his assertion is that unless Dr. Wood can answer his questions in the way he wants, then he is disinclined – and, by implication, everyone who watches the interview should be so disinclined -- to accept what she is saying.

Dr. Jenkins has missed the implicit question that is being directed to him by the things that Dr. Wood has said to this point in the interview. More specifically, if you start by looking at evidence -- and part of the evidence entails the massive degree of pulverization that is evident in relation to the buildings at the WTC – how does one explain the existence of such evidence ... evidence that is inconsistent with either a fire-induced progressive collapse theory or a thermite-based controlled demolition theory?

Moreover, Dr. Jenkins is committing a basic mistake with respect to science. He is letting his ignorance get in the way of doing research.

Because he knows of no way to reduce metal to dust, he wishes to deny the actual evidence of 9/11. The evidence at the WTC is telling anyone who cares to look at it that somehow metal has been turned to dust because, among other things, the buildings have, in fact, been largely reduced to dust with only 12 or 13 stories of actual structural components making up the rubble piles for more than 220 stories worth of materials – both structural and office equipment/furnishings.

Dr. Wood stipulates that there is an order to doing science. First, one must begin with what happened, and, then, one proceeds on to questions about how the ‘what’ was done and, finally, one addresses who might have done that ‘what’.

She points out that determining what happened doesn’t depend on how one understands the world. If all one has in one’s arsenal of knowledge are ideas about slingshots, bee-bee guns and firecrackers and, as a result, one claims that one doesn’t understand how any of these ‘weapons’ could have brought about the destruction of 9/11, one is letting one’s preconceived ideas about how the world operates dictate the nature of one’s research ... this is not how science works.

At this point, Dr. Jenkins wants to raise some questions about an analysis appearing on Dr. Wood’s web site that compared what happened at the Kingdome, when it was brought down by controlled demolition, and what happened at the WTC. His question is related to the height of the debris piles in each case.

Dr. Wood indicates that the part of her web site to which he is referring is still under construction. She further adds that she hasn’t taken a look at those figures recently so she is not intimately familiar with them.

Dr. Jenkins says: “Fair enough.” Then, despite having said this, he again wants to ask questions about the part of her web site dealing with the Kingdom ... as if he wasn’t being sincere in what he said and as if he hadn’t really been listening to what she said to him about the matter.

Dr. Wood indicates that she hasn’t double- or triple-checked her calculations. She was more interested in general trends and that the trends indicate that the debris pile associated with the Kingdome are greater in size than the debris piles associated with the Twin Towers

even though the Kingdome was a much smaller building than either of the two towers.

Dr. Jenkins contends that neither of the twin towers came down in their own footprint. He claims that the buildings collapsed in an area with a radius that was approximately six times their footprints.

Dr. Wood questions the six times their footprint assertion. She, then, remarks that a more realistic figure might be to talk about an area with a radius of 1,000,000 times either of the Twin Towers' footprint due to the ultrafine dust that wafted up into the upper atmosphere.

Dr. Jenkins responds by saying that United States Geological Survey people had sampled the dust. He said that, on average, the dust sampled was 70 microns, and, therefore, not all that small.

Dr. Wood asked him if they had sampled the dust in the upper atmosphere. Dr. Jenkins replies by indicating that he didn't see any dust going up into the upper atmosphere.

There are several issues that arise in conjunction with the foregoing exchange. First, when Dr. Jenkins is asked about where the dust samples were collected and where they collected in the upper atmosphere, Dr. Jenkins deflects and doesn't answer the question being asked but makes a comment about how he didn't see any dust going into the upper atmosphere.

Secondly, if the dust that is being alluded to by Dr. Wood were ultrafine, Dr. Jenkins wouldn't have been able to see it. Moreover, even if the dust had been 70 microns in size, Dr. Jenkins still wouldn't have been able to see it with his eyes.

Why has Dr. Jenkins suddenly made his eyes the instrument of choice when it comes to looking for ultrafine dust? Part of doing good science is choosing the right instrument for gathering evidence, and when it comes to ultrafine dust or even dust that is 70 microns in size, the unaided human eye is not the appropriate instrument to use.

In addition, the issue of: where dust samples were taken from, is an important theme. If the dust to which Dr. Wood is alluding is in the upper atmosphere and if the dust samples that were collected were taken at various locations in lower Manhattan, then the latter samples might have absolutely nothing of relevance to say about the character

of the dust to be found in the upper atmosphere – especially since anything that is found at, or near, ground level is likely to be far coarser in size than is dust that is light enough to be carried into the upper atmosphere.

At this point of the interview, Dr. Jenkins provides a picture of one of the towers. He makes a reference to the smoke that is coming from the building, and indicates that the smoke is coming from the fires in the building.

Again, Dr. Jenkins has committed a mistake. He is assuming that he knows what he is looking at. He believes that the ‘smoke’ to which he is referring is nothing but smoke from a fire ... even though he has not analyzed that smoke to determine what is in the rising cloud.

Is it possible that within the ‘smoke’ are ultrafine dust particles of disintegrated steel? Dr. Jenkins implies that the answer is ‘no’ because he has identified the rising cloud as being nothing more than smoke from a fire even though he has no empirical data to back up his assertion.

Dr. Wood points to a section of the building depicted in the photograph that is around the 50<sup>th</sup> floor. She says the fire was supposed to be around the 80<sup>th</sup> floor, so she asks him about the nature of the stuff that is rising into the air from near the 50<sup>th</sup> floor.

Dr. Jenkins wants to return to the issue about the debris pile. Dr. Wood counters by pointing out that since the current part of the discussion is not serving his interests, he wants to change the subject.

Dr. Wood indicates that Dr. Jenkins had been arguing that all the dust from the buildings came down. Now, when he is confronted with evidence indicating that something other than smoke from a fire might be rising into the atmosphere, he wants to change the subject.

She also points out that the tower in the photograph provided by Dr. Jenkins seems to show that much of the area of the building above the 50<sup>th</sup> floor is gone. She draws attention to the snowball-like cloud that is above the 50<sup>th</sup> floor and indicates that the size of the cloud is not big enough to account for the volume of the rest of the building that is missing, and Dr. Wood asks him to explain where the missing mass went.

Dr. Jenkins says that he sees debris falling in the photograph. By saying this, Dr. Jenkins appears to be missing the point being made by Dr. Wood.

The issue is not whether there is debris in the picture that can be seen falling to the ground. The issue is how much debris is falling.

Dr. Jenkins claims that he can't understand how Dr. Wood fails to see any debris falling in the photograph he is showing. Dr. Wood indicates that she is not saying there is no debris falling in the photograph, and at one point in the exchange, Dr. Wood makes a rather sarcastic remark about how some people might have had some pennies on their windowsill that fell to the ground, but whatever fell down did not constitute a significant amount of material.

There seems to be some sort of disconnect in Dr. Jenkins' thinking. He keeps talking about debris in the photograph and making comments about how he can't understand how she can't see falling debris in the picture while the point being made by Dr. Wood is that whatever debris came down is insignificant compared to what should have come down but didn't. The photograph being discussed indicates that over half of the building is gone, but the volume of the cloud above the 50<sup>th</sup> floor is not sufficiently large to account for the missing mass ... so where did the rest of the building go?

Dr. Jenkins goes on to argue that if one were to melt all the steel in a 110-story building down into its footprint, one would end up with a slab that was six feet tall that covered the building's dimensions. He further stipulates that if you melted all the concrete and office furnishings down, the resulting pile would not add much to the initial pile of melted steel.

The implication of the argument is that one shouldn't expect a very big debris pile. After all, he is alluding to a mathematical way of calculating dimensions that demonstrates how 110-stories of structural steel, concrete, fixtures, elevators, and office furnishings could be melted down to a slab that was slightly more than six feet tall distributed across the cross-sectional footprint of the building.

In several respects the foregoing 'observation' is rather a dumb argument to make. To begin with, the issue being discussed was in relation to a photograph that had been supplied by Dr. Jenkins. Dr.

Wood raised a question concerning the photograph: whatever falling debris was depicted in the picture, it, together with the volume of the snow-ball cloud above the 50<sup>th</sup> floor, was not sufficient to account for the mass and volume of the 110-storey structure that was being destroyed, so, where did the rest of the building go?

Therefore, the issue was not whether there was a way of mathematically calculating things that would permit one to reduce 110-stories of structural materials and building contents down to a pile six feet high, spread out over several hundred feet. The issue was what had happened to the upper half-to-two-thirds of the building as the structure was being destroyed since the amount of falling debris and volume of the explosive cloud above the 50<sup>th</sup> floor (i.e., the so-called 'snowball') was not nearly large enough to accommodate the quantity of material that should have been in evidence at that time.

Earlier in the discussion, Dr. Wood has asked Dr. Jenkins -- in relation to the photograph being discussed -- if he was trying to claim that over half of the building had burned up in 5 or 6 seconds. Dr. Jenkins stipulated that he wasn't trying to say that.

Well, if he wasn't trying to say that over half the building had burned up in 5, or so, seconds (the time which expired while this portion of the building went missing in action), then where did the missing part of the building go? And, more importantly, what did his comment about having a mathematical way of reducing 110-stories down to a relatively small slab of melted materials have to do with the question that Dr. Wood was asking?

The dumbness of the mathematical argument being put forward by Dr. Jenkins at this point is exacerbated by the fact that Dr. Jenkins has absolutely no evidence to demonstrate that any of the 110-stories melted -- along with the fixtures, office furnishings, elevators, and equipment -- let alone all, or most, of them. So, why is he talking about such things?

He does so because he is trying to counter the point being made by Dr. Wood that the debris pile for the Twin Towers is far, far, far smaller than what one would expect if two, 110-storey buildings came down through either a fire-induced progressive collapse or a termite-based controlled demolition. The small size of those piles raises some rather critical questions about the nature of the process that would



have been able to make much of the mass of those two buildings disappear.

At one point during the interview, Dr. Wood asks Dr. Jenkins whether, or not, his questions are sincerely motivated, and at another juncture, she comments that what is going on between the two of them is not productive or educational.

On each occasion, Dr. Jenkins protests that he is being sincere and that he finds the discussion educational. Yet, it seems fairly obvious that there is some sort of subtext to the discussion that is emanating from the side of Dr. Jenkins.

As I watched the interview, a line from a movie kept going through my head. The movie is: "The Shawshank Redemption" and the line actually is a question that the Tim Robbins character, Andy Dufresne, asks the Bob Gunton character, Warden Samuel Norton. Andy asks the warden: "How can you be so obtuse."

As I witnessed Dr. Jenkins proceed to exhibit various degrees of obtuseness during his interview with Dr. Wood, the foregoing question echoed about in my own mind. Many of the questions he asked, and the comments he voiced, and the mistakes he committed, and the assumptions that he made at various points during the interview all had an aura of obtuseness about them ... perhaps deliberately so.

In any event, the interview finally comes to an end. Dr. Wood leaves the set.

After Dr. Wood has departed, the camera stays on Dr. Jenkins. He says: "I was not protecting any interests. I was just trying to see what kind of scientific basis there was, and, ah, I think I found out" ... and he shrugs his shoulders and raises his eyebrows as he does this.

I felt that keeping this portion of things in the final video product that was released on the Internet was highly unethical. I feel this way for several reasons.

First of all, I didn't hear anyone ask Dr. Jenkins whether, or not, he was trying to protect any interests. However, even if someone from off-camera did ask him that question, the manner in which he responded was problematic.

Dr. Wood had no opportunity to respond to the manner in which he was trying to frame the interview for people who might,

subsequently, view the interview. He was trying to imply that there was no scientific basis to what Dr. Wood was saying, and, yet, in my opinion, the only person who had conducted himself in a way that did not reflect good scientific practice during the interview was Dr. Jenkins.

Secondly, Dr. Wood had agreed to an impromptu interview at a late hour that was supposed to consist of only a few questions. Not only did the interview consist of more than just a few questions, but, as well, it was obvious that Dr. Jenkins was less interested in using the interview to provide Dr. Wood with an opportunity to talk about her views on various 9/11 issues than he was interested in using the interview to try to frame her position in a negative way ... his body language, tone of voice, questions, comments, and attitude all indicated that the purpose of the interview was not intended to be constructive or educational.

In addition, throughout the interview, the lighting was done in such a way that Dr. Jenkins was always well lit but Dr. Wood was often lit up in shadowy, unflattering ways. The pervasiveness of this disparity of treatment either was a reflection of the lack of ability and considerateness of the videographer or it was deliberately done in an attempt to try to create a negative visual impression of Dr. Wood.

The latter possibility is actually lent some degree of credence when one notes what was done to the video in post-production. Following the interview footage, a section was added to the video that began with what purports to be a quote from Dr. Judy Wood about how some people might have had some pennies on their windowsill that fell to the ground in the way of debris.

Not only is the quote taken out of context, but, as well, it is not actually something that Dr. Wood said. Rather, it consists of an amalgamation of several things that she said and is made to look like it is one continuous quote.

After the quote, images of debris piles from the World Trade Center are shown in a sort of slide show. Accompanying the slides is someone singing the song: "Pennies from Heaven."

Dr. Wood never said that there were no debris piles at Ground Zero. She said that the amount of debris piles that were present there

does not reflect the quantity of debris that should have been present in relation to 2, 110-storey buildings filled with various kinds of material content – not to mention the other buildings at the World Trade Center that had their own debris to contribute to the piles at Ground Zero.

Furthermore, there is no indication in the photographic slideshow at the end of the video of when or where in the WTC grounds the photos were taken. There were debris piles from some of the other buildings in the WTC that were about as large as what had been left in relation to either of the Twin Towers, and, in addition, Dr. Wood has indicated that debris piles arising from the bottom 13- or 14-stories might have been largely unaffected by whatever helped destroy the Twin Towers and, consequently, showing pictures of debris piles doesn't really address her primary point – namely, the size of those piles is significantly less than what one might expect from the “collapse” of two, 110-storey buildings filled with various assortments of: steel beams, concrete slabs, floor assemblies, equipment, fixtures, furnishings, and the like.

The foregoing video with its derogatory post-script is not an isolated incident. There have been a variety of attempts to discredit Dr. Wood and her work – ranging from: Someone impersonating her on a radio interview, to: Certain people within the so-called 9/11 truth movement that sought to cast Dr. Wood in a negative light.

Whether such activities are the expression of some sort of counter-intelligence strategy by agents unknown, or whether such activities merely are the result of bruised egos that are upset because Dr. Wood is putting forth research which indicates that their pet scientific theories don't reflect the actual evidence very well or very credibly, I don't know. What I do know is that her research should neither be ignored nor framed in distortive ways because that research clearly demonstrates that the official, government conspiracy about 9/11 is in error when it comes to the events that took place at the World Trade Center on 9/11.

The one area where I might disagree with Dr. Wood has to do with the issue of how to proceed. Dr. Wood is of the opinion – one that I share with her up to a point – that before one begins trying to answer the question of who is responsible for 9/11 or why they did what they did or how they pulled it off, one needs to establish the ‘what’ of 9/11.

One of the reasons why Dr. Wood feels it is important to proceed in the foregoing fashion is because it is just good scientific practice. One needs to establish the facts of a matter before moving on to other kinds of questions concerning those facts.

Another reason for proceeding in the way she does is because she is concerned about issues of double jeopardy. In other words, if one accuses someone of murder and, in the process, claims that the weapon used to carry out such a murder is, say, a gun, and it turns out that one's theory about the character of the weapon is incorrect because the person who was murdered died of strangulation, then this jeopardizes one's case, and if one should charge someone with murder but lose the case as a result of such issues, one can never charge that person with that murder again.

Consequently, she would like to nail down all the facts about the 'what' of 9/11 – at least with respect to the physical evidence – before proceeding further into the investigation and, especially, before making any legal charges against anyone. She does not know who is responsible for 9/11 or why they did what they did, but she does know that the official conspiracy theory about how the buildings at the World Trade Center were destroyed is not tenable or credible.

While I agree with Dr. Wood about the problems surrounding any attempt to proceed prematurely with respect to issues of legal charges and prosecution against this or that individual, organization, body, agency, or the like, I disagree with her about where things stand at the present time in relation to the 'what' of 9/11. Dr. Wood would like to spend more time on the 'what' of 9/11, and I do not feel this is necessary.

The reason I am inclined in this manner is not because I feel that all of the questions have been answered about the 'what' of 9/11. However, I believe that enough of the 'what' has been overwhelmingly demonstrated to prove that the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 is wrong at almost every – if not every – juncture.

However, this does not mean that the next step in the process is some form of legal prosecution. The next stage should involve a thoroughly transparent investigation into 9/11 that is conducted by the American people, with full subpoena power and adequate funding, and that is not conducted by government-appointed bodies filled with

individuals who will do the bidding of the government, the media, the military, or corporations in relation to 9/11.

The Constitution provides a number of sources of authorization for such an investigation. For example, grand juries are empowered to investigate any issue they wish in order to determine if there might be some degree of culpability associated with a given event, and if special grand juries were impaneled in every state of the union with proper funding and empowerment, then I believe any number of reports would be forthcoming that would help the American people to get closer to the truth and would permit America to look at 9/11 in a much different way than currently is the case.

If, on the other hand, one doesn't like the idea of grand juries investigating 9/11, there are other provisions in the Constitution that do provide for such a possibility. These other provisions are inherent in Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution, as well as in the 9<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup>, and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments to the Constitution.

I have written about these issues elsewhere in the present book (see: 'Constitutional 911: 9/11 and the Constitution'), so I won't repeat myself here. People have priority over either states or federal governments, but this principle has been lost sight of during the last several hundred years.

What I am trying to do in the present work is to prove that the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 is not defensible. What I believe Dr. Judy Wood already has demonstrated is that the official government conspiracy theory concerning the events at the WTC are not defensible.

At this point, one does not necessarily have to prove what happened on 9/11. One only has to prove what did not happen on 9/11 ... and what did not happen on 9/11 is the narrative that has been laid out by the official government conspiracy theory.

Proving what did not happen is the key to enabling further investigations into 9/11 ... investigations that can be funded and empowered by the people – not the government – of the United States. The official government conspiracy theory attempts to claim that it has the basic answers to questions about 9/11, when, in truth, the official

government conspiracy theory has no credible or tenable answers with respect to 9/11.

Dr. Wood is concerned about the issue of double jeopardy. However, it is the government that has placed the investigation into 9/11 at risk.

The burden of proof in any prosecution is on the government. It is not up to the defense to prove what happened, but, rather, it is up to the prosecution to be able to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that someone has committed a crime.

Dr. Wood's research indicates that there is not just reasonable doubt that can be raised in conjunction with the government's theory of 9/11, but, her research demonstrates that the government's official conspiracy perspective concerning events at the WTC on 9/11 is not plausible, tenable, or credible. Furthermore, the material in the rest of this book demonstrates the same point but in a different way.

The government has not met the burden of proof with respect to 9/11. The government has acted precipitously and recklessly in relation to 9/11 and, as a result, tens of thousands of people have died, thousands more have been maimed, and trillions of dollars have been wasted in defense of an untenable theory about 9/11. In addition, the Constitution has been shredded as a result of a false theory about what happened on 9/11.

A number of successive governments need to be held accountable for what they have done on the basis of a ridiculous conspiracy theory about 9/11. The media needs to be held accountable as well.

The best way to hold them accountable is to establish an investigation into 9/11 that is run by the people and not the government. What did not happen on 9/11 – i.e., the government's official conspiracy theory -- already has been demonstrated or proven many times over.

The purpose of a new investigation is to establish what actually did happen on 9/11. The money that is being spent on two wars, maintaining hundreds of military bases around the world, as well as subsidizing a military-industrial complex to the tune of trillions of dollars should be used to fund such projects as a new 9/11 investigation run by the people and not by the government ... because,

quite frankly, neither the government nor the military nor the intelligence community nor the media nor academia has solved the problems leading up to or entailed by the issue of 9/11.





### **3.) Black Box Operations**

The first part of the following analysis is based on a number of DVD's (Entitled: 'Pandora's Box - Chapters 1 and 2', as well as: 'Attack on the Pentagon') that were compiled and produced by a group of former military and commercial pilots who do not accept the official government conspiracy theory concerning what happened at the Pentagon on 9/11. The latter part of this chapter is based on research that was published in the form of several DVD's ('The Pentacon' and 'The North Side Flyover') that were put together by Craig Ranke and Aldo Marquis.

-----

On February 19, 2002, the Office of Research and Engineering for the National Transportation Safety Board issued the results of its findings - entitled 'Flight Path Study' -- concerning American Airlines Flight 77 - a Boeing 757-200, registration: N644AA - which supposedly crashed into the Pentagon at 9:38 AM, Eastern Daylight Time on September 11, 2001. These findings were based on the NTSB's analysis (DCA01MA064) of the raw data that allegedly came from the Flight Data Recorder for Flight 77 that, purportedly, had been recovered several days after the aforementioned crash.

In order to access the foregoing report, a request under the Freedom of Information Act had to be filed. On August 11, 2006, Melba D. Moye of the NTSB sent a letter in response to the FOI request. Accompanying her letter were 3 CD ROMs that contained the findings of the NTSB for - allegedly -- American Flight 77.

On behalf of a group of pilots (consisting of individuals with many years of commercial and/or military experience), a person by the name of Jeff Hill contacted the NTSB and attempted to induce Jim Ritter -- who was the Chief of the Vehicle Performance Division for the NTSB who signed off on the aforementioned February 19, 2002 report -- to answer some questions concerning a number of discrepancies and problems with the report to which Jim Ritter's name had been affixed. When Jeff spoke with Jim Ritter about the matter, the NTSB employee indicated that he really couldn't answer Jeff Hill's questions. However, he would be glad to take down Jeff's contact information and have the appropriate person get back in touch with Jeff in relation to his questions.

Several hours after the conversation between Jeff and Jim came to an end, a member of the public relations staff for the NTSB contacted Jeff. The PR guy indicated that it was NTSB policy to never elaborate on any analysis or report that it did on behalf of some other agency of government – in this case, the FBI.

The questions that Jeff Hill had for the NTSB arose out of an analysis by the group of pilots to which I alluded earlier. That group's analysis had been performed in relation to the plotting, analysis, and presentation of raw data by the NTSB that supposedly came from the Flight Data Recorder for American Airlines Flight 77 – one of the two, so-called 'black boxes' that are housed in the tail section of commercial jets.

The 3 CD ROMs noted earlier that were released by the NTSB under a FOI request contained Comma Separated Value (CSV) files that represented the plotting of a variety of variables from the raw flight data that supposedly had been recorded by the FDR of American Airlines 77. In addition, the 3 CD ROMs contained an animated depiction of the entire flight path of American 77.

One of the discrepancies about which the foregoing group of pilots wanted to question the NTSB involved the following issue. According to the 9/11 Commission, Flight 77 approached the Pentagon from the south side of Columbia Pike that runs, in part, along the south of the Navy Annex, and the 9/11 Commission also indicated that the plane approached the Pentagon along a flight path that was to the south of the former Citgo gas station (now known as the Navy Exchange) which is about a quarter of a mile away from the portion of the Pentagon that was struck. However, the report filed by the NTSB indicated that the plane in question flew along the north side of the Navy Annex and to the north of the aforementioned Citgo gas station.

Both of the foregoing descriptions cannot be correct. However, neither the NTSB nor the FBI seemed the least concerned about the discrepancy between the two accounts. One might also note in passing that it seems strange that the account of the 9/11 Commission should differ from that of the NTSB since both, supposedly, come from the FDR information that has been provided by the NTSB.

The official government conspiracy theory maintains that the flight path of American 77, as it neared the Pentagon, resulted in five

light poles being knocked down. The problem with the foregoing scenario is that if the information provided by the NTSB is correct, then the flight path of the plane that is approaching the Pentagon does not go through the area where the five light poles in question came down.

There are further problems entailed by the NTSB description of the flight path of American 77. For example, the NTSB material indicates that one-second prior to impact the plane was 180 feet above sea level, but there are some questions concerning the accuracy of this figure.

In the animated flight path provided by the NTSB, the altimeter for the aircraft being described displayed a height of 300 feet above sea level while waiting to take off from Dulles Airport. This is the field elevation above sea level.

The NTSB-supplied data also shows a barometric pressure of 30.21. This is the local barometric pressure for Dulles at the time American Airlines Flight 77 was readying for takeoff.

A standard operating procedure for commercial flights is that once a flight takes off and rises through 18,000 feet, the barometric pressure indicator is manually changed to 29.92. When this occurs, the plane's altitude gauge is automatically reset to an altitude that is minus the 300 feet indicated in the altimeter at the time of take off for (allegedly) Flight 77.

The hard data file from the NTSB indicates that when (allegedly) Flight 77 rose above 18,000 feet, the barometric pressure was manually adjusted and, as a result, the altitude for the flight was adjusted downward accordingly. Furthermore, the hard data file from the NTSB also indicates that when (allegedly) Flight 77 descended through 18,000, the barometric pressure again was adjusted manually to reflect local barometric conditions and the altitude for the plane was, once more, automatically reset upward in conjunction with that local barometric pressure.

The local barometric pressure for Reagan National Airport (which is next to the Pentagon) was 30.22 on September 11, 2001. When the plane's altitude indicator snaps back as the barometric pressure gauge

is manually adjusted to the local barometric pressure (below 18,000 feet), one should see the actual altitude for the plane above sea level.

Although the hard data file provided by the NTSB reflected all of the foregoing changes and adjustments, the animated flight path provided by the NTSB for Flight 77 did not follow suit. More specifically, according to the hard data files supplied by the NTSB, when the altimeter for Flight 77 is adjusted to a barometric pressure of 30.22, local conditions, the altimeter will show an altitude of 455 feet above sea level, and when the altitude is further adjusted to reflect the local temperature, the altimeter for (allegedly) will read 479 feet above sea level.

Yet, according to the animation file provided by the NTSB for the same flight path, the altimeter read 180 feet above sea level. This means that the animated version of the flight path for the plane in question shows an altimeter reading that is 300 feet too low. In other words, the altimeter in the animation should have shown an altitude of roughly 480 feet but, instead, indicated a much lower altitude of 180 feet.

Was this discrepancy between the hard data file and the animated version of the data in that file the result of a mental lapse/error of some kind, or was it a deliberate deception. Whichever of these possibilities might be the case is, in some ways, irrelevant.

The fact is that the hard data file provided by the NTSB is based directly on the raw data from the Flight Data Recorder. Moreover, such raw data indicates that whatever was approaching the Pentagon on 9/11 was too high to hit either the five light poles or the Pentagon.

The light poles were 80 feet above sea level. The plane was 479 feet above sea level ... you do the math.

-----

The group of commercial and military pilots who did the foregoing analysis of the discrepancies in the report on (allegedly) Flight 77 that was produced by the NTSB in early 2002 also performed some additional analysis of the Flight Data Recorder information provided by the NTSB. This subsequent analysis addressed the question of whether the flight path being depicted by the NTSB (allegedly Flight 77) would have been able to negotiate the topography and obstacles

that appeared to fall within the flight path of the plane that was expressed through the FDR that had been recovered for (allegedly) 77.

Topographically, the Pentagon is situated at the bottom of a fairly long descending hill. Toward the top of this hill stands an antenna owned by the Virginia Department of Transportation.

This antenna falls within the reported flight path of (allegedly) Flight 77. So, one of the issues that needs to be addressed is whether, or not, a Boeing 757 would have been able to clear the VDOT antenna and, then, descend down the hill in a manner that would have enabled it to knock down five light poles as required by the official government conspiracy theory.

In order to answer the foregoing question, one has to develop a model that will take into account the total velocity vector for the aircraft being considered. The total velocity vector consists of both a horizontal and a vertical component.

The VDOT antenna that sits at the top of the hill along the indicated flight path for (allegedly) Flight 77 stands 304 feet above sea level and is roughly 3400 feet distant from the Pentagon. The data provided by the NTSB south flight path indicates that at the point of the VDOT antenna, the flight path alleged to be that of American 77 was said to be 699 feet above sea level.

The light poles that allegedly were knocked down by Flight 77 stood 80 feet above sea level and were, approximately, a little over a thousand feet (1016) from the Pentagon, but since the ground in which the light poles were rooted was 33 feet above sea level, the actual height of the light poles is about 47 feet. Contact allegedly was made with the first light pole at a height of approximately 59.4 feet.

According to the data supplied by the NTSB, the momentum vector of the aircraft was established to be about 781 feet per second. Given this momentum vector and the foregoing figures for height and distance in relation to obstacles (VDOT antenna and light poles) and the character of the topography leading to the Pentagon, the group of commercial and military pilots doing the analysis of NTSB data for Flight 77 concluded that the plane could not possibly have hit the light poles.

Using a parabolic formula that permits one to take into account both the vertical and horizontal components of the total velocity vector of the aircraft data being studied, the aforementioned group of commercial and military pilots took the CSV files provided by the NTSB and made some calculations. They found that the highest g-force figure that appears in the CSV file is 1.75 g's. The duration of that force was about 1/8<sup>th</sup> of a second.

When they averaged the g-force load for a crucial four-second period of duration extending from above the VDOT antenna to the Pentagon, the pilots came up with an average g-force of 1.17. Yet, the g-force load that would have been encountered by a Boeing 757 traveling at a velocity of 781 feet per second and descending from a height of 699 feet above sea level (at the VDOT antenna) to the height of the first light pole would have been 4 g's – a figure that is not found in the hard data file provided by the NTSB.

The pilots analyzing the NTSB data files for (allegedly) American Airlines 77 proceeded to indicate that the situation might actually be even more problematic than the foregoing calculations indicate. The 4-g load indicated above is determined as a function of the data provided by the NTSB – yet, such data clearly indicates that the g-force loads actually recorded by the Flight Data Recorder were not present at any point – let alone for four seconds -- in the CSV file provided by the NTSB under a Freedom of Information request.

Nevertheless, the aforementioned group of pilots decided to take a look at a more strenuous challenge. The question they addressed is the following: what if the altitude of the aircraft was lowered from the 699 feet indicated by the NTSB to a height starting just above the VDOT antenna. Given this scenario, could the aircraft have pulled up level at the first light pole from its descent of a little over 304 feet – just above the VDOT tower -- to be able to skim, just six feet above ground level, across 507 feet of Pentagon lawn as supposedly is depicted in the five frame video released by CNN?

Using a three-point arc radius extending from atop the VDOT antenna to a point of leveling out at the first light pole, they came up with an arc radius of 2,085 feet. Then, using the acceleration formula –  $a=v^2/r$  (with  $v= 781$  feet per second, and  $r = 2,085$  feet), they calculated a figure of 292.2 feet per second<sup>2</sup>.

When this latter figure is divided by 32 feet/sec<sup>2</sup>, one arrives at the g-force that would be encountered in pulling up from a dive starting at just above 304 feet (at the VDOT) to a point of leveling out at the first light pole prior to the Pentagon lawn. This g-load figure is 9.14 and becomes 10.14 when one factors in the Earth's gravitational force as well (9.14 + 1).

According to the pilot group doing the foregoing analysis, transport category aircraft are restricted to a g-force load of 2.5 positive gs. The tolerance levels built into transport category aircraft would likely permit such vehicles to withstand higher g-force loads, but the pilots believe that such aircraft would be unlikely to survive stresses much above 5 to 6 g's. Yet, their calculations indicate a g-force load that would be nearly twice as much as what transport category aircraft are likely to be able to survive.

The pilots then considered another possibility. If one were to take the altitude of 699 feet that is given in the FDR information supplied by the NTSB and, then, calculated the g-forces for the arc radius that extends from above the VDOT antenna to a point of leveling out to go across the Pentagon lawn as indicated in the five-frame video released by CNN, one comes up with a g-force load of 34.

In relation to one set of calculations performed by the pilots, a g-load force of 4 should have been in evidence, but such a figure is nowhere to be found in the data entries for the FDR files supplied by the NTSB. According to a second scenario explored by the pilots, a g-force load of 10.14 would have experienced by the Boeing 757, and such a g-force load was almost twice as much as what a Boeing 757 transport category aircraft should have been able to survive. Now, in a third scenario, the pilot group calculated that a g-force load of 34 would have been encountered -- something that is not only impossible but ludicrous -- and, yet, that result is based on the data that the NTSB, itself, supplied under a Freedom of Information request.

From the perspective of altitude, -- and as outlined in the first part of this chapter -- the pilots indicate that the aircraft for which the NTSB supplied data would have been too high to hit either the light poles or the Pentagon. From the perspective of g-force load -- which had been outlined in the second part of this chapter -- the pilots indicate that the aircraft for which the NTSB supplied data either could

not have survived the stresses of a dive from either 304 feet above sea level or 699 feet above sea level and still managed to hit the light poles or travel relatively level across the lawn as depicted by the five-frame video noted earlier.

-----

Some critics of the aforementioned pilot group claim that the FDR information must have been missing 5 or 6 seconds or stopped recording 5 or 6 seconds prior to impact with the Pentagon. According to such individuals, this is why altitude discrepancies arise in conjunction with the NTSB-supplied data.

One source of positional information for commercial aircraft like a Boeing 757 is provided by an inertial navigation system in the plane. Such systems have been known to break down, especially when an aircraft is experiencing extreme conditions of acceleration, rapid descent, and maneuvering as was reported to be the case with respect to American Airlines 77 that supposedly engaged in a 333-degree downward spiral at a rate of thousands of feet per minute during the last leg of its alleged journey to the Pentagon.

However, in addition to the positional information that is supplied by the internal navigation system of an aircraft, the Flight Data Recorder has an independent means for determining the position of an aircraft. This involves what is known as DME or Distance Measuring Equipment, and unlike the inertial guidance system, DME is not self-contained but involves a receiver on the aircraft that picks up signals from ground-based facilities.

The ground-based radio beacon signals that were being received during the last part of the aircraft's flight were coming from Reagan National Airport. This ground facility had the designation: DCA VOR.

The FDR indicates that at 9:37:43 AM, the aircraft was 1.5 DME or 1.5 nautical miles from DCA VOR. The NTSB data indicates that the impact time at the Pentagon was at 09:37:45.

If one uses a flight path that runs south of the Navy Annex/Citgo gas station, the 1.5 nautical miles places the plane roughly 2695 feet from the point of impact with the Pentagon. This means that the aircraft would have to have been somewhere between the VDOT tower (3600 feet away from the Pentagon) and the Pentagon and, therefore,



would have been engaged in a rapid descent down the slope of the hill from somewhere above the VDOT tower to the Pentagon that is situated at the bottom of the hill.

So, there does exist at least one point of data in the FDR files that places the aircraft temporally closer (3.5 seconds) to the Pentagon than those critics suppose who have claimed that the last 5 or 6 seconds of the FDR information must have stopped recording since the existing FDR files place the aircraft at too high an altitude to have been able to hit either the light poles or the Pentagon. Moreover, the pilot group being criticized points out that if one were to assume that the flight path for the aircraft were to the north of the aforementioned Citgo gas station – rather than the southern flight path toward the Pentagon reported by the 9/11 Commission -- then, the 1.5 DME would actually place the plane within 2 seconds (or 1600 feet) of the Pentagon rather than the 3.5 seconds (2695 feet) entailed by the flight path to the south of the Navy Annex and the former Citgo gas station.

In either case, there is data available that suggests that those critics who try to argue that the last five or six seconds of the FDR are, for whatever reason, missing are being rather arbitrary in the manner in which they are trying to explain away the discrepancies between the NTSB-supplied FDR information and the requirements of the official government conspiracy theory with respect to impacting light poles and the Pentagon. Irrespective of whether one is talking about a northern or a southern flight path toward the Pentagon, it would not have been possible for the 1.5 DME data point to have appeared in the FDR files if, as some have tried to argue, the FDR stopped working some 5 or 6 seconds prior to impact.

Even in the case of the previously noted 3.5 second distance from the Pentagon, the DME places the aircraft between the VDOT tower and the Pentagon, and, therefore, the aircraft still would have had to be in a rapid descent (coming from above the VDOT antenna) from which it would have had to pull up level at the light poles to be able to skirt across the 506 feet of Pentagon lawn in the manner that is depicted in the CNN 5-frame video. Consequently, one still would have to deal with the problem of encountering g-force loads (4.0 g's) that fall beyond the FDR information provided by the NTSB – namely, an average of 1.17 g's across the 4 second journey to the Pentagon from somewhere

above the VDOT antenna (either roughly 304 feet or 699 feet) -- and, possibly, also fall beyond the capacity of a transport category aircraft to survive – depending on which calculation scenario one pursued.

When one does the appropriate calculations using the 1.5 DME position, the aircraft still would have been too high to hit any of the light poles. The aircraft also would have had an altitude that would have been too high to hit the Pentagon.

One might add another wrinkle to the foregoing set of issues. There is an embankment of roughly 15 feet leading from the road that skirts the Pentagon down to the lawn that leads to the alleged point of impact on the first floor of the Pentagon where the Office of Naval Intelligence is located. This means that one will have to explain how an aircraft the size of a Boeing 757 that allegedly (according to the NTSB) was traveling at a velocity of 781 feet per second would be able to drop 9 feet (15 feet minus the six feet that the plane was supposed to be above the ground as it went across the lawn) within a fraction of a second as it traversed 506 feet (the distance from the edge of the lawn to the Pentagon that exists along the southern flight path).

Boeing 757's are incapable of responding this quickly. At least this is my understanding based on what the pilots who fly them say about the maneuverability of such aircraft, and, yet, the official government conspiracy theory requires that such maneuverability occurred in order for the Boeing to have impacted the Pentagon on the first floor as claimed by that same official government conspiracy theory.

In short, when one plots the NTSB FDR files for (allegedly) Flight 77 against the requirements of the official government conspiracy theory, one encounters a variety of insurmountable problems. The NTSB files do not support any of the contentions of the official government conspiracy theory either with respect to the issue of how five light poles near to the Pentagon were knocked to the ground or with respect to the issue of what hit the Pentagon.

-----

In the foregoing discussion, I repeatedly have used the term “allegedly” in conjunction with any claims concerning American Airlines Flight 77 and the NTSB files for the Flight Data Recorder information on which the February 19, 2002 report supposedly was

based. The reason for dropping, on a fairly regular basis, such cautionary insertions into the previous discussion are pretty straightforward.

After the transponder for Flight 77 had been turned off, the aircraft supposedly became 'lost' to air traffic controllers. Later, the aircraft was allegedly re-acquired by radar, however the aircraft that was reacquired was never, at any point, positively identified as American Airlines Flight 77.

Therefore, although the FDR information released by the NTSB claims to come from American Airlines Flight 77, there is – due to the foregoing consideration – a substantial degree of uncertainty surrounding such an assertion. This uncertainty only becomes exacerbated when one realizes that the flight data supplied by the NTSB doesn't really reflect the claims made by the official government conspiracy theory with respect to Flight 77 on 9/11.

If the FDR information provided by the NTSB on February 19, 2002 actually comes from Flight 77, then the information provided by NTSB indicates that whatever struck the Pentagon was not Flight 77. The data and animation files provided by the NTSB indicate that the flight path of the aircraft being described in those files could not possibly (either from the perspective of altitude or g-force load) have brought such an aircraft in contact with either the five light poles that somehow ended up on the ground near the Pentagon, nor could the aircraft being described by the NTSB report possibly have brought that aircraft in contact with the Pentagon. If the FDR information provided by the NTSB on February 19, 2002 did not come from Flight 77 as claimed, then, someone at the NTSB is guilty of filing a false report to the FBI and to the American public. Whichever of the foregoing possibilities might be the case, the official government conspiracy theory concerning how the Pentagon became damaged and how more than one hundred lives lost their lives is completely without merit or supporting evidence.

-----

The foregoing discussion of the analysis by a group of commercial and military pilots in relation to the NTSB's report on the Flight Data Recorder that, supposedly, came from American Airlines Flight 77 refers to two flight paths. One flight path is south of the Navy Annex

and the former Citgo gas station, and this flight path is promulgated through the official government conspiracy theory concerning Flight 77. The other flight path is over the north side of the Navy Annex and to the north of the Citgo gas station.

The ramifications that ensue from choosing one of the two flight paths are considerable. If one selects the southerly flight path, then this is consistent with the position of The 9/11 Commission and with *The Pentagon Performance Report*, but if one selects the northerly flight path, then this is consistent with the animation for (allegedly) Flight 77 that was provided by the NTSB and inconsistent with *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

More dramatically, if the aircraft described in the NTSB animation is what struck the Pentagon, then, the entire *Pentagon Performance Report* is in error. This is the case because the Pentagon report describes a path of destruction that could not have occurred if the Pentagon were struck by a aircraft that flew along the northerly flight path toward the Pentagon since the angle of impact of the northerly flight path in relation to the Pentagon would have been quite different from the angle of impact (and destruction) that appears in *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

The analysis of the group of pilots that was outlined in the earlier discussion of this chapter already has shown that the aircraft described through the Flight Data Recorder information presented by the National Transportation Safety Board could not possibly have struck either the five light poles or the Pentagon as required by the official government conspiracy theory for 9/11. More specifically, the aircraft being designated as Flight 77 by the NTSB could not have hit the Pentagon if it flew along a southerly flight path.

The aforementioned group of commercial and military pilots even indicated that the DME data in the Flight Data Recorder could be understood to be more consistent with a northerly flight path than with a southerly one. In other words, if the DME information were applied to a northerly flight path, it would have constituted a data point that left only 2 seconds unaccounted for in the final leg of the aircraft being described in the NTSB report, rather than the 3.5 seconds that would be unaccounted for if the flight path went along a southerly flight path [north and south being relative to the former

Citgo gas station sits just a quarter of a mile from the West façade of the Pentagon.]

What evidence is there that the aircraft that approached the Pentagon at approximately 9:38 AM on 9/11 came along a northerly flight instead of a southerly one? Actually, there is quite a bit of evidence to indicate as much.

Two 9/11 investigators traveled from California to Arlington, Virginia at their own expense to examine the foregoing issue. Their names are Craig Ranke and Aldo Marquis.

The foregoing investigative team interviewed a number of people on several different occasions, spread out over several years. The initial set of interviews involved four people.

These people were: (1) Robert Turcios, who was an employee at the Citgo gas station on 9/11; (2) William Lagasse, a sergeant in the Pentagon Police force; (3) Chadwick Brooks, also a sergeant with the Pentagon Police; (4) Edward Piak who owned/managed a business that was situated on the opposite side of the Naval Annex from the Citgo gas station.

I have watched these interviews. None of the people being interviewed appeared to have been coached or led by the two individuals conducting and filming the interviews. I found the testimony and the witnesses to be very credible.

Independently of one another, each of the four witnesses described a flight path for a large two-engine jet – although none of them identified the aircraft as displaying the design schemes or colors of American Airlines. With the exception of Edward Piak (and I'll explain this in a moment), each of the other three individuals described the flight path of the aircraft they saw on 9/11 as approaching the Pentagon over the northern part of the Navy Annex and to the north of the Citgo gas station.

Independently of one another, each of the three individuals drew a flight path on a paper that depicted a physical sketch of the area topography, and those drawn flight paths were very similar to one another in the sense that all of them depicted the flight path of the aircraft they saw as passing to the north of the Citgo gas station. Each of the individuals was 100% confident concerning the nature of the

flight path they witnessed on 9/11 with respect to the Navy Annex, the Citgo gas station, and the Pentagon.

The testimony of Edward Piak was somewhat different from the other three individuals. This is because he was watching the aircraft from the far side of the Navy Annex (relative to the Citgo gas station and the Pentagon), whereas all three of the other witnesses had viewed the aircraft from positions near, or at, the Citgo gas station.

However, the flight path described by Edward Piak is consistent with the flight path described by the three other individuals noted above. He indicated that he saw the jet aircraft fly along a path that was somewhere between the center top of the Annex and the northern side of the Annex but in the direction of the Pentagon.

Robert Turcios, Chadwick Brooks and William Lagasse indicated that they watched the aircraft until it disappeared in an explosive fireball at the Pentagon. They assumed that the explosion occurred when the aircraft hit the Pentagon, but this might not have been the case.

They three individuals did indicate that there were no other aircraft near the Pentagon at the time of the explosion other than the one that each, separately, had watched fly toward the Pentagon on the morning of 9/11. If any aircraft hit the Pentagon, it would have been the one that they saw disappear in an explosive cloud of smoke and fire.

The foregoing accounts present a huge problem for the official government conspiracy theory. If the plane observed by the four individuals did, indeed, strike the Pentagon, the angle of incidence of that plane would have been totally at odds with the path of physical damage described in *The Pentagon Performance Report*, and, among other things, this includes the fact that the flight path of the plane those witnesses observed could not possibly have knocked down any of the light poles that, somehow, were on the ground near the Pentagon.

Although I found all of the testimony to be credible, one of the foregoing individuals added a bit of enhanced nuance to the issue of credibility. William Lagasse, a sergeant with the Pentagon Police, indicated a certain degree of hostility to the idea that what he was

saying was inconsistent with the “official government conspiracy theory”, and, as a result, he rejected the use of such terminology ... wanting to know what the investigators were talking about.

Further nuances of credibility were added to his testimony when the two investigators indicated they subsequently found out that superiors for Sergeant Lagasse were no longer permitting him to speak with interviewers on the matter of 9/11. However, the two interviewers indicated that Sergeant Lagasse had come to appreciate the implications of his testimony concerning the northerly flight path vis-à-vis *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

-----

Sometime later, the two 9/11 investigators (Ranke and Marquis) returned to Arlington, Virginia in search of additional witnesses concerning the characterization of the flight path with respect to the large jet plane that approached the Pentagon on the morning of 9/11. Their search was assisted when they came across an article written for a local Arlington paper by Milan Simonich.

The article was entitled: ‘Army history unit piecing together accounts of Pentagon attack’. The article had appeared in the Sunday, December 16, 2001 issue of *The Post-Gazette News*.

The article described how a three-person unit from the Army’s 305<sup>th</sup> Military History Detachment was conducting interviews in order to: “write the U.S. government’s book on the Pentagon assault and the lessons that can be learned from it.” The article mentioned a number of individuals who already had been interviewed: Darius Prather, Donald Carter, and Darrell Stafford.

The three individuals all worked in the maintenance department of Arlington National Cemetery. The maintenance buildings are very near to the aforementioned Citgo gas station (separated by a small road and a fence).

All three of these individuals confirmed the account of the previous four witnesses with respect to the flight path of the jet that they saw heading toward the Pentagon. The aircraft they saw approached the Pentagon along a flight path to the north of the Citgo gas station after passing over the north-central portion of the Navy Annex.

Again, their testimony is completely at odds with the physical damage report of *The Pentagon Performance Report*. In addition, their testimony indicates that the flight path of the aircraft they observed would not have brought the plane in contact with any of the five downed light poles near the Pentagon.

Unlike the four other witnesses, the three new individuals also indicated they saw another plane -- a C-130 (probably flown by Steve O'Brien) -- some thirty seconds to several minutes later after seeing the jet fly toward the Pentagon along the north side of the Citgo station. However, the heading for the flight path of the C-130 reported by Prather, Carter, and Stafford is inconsistent with the 84 RADES (radar) report in relation to that aircraft.

William Middleton, a worker at Arlington National Cemetery, was another individual interviewed both by the Military History Detachment unit as well as by Ranke and Marquis. On the morning of 9/11, he was in the cemetery but relatively near the northeast edge of the Navy Annex.

If the aircraft described by the NTSB report had approached the Pentagon along a flight path to the south of the Citgo gas station, William Middleton would not have been able to see the jet aircraft approach the Pentagon because the Navy Annex would have prevented him from watching the aircraft.

Instead, he describes how the jet aircraft flew between the Sheraton Hotel and the Naval Annex. It flew right over Southgate Road that is between: the area of Arlington Cemetery in which he was working and the Navy Annex. His account is consistent with seven other witnesses.

Another witness is Sean Boger. He was working at the Heliport that is situated a little to the north of the location of the 'event' in the West façade of the Pentagon.

He indicated that the plane he saw coming toward the Pentagon was coming along a flight path that was to his right. In other words, the flight path of the plane would have been to the left or north of the Citgo station.

A tenth witness is Terry Morin. There is a well-known 9/11 photograph of a number of men carrying something fairly large



beneath a blue tarp near the Pentagon following the event at roughly 9:38 AM, and Terry is one of the people in the photograph (the fifth person back on the near side).

He is a Marine aviator who worked at the Navy Annex. On the morning of 9/11, prior to the event at the Pentagon, he was in the middle wing of the Navy Annex, near the outer edge of that wing.

Terry Morin relates that he heard a noise bounce off the east wall in the wing of the Navy Annex in which he was walking, and as he heard the sound, he turned his head to see the belly of a jet aircraft pass overhead. When asked by the two investigators if the plane he saw was on the southern side of Columbia Pike (which, for a certain distance, runs north-south along the south side of the Annex), he indicated that the plane did not fly to the south of Columbia Pike and the Navy Annex, but flew over the Annex, and if the aircraft had flown to the south of the Navy Annex, he would have seen the side of the aircraft, not the belly of the plane.

Although he only saw the plane for an instant, his description is consistent with the north side of the Citgo account given by the other witnesses. Moreover, the testimony given by Terry Morin is inconsistent with the version promulgated through the official government conspiracy theory concerning events at the Pentagon on 9/11 which requires that the plane which allegedly struck the Pentagon to have been on the south side of Columbia Pike and the Navy Annex at all points of its flight path.

Although various media outlets have indicated that there were 104 alleged impact witnesses in relation to the 'event' at the Pentagon, Craig Ranke and Aldo Marquis have not been able to find even one credible witness who has contradicted the testimony of any of the foregoing ten accounts of a aircraft that approached the Pentagon from the north side of the Citgo gas station and disappeared in a explosive cloud of fire and smoke.

The group of pilots who analyzed the NTSB's report of (allegedly) Flight 77's Flight Data Recorder indicates that the aircraft described through that data could not have hit the Pentagon. The foregoing, ten eyewitnesses all place the jet aircraft on a flight path to the north of the Citgo gas station, and such a flight path is completely at odds with

the path of physical damage (both before and in the Pentagon) that is described in *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

Whatever caused the path of physical damage depicted in the foregoing report, that path of damage was not due to the aircraft described in the NTSB report that supposedly gave expression to the FDR 'black box' information taken from the wreckage of Flight 77 found in the Pentagon because when critically examined the NTSB data and animation indicate that the aircraft in question could not possibly have struck either the light poles near the Pentagon nor the Pentagon. Furthermore, whatever caused the path of physical damage depicted in *The Pentagon Performance Report*, that path of damage was not due to the jet aircraft that ten witnesses indicated flew to the north side of the Citgo gas station since such a flight path would impact the Pentagon at an angle that is completely inconsistent with the angle of the path of damage described in *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

Apparently, something else caused the path of damage that is being described in that report. Whatever that "something else" is, it stands at odds with the account that is given in the official government conspiracy theory concerning events at the Pentagon on the morning of 9/11.

Another Pentagon Police officer, Roosevelt Roberts, Jr., offers some additional clues to the foregoing puzzle. An interview he gave about events on the morning of 9/11 is archived in the Library of Congress, and, in addition, Craig Ranke and Aldo Marquis interviewed him by phone.

On the morning of 9/11, Roosevelt was to participate in an assignment of some kind at the Pentagon Heliport with other members of his unit around 10:45 AM. He said that he was inside the Pentagon working his way over to the Heliport.

At a certain point in his journey toward the Heliport, he stopped at the south loading dock of the Pentagon. This is right around the corner from the portion of the West façade of the Pentagon that shortly would experience an event of some kind.

He reported that just as he hung up a phone, an explosion occurred. He both heard and felt the explosion.

Dust was coming down from the ceiling in the area of the south loading dock. Roosevelt indicated that he heard people screaming.

He ran to the center of the dock and looked up. As he did, he saw a large jet flying near a portion of the south parking lot.

The aircraft was flying away from the Pentagon. It was very low – less than a hundred feet above the ground according to Roosevelt -- and banking.

Given the proximity of the plane to both the Pentagon and the time of explosion, and given that the heading of the jet aircraft seen by Roosevelt Roberts is consistent with a flight path that was north of the Citgo gas station and given that none of the other ten witnesses saw any other jet aircraft near the Pentagon at the time of the explosion, Craig Ranke and Aldo Marquis are of the opinion that the plane seen by the ten other witnesses is the same plane seen by Roosevelt ... only he saw it after it had flown by, low over the roof of the Pentagon, and after the explosion.

This still leaves unexplained the cause of the explosion (some say there were several explosions) at the Pentagon around 9:38 AM. However, one might surmise, with some degree of justification, that what caused the path of damage described in *The Pentagon Performance Report* is something other than a jet aircraft, and one can say this while noting that the analysis of the NTSB FDR for (allegedly) Flight 77 that was performed by the aforementioned group of commercial and military pilots is completely consistent with the reports of the ten eyewitnesses interviewed by Ranke and Marquis and totally inconsistent with the requirements of the official government conspiracy theory concerning the events at the Pentagon on 9/11.



#### **4.) Beyond a Reasonable Doubt**

If I had to pick one issue related to the tragedy of 9/11 that stood the best chance of winning the title of being the most controversial topic – and there are a lot of deserving candidates – the subject matter that probably would be crowned the undisputed champion concerns the matter of planes and the World Trade Towers. By this, I am not referring to the problems of credibility and plausibility surrounding the idea that two individuals (namely, Mohammed Atta and Marwan al-Shehhi) who had extremely limited flying skills, training, and experience might be able to successfully maneuver jets near sea level at speeds ranging from 440 mph (North Tower) to 540 mph (South Tower) and still be able to hit several targets that were a little over two hundred feet square – something that, according to pilot John Lear, well-trained pilots with many years of experience flying large commercial jets had trouble doing on a simulator shortly after the events at the Twin Towers on 9/11.

The plane controversy to which I am alluding revolves around the question of whether, or not, planes struck the Twin Towers at all. There are even many people who believe that 9/11 was an ‘inside job’ who not only start rolling their eyes when this issue comes up but have thrown people out of their 9/11 ‘truth’ organizations for even broaching the topic.

Everybody knows that two Boeings – one from American Airlines and one from United Airlines – hit the North and South Towers at the World Trade Center on the morning of 9/11. When I hear assertions like the foregoing one, I am reminded of a song by Leonard Cohen entitled appropriately enough: ‘Everybody Knows’ in which a whole series of issues are asserted as being things that ‘everybody knows’ and, yet, the reality is that what everybody knows is not necessarily true or if true not something that everyone necessarily knows ... although people might believe such things to be true even if they do not actually know them to be true.

One of the most prominent problems in philosophy, science, theology, psychology, and criminal proceedings concerns the problem of finding a reliable, credible method that permits people to distinguish between knowledge and belief. Many things are believed,

but people tend to know far, far, far less than what they believe to be the truth about some aspect of reality.

The only criterion for belief is the belief itself. On the other hand, the problem of establishing a framework through which one can demonstrate that a given understanding constitutes knowledge is much more complicated ... involving many more criteria and considerations.

Let us try a thought experiment. The thought experiment will be difficult because it will require the reader to temporarily put aside what she or he believes he or she knows.

The thought experiment involves a court case. The person who is being tried is someone that the prosecution claims has had some supporting role in the events of 9/11 in relation to helping to bring about the World Trade Center tragedy. The counsel for the defense claims his client is innocent of all such charges.

The name of the defense counsel is Morgan Reynolds. Dr. Reynolds is professor emeritus at Texas A & M University (and Robert Gates, the present Secretary of the Defense Department, disowned Dr. Reynolds when the Mr. Gates was President of Texas A & M University due to Dr. Reynolds's statements about 9/11.). Dr. Reynolds also once served as a director of the Criminal Justice Center in relation to the National Center for Policy Analysis and, as well, Dr. Reynolds was the chief economist for the U.S. Department of Labor -- from 2001 to 2002 -- during George W. Bush initial term in office.

Many of the facts and ideas -- but not all -- encompassed by the following case are drawn from the writings and talks that Dr. Morgan has given in relation to the issue being examined in this chapter. The way in which those facts are explored and presented here, however, is mine.

Let's take out all opening and closing statements in our legal thought experiment since such statements have no legal, probative value but are just statements about what the respective sides believe concerning the case. In other words, opening and closing statements are nothing more than narratives ... stories about what the prosecution and defense believe about a given case ... attempts to

persuade the jury to interpret evidence or see things in one way rather than another.

Moreover, for the sake of a certain amount of brevity, rather than providing a transcript for an imaginary trial – complete with objections, rulings, side bars and the like -- I will merely put forth some things that are to be deliberated upon by the jury. The task of our hypothetical jury is to try to get a sense of where the truth lies in relation to the various evidential considerations being presented.

Let's try to remember that in the American system of justice, the burden of proof is always on the government. When the state or federal government accuses someone of a crime, it is up to the prosecution to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt that the person being accused by the government actually has done that with which the individual is being charged.

Furthermore, because emotions have been so inflamed by media coverage of 9/11 we will assume that a motion for a change of venue has been filed and granted in our hypothetical legal case. In addition, the jurors who will hear the evidence for the thought experiment are a rather special lot.

More specifically, let us suppose that the jurors for the hypothetical proceeding have been living in a cave in ... well, not Afghanistan ... but somewhere. As a result of their secluded living quarters, they have not had access to: phones, television, radio, newspapers, movies, magazines, books, or other people – especially fellow Americans.

In other words, the jurors I have in mind are ideal for the case being considered because they have no preconceived ideas about what might, or might not, have taken place on 9/11. Consequently, they are willing to listen to the evidence provided by both prosecution and defense with an open mind and weigh such evidence in terms of its credibility, plausibility, and the degree to which that evidence is, or is, not well-established.

Let us begin with two statements. These statements are at the heart of the current, hypothetical legal proceeding.

The first statement is as follows. 'On the morning of September 11, 2001, American Airlines Flight 11, carrying an eleven-member crew as

well as 76 passengers -- and traveling at a speed of approximately 440 mph -- flew into the north side of WTC 1 (the North Tower) at 8:46 a.m.'

The second statement is similar to the first one, but it contains a few differences. 'On the morning of September 11, 2001, United Airlines Flight 175, carrying a nine-member crew, together with 51 passengers -- and flying at a speed of 540 mph -- struck the south face of WTC 2 at about 9:03 a.m.'

The challenge facing our hypothetical prosecution, defense, and jury is an exercise in epistemology. For the prosecution, the challenge is a matter of being able to prove that the foregoing two statements are true? For the defense, the challenge is whether, or not, it will be able to create reasonable doubt with respect to the aforementioned statements. For the jury, the challenge is a matter of trying to decide if the prosecution has proved its case or if, as the defense alleges, there is more than a reasonable doubt concerning the claims of the prosecution.

There are three kinds of evidence that might be considered in conjunction with the foregoing challenges. One can critically examine (1) video/photographic depictions; (2) eyewitness testimony, and (3) forensic data.

For example, one of only two pieces of eyewitness/video evidence in support of the first claim of the prosecution -- namely, that a commercial jet struck the North Tower -- comes from Jules and Gédéon Naudet (Another piece of alleged evidence concerning a crash at the North Tower comes in the form of a video from Pavel Hlavel). The Naudet brothers were in New York City on the morning of 9/11 filming a documentary about a firefighter and were acquiring film footage just a few blocks north of the World Trade Center.

In their famous video clip one first sees the image of a firefighter with a helmet on. The North Tower (and a number of other buildings) serves as a backdrop in the distance (about ten blocks away).

Next, one hears some sort of a jet plane-like noise echoing off the buildings around the firefighter. The firefighter looks up and cranes his neck around in several directions trying to find the source of the noise.



The camera pans up with a fairly clear view of the North Tower. Within seconds, one sees something streak toward the tower and an explosion occurs.

One could ask several questions at this point. For instance, given that the sounds of planes of all kinds are a common daily occurrence in many parts of New York City, why would the sound of plane engines cause a film crew to turn away from the subject of their documentary? Moreover, why did the camera pan up to the North Tower if the documentary was about a firefighter?

There are probably a variety of answers that might be given in conjunction with both of the foregoing questions. Those answers might be plausible and, perhaps, they might even be true.

One might pay such questions very little attention except for one fact. When the Naudet brothers' film is examined frame by frame, the results are inconclusive with respect to establishing the identity of what the precise nature of the object is that is being depicted in the film with respect to the explosion in the North Tower.

It might have been a wide-body 767-200ER commercial jet. On the other hand, it might not have been such a jet.

However, everybody knows what it was ... right? The Naudet brothers' video clip has been framed by many people – both in the media and in government -- according to a particular narrative about 9/11, but questions remain as to whether such a framing actually fits in with a variety of evidential considerations ... including the probative value of the Naudet brothers' film clip.

One might, or might not, consider it strange that just two videos were captured with respect to the crash at the North Tower that is situated in a world media center visited by many tourists and scoured by many traffic helicopters in relation ... a crash that supposedly was caused by a large commercial jet plane flying at a very high speed at an extremely low altitude across parts of New York on a very bright, clear September morning. Such a consideration does not constitute evidence, but it is a question that does bubble to the surface – especially when one entertains that question in the context of other issues (which will be pursued shortly) surrounding the alleged events of the morning of 9/11 in New York City.

Days and weeks later, a number of additional videos and photographs surfaced that, supposedly, depict the crash of a commercial jet into the South Tower. One of these photographs was taken by Carmen Taylor who, on the morning of 9/11, was, purportedly, on a ferryboat with a clear view of the towers. She is described as an amateur photographer and a tourist.

Her photograph is of a plane-like object that is just about to crash into the South Tower. There is also a second photograph allegedly taken by her. This one supposedly depicts an explosion or fireball at the South Tower.

The Sony camera supposedly used by Carmen Taylor is a model in which, apparently, there is a ten-second delay that occurs between shots. Yet, the two photos she released show a jet aircraft just about to hit the South Tower as well as a second image of an explosion that would have occurred within a second, or so, after the first image and, therefore, would have taken place faster than a camera possessing a ten-second delay between shots should have been able to capture.

In addition, the plane in the initial photograph does not seem to exhibit the standard dark blue and gray colors of a United Airlines aircraft. Perhaps, this is because of the angle at which the picture was taken relative to the plane-like object or, perhaps, this is due to certain kinds of shadowing that are filtering the true colors of the plane.

The fact of the matter is that we don't know anything about Carmen Taylor or the provenance of her photograph. Neither her 9/11 account nor the photographs she is alleged to have taken have been authenticated or subject to any sort of forensic analysis, and in order for her testimony and photographs to be entered into evidence, both things need to be subjected to some appropriate sorts of objective scrutiny.

There also are several videos attributed to Scott Fairbanks and Michael Herzarkhani that show an aircraft impacting the South Tower. The problem with those videos, however, is that they give rise to a number of questions.

The plane depicted in their videos seems to violate several basic laws of physics during the time frame when the plane appears to make contact with the steel-framed South Tower. More specifically, the

plane seems to just merge with the building with no signs of the sort of collision one would expect when objects with significantly different inertial properties engage one another – that is, there is no sign that either the building or the aircraft are affected by the collision.

There are no plane parts that are bouncing off the building. There is no immediate explosion of jet fuel.

How does one know that what the videos are depicting is an accurate record of what happened at the South Tower on 9/11? Like the Carmen Taylor photographs, the videos by Fairbanks and Herzarkhani need to be subjected to forensic analysis to determine their degree of authenticity and whether, or not, the videos have been altered in some fashion.

The foregoing sorts of problems also permeate a number of other videos that purport to depict a 767 United Airlines aircraft plowing into the South Tower. These videos are attributed to the following sources: Evans Fairbanks, Park Foreman, Scott Myers, and WNBC.

Before one can accept any of those videos as reliable evidence in a legal proceeding, they have to be forensically scrutinized and the people who supposedly took the footage must be deposed. When people have attempted to do this by, for example, requesting copies of the videos via a Freedom of Information request, their requests have been denied, ignored, or the individuals making the request have been charged exorbitant fees merely for the organization (NIST) to do a search to see if the videos exist.

It bears mentioning that although the North Tower event had already occurred and despite the fact there were many professional and amateur photographers and videographers on hand in and around Ground Zero because of the North Tower event, there were no photographs or videos of any plane striking the South Tower on 9/11 that were shown to the public within seconds or even minutes of the alleged South Tower event. All of the videos that depict a large jet striking the South Tower did not show up until hours, days and weeks later, and all of these videos seem to entail certain kinds of problems that raise questions about the authenticity of those videos.

The only live videos of the South Tower event were filmed from the opposite side of the South Tower where the alleged collision took

place. Those videos show a plane disappearing behind the South Tower followed by an explosion.

Did the plane that disappeared behind the South Tower collide with the building? I don't know.

What I do know is that I have seen a televised event in which the illusionist, David Copperfield, made a Boeing jet seemingly disappear in front of a live crowd that surrounded the aircraft. I also have seen equally impressive feats of close up 'magic' or illusions by people such as David Blaine, Doug Henning, and Criss Angel.

Is it possible that the aircraft depicted in the live shots of the South Tower crashed into the far side of the building? Yes, it is!

Is it possible that what was shown on television involved some sort of fakery or illusion? Yes it is!

Quite surprisingly, there are very, very few individuals who claimed to have been eyewitnesses to the alleged Tower collision. Moreover, there are questions of credibility and conflict of interest surrounding many of those reports.

For example, there was one individual in a Harley T-shirt who was interviewed by Fox television on, or around, 9/11 who stated during the interview that: "several minutes after the first plane hit, I saw this plane coming out of nowhere, and just scream right into the side of the twin tower, exploding through the other side, and then I witnessed both towers collapse, one first and then the second, mostly due to structural failure, probably because the fire was just too intense."

Where was the individual when he witnessed all of the foregoing? Was his vantage point such that he would have been able to witness both the crash and the subsequent explosion through the other side of the building? Can his testimony be corroborated independently by anyone else?

Moreover, contrary to the individual's televised statement, the second plane did not hit (allegedly) several minutes after the first plane supposedly struck the North Tower. More than a quarter of an hour separated the two events.

The manner in which the individual describes the temporal aspect of things could raise questions about the credibility of the rest of his testimony because there is a significant difference between 'several

minutes' and more than a quarter of an hour. Some of our hypothetical jurors might consider the matter trivial and, therefore, irrelevant, while other members of our hypothetical jury might wonder if other parts of the account are being altered in similar ways.

There is a further aspect of the person's foregoing account that might raise some credibility issues in relation to such testimony. More specifically, the individual's theory about what destroyed the Twin Towers – namely structural failure and fires – is neither tenable nor has it been substantiated (contrary to the opinion of many, NIST did not explain what caused the three towers at the WTC to come down, but, rather, only put forth three hypotheses about what might have been the initiating event that led to global, progressive collapse in each building studied). Why would the person being interviewed offer such a theory ... a theory indicating that he is the sort of individual who – at least on this occasion -- is quite willing to voice opinions concerning things about which he is ignorant and, therefore, would tend to undermine his credibility as a witness when he voices such unfounded theories?

Almost all people who “witnessed” the event at the South Tower did so via television, and many of those individuals have, at one time or another, attended movies where special effects are in evidence. Quite frequently, those special effects can be made to look very realistic ... especially when one has only a few seconds to view them.

If one were only talking about an isolated case – that is, a person is watching the video of a plane disappearing behind the far side of the South Tower, and this is followed by an explosion, and there were no other events involving 9/11 through which to assess the plausibility and credibility of such an event – one might be tempted to say: “Well, although I didn't see the plane crash, it seems reasonable to suppose that what happened is that the plane did crash and the occurrence of the explosion a short time later serves as evidence of that crash.” However, the problem of assessing the credibility or authenticity of such a video becomes much more difficult if one also has critically reviewed the alleged evidence put forth by the government with respect to the destruction of three buildings at the WTC on 9/11 and if one also has studied the alleged evidence for the official government theory concerning what supposedly took place at the Pentagon on

9/11, and, as a result of one's studies, one has found that all four of the explanations being alluded to above are not even remotely credible, plausible, or verifiable.

One could ask: "Well, if it wasn't a plane crash that caused the explosion at the South Tower, then what happened to the plane and what caused the explosion"? One might just as well ask: "Well if the Boeing aircraft in the David Copperfield illusion didn't disappear, then what happened to it, and why didn't all of the people in the live audience surrounding the aircraft see what actually happen?"

Magicians don't reveal their secrets. Keeping secrets preserves the illusion and permits them to earn a livelihood.

The fact that a given audience can't figure out how an illusionist did something, does not constitute evidence that the illusion did not take place. After all, the illusion did occur, and everybody who was present during the illusion is a witness to the illusion's 'reality'.

If the only piece of evidence one has is a video that depicts a large jet disappearing behind a building followed by an explosion with no plane reappearing into view following the explosion, one might say: "The plane must have crashed into the building." However, the video is not the only piece of evidence that exists, and there is a great deal of this additional evidence that is difficult to reconcile with a plane crashing into the building.

Let's leave the issue of possible photographic and video evidence aside for the moment and move on to some of these other evidential considerations. For example, reflect on the following information.

On the basis of video evidence (which in view of the foregoing discussion might be of questionable credibility), NIST (National Institute for Standards and Technology) has estimated that the speed of United Airlines Flight 175 as it allegedly struck the South Tower of the WTC was about 540 miles per hour. Is this a credible statement?

Flight 175 supposedly collided with the South Tower about 1,000 feet above sea level. The nearer one approaches sea level, the greater will be air density.

The drag on a commercial jet increases proportionately to the air density through which the aircraft is flying. Moreover, drag also

increases with the square of the velocity of such a vehicle under such conditions.

A number of pilots with both commercial and military experience indicate that a Boeing 767 is not designed to fly at speeds in excess of 500 mph near sea level. More specifically, they indicate that in order to be able to maintain speeds of 540 mph through the air density that exists at 1,000 feet above sea level, the amount of thrust being generated by the jet engines must be equal to the total amount of drag experienced by the aircraft. However, the turbo fans that are in the jet engines of a Boeing 767 which will be required to provide that amount of thrust tend to experience problems in such relatively high density air and instead of generating thrust, the turbo fans actually have a braking effect on the speed of the aircraft and, therefore, would prevent the aircraft from attaining, let alone sustaining, a speed of 540 mph at 1,000 feet above sea level.

In addition, there is a very good chance that a Boeing 767 flying at a speed of 540 miles per hour at 1,000 feet above sea level would come apart due to the resonant frequencies that would come into play as such an aircraft flew through relatively high air density at the speed indicated by NIST. When Joseph Keith -- a retired aerospace engineer -- worked for Boeing, one of his assignments was to design so-called 'shaker systems' in order to test and assess the structural resiliency of Boeing aircraft under various conditions. He claims that the structural integrity of a Boeing 767 would have been severely compromised -- to the point of coming apart -- under the sort of conditions being described by NIST in conjunction with United Airlines Flight 175 as it allegedly approached the South Tower.

Joseph Keith contacted his old employer, Boeing, about the foregoing structural integrity issue of a 767 flying at 540 miles per hour at such a low altitude. Boeing never responded to his inquiry.

So, what are the implications of the foregoing points with respect to either the video evidence that forms part of the 9/11 conspiracy theory being promulgated by the government or with respect to the NIST analysis of the damage to the South Tower that was calculated on the basis of such videos? The long and short of such implications is as follows: one needs to question the authenticity of videos that depict an aircraft performing in a way that is not physically possible -- either

with respect to speed or structural integrity -- under the conditions being depicted in the video, and, therefore, one also must seriously question the credibility of NIST's analysis of alleged destruction that is based on such problematic sources.

Let's consider another set of issues. Although there were hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals who were milling in and around the WTC following the first crash, almost no one heard any sound of an approaching jet flying at a high speed at low altitude.

The speed of sound at sea level is roughly 760 miles per hour. This is more than two hundred miles per hour faster than the reported speed of Flight 175 that, allegedly, was heading for the South Tower.

Jet engines running at near full throttle near sea level would register somewhere between the 130 and 140 decibel level. This would be a painful stressor for human ears.

Yet, following 9/11, no one at Ground Zero commented on going through any sort of a deafening or painful auditory experience in conjunction with a large commercial jet flying at some 540 miles per hour just a thousand feet above them. Why not?

In one study of witness statements concerning 9/11, there were 117 people who were interviewed in conjunction with the South Tower event. Approximately 98 of those individuals indicated they had not seen or heard anything prior to the 'event'.

There were about 19 to 20 people who indicated that they had seen and/or heard an aircraft. However, there is such a degree of variability in these latter reports that one encounters difficulty trying to develop any sort of consistent picture concerning the precise identity of what actually was seen or heard on 9/11 by those individuals.

All twenty of these possible witnesses would have to be deposed, and if they testified in our hypothetical legal case, their accounts would be subject to cross-examination. It is difficult to know where any of this would leave us -- especially if none of the people actually saw the plane strike the South Tower.

There are many factors that can affect the accuracy of eyewitness accounts. Memory is malleable and can be shaped by what a person learns later about the event one is being asked to remember.



Moreover, there is phenomenon known as confabulation in which people tend to fabricate aspects of experience or conflate them in order to try to make sense of what they believed they experienced at the time of a given event about which they are being questioned.

Due to the foregoing considerations – and others that could be mentioned -- eyewitness accounts often tend to carry less weight in legal proceedings than forensic evidence does. This is even more the case if forensic evidence brings into question the accuracy of such eyewitness accounts.

For instance, there are approximately a little over three million parts that comprise a Boeing 767. Those parts all have unique identifying numbers that are recorded in a maintenance log for the aircraft.

A partially charred passport was found for one of the alleged hijackers, (Satam al-Suqami) but not one of the more than 6 million parts (none of which are made of paper) for the two Boeings was ever identified and cross-referenced against the appropriate maintenance logs to verify that such a piece, or pieces, came from either of the two commercial jets that supposedly struck the Twin Towers.

Furthermore, there was a strange absence of wreckage outside the Twin Towers. In other words, there were no pieces of wings, flaps, tail sections, fuselages, engines, bodies, seats, luggage, or the like that were readily in evidence on the ground surface in and around either of the two towers, and this is a point to which we will return a little later on in the discussion.

A few life jackets were eventually found on the roof of one of the other WTC buildings (Building 5). However, life jackets don't carry part numbers and, therefore, there is only an assumption that links such materials with the commercial jets that allegedly slammed into the Twin Towers on 9/11.

In addition, a few other plane parts have been brought forward as evidence of commercial jets having actually struck the Twin Towers. Unfortunately, as noted before, those parts have never been properly verified as having numbers that can be matched against the maintenance logs for the two commercial aircraft.

If I were a juror who had been living in a cave for sometime before and after 9/11, I might ask myself how those life jackets and unverified plane parts came to rest in the places where they were found. There is no proof of how those objects got to be where they were found, and there is no proof that uniquely ties them to either of the allegedly hijacked airplanes.

One can make assumptions about the origins of those objects. However, there is no proof to indicate that, if any, of those assumptions are correct.

If I were inclined to a certain degree of skepticism, I might find it curious that none of the more than 6,000, 000 numbered parts from two Boeings were not located in and around the Twin Towers, while a few unnumbered life jackets, together with several unverified and, apparently, unverifiable plane parts were located. What is the likelihood of something like that happening?

In evaluating a situation, sometimes one must use common sense when the available evidence is not clear-cut and, as a result, one does not have proof, one way or another, about the meaning, significance, or truth of such evidence. Although rare events do occur, we often are more inclined to engage evidence through the filters that govern how the world usually tends to operate, and we probably will have to be given some powerful arguments to induce us to abandon our normal way of looking at the world.

Is it possible that the few pieces of evidence that survived on 9/11 from more than 6,000,000 numbered plane parts just happened to be unnumbered and unverifiable objects? Yes, it is possible for this to be the case.

At the same time, such a scenario is also extremely unlikely. So, why should one suppose that the least likely possibility is what actually occurred?

Reportedly, there was a piece of fuselage found at the WTC that survived unburned and relatively unscathed – except to the extent that it supposedly was part of something bigger from which it, somehow, became separated. The piece of fuselage was ‘discovered’ on top of Building 5 in a photograph allegedly taken by Dr. Gene Corley, who had been hired by FEMA to help out with various tasks.

The photograph was supposedly taken on October 25, 2001. The problem with this claim is that other photographs taken of the roof area of Building 5 just after 9/11 show no such fuselage.

Another plane part that was supposedly found in the vicinity of the WTC was a small piece of engine. A number of experts, including former commercial and military pilots, have raised some questions about the authenticity of the engine part.

More specifically, the 767 jets used by United Airlines only have Pratt & Whitney engines. However, the engine piece that was 'recovered' appears to be made by General Electric's French partner, Snecma.

In addition, the foregoing set of aviation experts indicate that there are problems surrounding the flight path of the foregoing engine part as it was allegedly ripped from UA Flight 175 -- due to its alleged collision with the South Tower -- and, somehow, managed to scale several tall buildings, bounce on the intersection of Church and Murray Streets -- without leaving any marks in the road -- and ended up underneath some scaffolding. The primary problem with the foregoing flight path is that it is not very -- if at all -- plausible or likely.

Another plane part -- part of a landing gear -- also ended up beneath some scaffolding ... this time at West and Rector Streets, a number of blocks south of Building 1. This piece of 'evidence' has a flight path problem as well.

There is no hole in the south face of Building 1 that is big enough to accommodate an object the size of the landing gear part that was found. Examination of the photographic evidence confirms the foregoing fact, so, how did the landing gear part end up at West and Rector Streets since it would have had to exit through the south side of Building 1 in order to get to the place where it was found -- and, as previously noted, there is no photographic evidence of the south side of Building 1 that shows evidence of an exit-hole big enough to have accommodated such an object?

Of course, the foregoing issues could be cleared up, to an extent (but not completely), if authorities would simply demonstrate that the part numbers for the aircraft pieces they have in their possession

matched the part numbers in the maintenance logs for the respective aircraft. Unfortunately, the authorities have been unwilling to do this.

Aidan Monaghan filed a request under the Freedom of Information Act to induce the FBI to reveal the identity of whatever parts it had found in relation to the two Boeings that allegedly struck the Twin Towers, along with whatever parts were recovered in conjunction with the other two allegedly hijacked aircraft on 9/11. The FBI has refused the request, and a subsequent appeal of the FBI's decision also was denied.

The FBI claims that it is under no obligation to disclose such information. This belief might, or might not be true, but one thing is clear – namely, information (if it actually exists) that is not disclosed is no evidence at all, and jurors are free to interpret such resistance as indicating that either there is nothing in the possession of the FBI that has probative value, or if it does have probative value, then it runs contrary to the prosecution's case and, consequently, is being withheld from the critical scrutiny of independent investigators.

There also are some problems that are entailed by the passenger manifests that were released in conjunction with the events on 9/11. To begin with, no official, final passenger manifest lists were ever released in conjunction with either Flight 11 or Flight 175. Moreover, with respect to the unofficial passenger manifest lists that were released, no Arab names appear on those lists, let alone the names of any of the alleged hijackers.

In the context of such unofficial passenger manifests, one might also reflect on the case of Ellen Mariani. Mrs. Mariani lost her husband, Louis, on 9/11.

Mr. Mariani allegedly was aboard Flight 175, along with 59 other people, on the morning of 9/11. However, rather strangely, Mrs. Mariani has never been able to find, or come into contact with, the surviving family members of any of the other individuals whose names appeared on the passenger manifest list.

Perhaps, this is just another one of those life happenings that, while odd, is just one of those things. In other words, while her inability to find or contact other surviving members of the United Airlines Flight for which her husband was booked might be considered

to be somewhat unlikely when compared, say, to other air crash tragedies when surviving family members were able to contact one another, nonetheless, perhaps it is nothing more than an unlikely and odd but 'true' life happening.

On the other hand, the Mariani situation naturally leads to certain kinds of questions. For instance, did the names on the passenger manifests belong to real people? If so, how do we know this?

Have their identities been checked? Who did the checking?

How was the checking done? In other words, what was the methodology used to establish the identity of the passengers?

How many of the surviving family members have been interviewed? Who conducted the interviews, and how were they done?

Are there any records or receipts that can independently verify that the people associated with the names listed on the passenger manifest list actually purchased tickets? If they did purchase tickets, did they show up at the airport to board their flight and are there any video records to verify this?

Are the foregoing questions unnecessary? If they are considered to be unnecessary, then on the basis of what verifiable data is one making claims concerning who was and was not on any of the commercial aircraft that allegedly struck the Twin Towers at the WTC?

One of the reasons why the foregoing questions might be considered to be necessary is that there were a number of other alleged passengers on Flights 11 and 175 who also are surrounded in a bit of mystery. Those individuals are the alleged hijackers of the two aircraft that supposedly crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11.

The names of those alleged hijackers do not appear on the passenger manifests for those flights. Moreover, there is no reliable, verified video of any of the hijackers getting ready to board those planes on 9/11. In addition, a number of people with the same names and photographic likeness as some of the alleged hijackers have been reported to be alive and well and living at different locations in the Middle East.

What do we know? What do we believe? What are we led to believe? How do we go about distinguishing among these possibilities?

According to the automated Bureau of Transportation Statistics Database, American Airlines Flight 11 was not operating on 9/11. Among other things, the database keeps a running tab of all commercial flights, and AA 11 is not found in the database for the day in question.

In addition, there is an anomaly surrounding the process through which the Boeing aircraft that was known as Flight 11 on 9/11 was deregistered. The FAA rulebook stipulates that aircraft must be deregistered within twenty-four hours of the time they are destroyed ... such as during a crash into the North Tower of the WTC.

The tail number of the Boeing aircraft that was called Flight 11 on 9/11 was N334AA. The aircraft with that tail number was not deregistered until January 14, 2002 ... some four months later and, consequently, in contravention of FAA requirements.

There is a similar anomaly inherent in the deregistering of the Boeing that was known as United Airlines Flight 175 on 9/11 and which, supposedly, was destroyed when it slammed into the South Tower. The tail number of that Boeing aircraft was N612UA, but it was not deregistered until September 28, 2005 ... more than four years after it supposedly crashed into the South Tower and, therefore, in contravention of the rules that have been established by the FAA for the deregistering of planes that have been destroyed.

There is a whole litany of questions that need to be asked with respect to the process of deregistering in conjunction with the two aircraft that allegedly crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11. Until those questions have been satisfactorily resolved, then one cannot legitimately claim that either of the commercial aircraft at issue slammed into the Twin Towers on 9/11.

There also are questions that arise in conjunction with the Bureau of Transportation Statistics Database in relation to AA Flight 11. One of those questions is: why is there no record of that aircraft flying on 9/11?

If the hypothetical prosecution of our thought experiment cannot provide verifiable evidence capable of satisfactorily answering such questions – either with respect to the process of deregistering destroyed aircraft or in relation to the Bureau of Transportation

Database – then its case contains some significant lacunae. If the prosecution cannot provide verifiable evidence capable of demonstrating the authenticity of the aforementioned photographs and videos of, respectively, Taylor, Fairbanks and Herzarkhani, or the authenticity of the passenger manifests, then not only do such things fail as evidence in a legal sense, but one must ask the question of why such photographs, videos and passenger lists have surfaced and are being offered as “proof” of something (the events on 9/11 at the WTC) that – forensically speaking – that those pieces of ‘evidence’ don’t really authenticate or prove.

There also are a variety of questions that arise with respect to seismographic recordings made in conjunction with alleged aircraft collisions involving the Twin Towers. The Lamont-Doherty Observatory registered a number of seismic events on 9/11.

At approximately 8:46 A.M. EDT, there was a seismic event measuring 0.9 on the Richter scale in relation to the North Tower. Nearly seventeen minutes later – just before 9:03 A.M. -- there was a second seismic event that measured 0.7 on the same scale that, allegedly, arose in conjunction with a commercial jet striking the South Tower.

According to our hypothetical prosecution, the aircraft that hit the South Tower was traveling approximately 100 mph faster than the commercial jet that supposedly struck the North Tower. The faster plane was described as weighing 3 tons less than the slower aircraft that would affect the total kinetic energy of that vehicle relative to the slower plane, but the effect would be fairly negligible.

Despite the fact that the faster plane would have manifested greater kinetic energy when it struck the South Tower and despite the fact that it allegedly struck the South Tower lower down (around the 78<sup>th</sup> floor) than the slower jet allegedly hit the North Tower (around the 94<sup>th</sup> floor), the seismic reading for the slower, lower impact plane was .2 greater than the faster plane despite the fact that it struck its building some sixteen floors further from the ground and, therefore, would have had its kinetic energy dispersed through a greater number of absorbent structural features that had been built into the two buildings than was the case in relation to the faster jet. Why would this be the case?

Maybe, there are reasonable explanations for this discrepancy. Maybe, the officials got the speed of the jets wrong, or maybe they got the total weights wrong, or maybe the different angles of impact might have affected what was registered seismically.

However, until one can nail down the facts on such issues, one wonders why a plane that supposedly has greater kinetic energy and collides with a building lower down than another aircraft with less kinetic energy that struck a building higher up would register less strongly on a seismic recording. The seismic reading for the faster, lower-impacting plane was only slightly more than a single jackhammer blow would register on a seismic device that was measuring things from an equivalent distance.

There is another issue to factor into the foregoing considerations. The point of alleged impact for the two commercial jets places those planes at different distances from the mammoth steel beams that sit at the core of each of the buildings.

The point of contact for the aircraft that allegedly struck the North Tower placed that plane some 60 feet from the core of the building. The point of contact for the commercial jet that supposedly hit the South Tower placed the plane just 37 feet away from the core structures of that building.

The closer proximity of the latter vehicle to the core structures at point of impact were said to have led to the severing of 10 core beams. The greater distance of the former aircraft from the core structures at point of impact resulted in much less damage – namely, six severed columns.

The commercial jet that allegedly struck the South Tower was said to be traveling 100 miles per hour faster than the plane that supposedly hit the North Tower, and the plane that hit the South Tower allegedly struck the building 16 floors lower than did the aircraft that supposedly hit the North Tower, and the core damage in the South Tower was estimated to be considerably greater than core damage in the North Tower, and, yet, the seismic reading associated with the strike of the South Tower is .2 less than is the seismic reading correlated with the strike of the North Tower. This issue needs to be clarified, and if it cannot be, then, it constitutes one more issue that



undermines the credibility of the prosecution's case concerning what, if anything, hit the two towers.

After all, if our special jury of cave dwellers hears that there are anomalies, problems, and questions surrounding alleged evidence involving: passenger lists, photographs, videos, the Bureau of Transportation Database, FAA deregistering procedures, and seismic data, then why should jurors accept the prosecution's version of things? Surely, there would be more than reasonable doubt if none of the foregoing issues could be resolved in a satisfactory and credible manner.

What is more, most people in America – if not the world – are, in the same epistemic condition of the cave dwelling jurors in the present thought experiment. In other words, they need someone to satisfactorily resolve the outstanding problems concerning evidence in relation to the prosecution's case, but the problem is that none of them are being required to be jurors in an official case concerning 9/11, and, as a result, such issues tend to slip into the cracks of unasked questions.

If a question falls in the forest and no one is present to hear it, then, of course, the issues raised by the question might never be addressed. Many of the issues of 9/11 are like this for the vast majority of people.

Another anomalous issue to be added to the foregoing collection of problems concerns Flight Data Recorders (FDR) and Cockpit Voice Recorders (CVR) for the two aircraft that supposedly struck the Twin Towers. The anomaly is that, allegedly, no such recorders were found at the WTC ... although there have been unverified rumors the testimony of eyewitnesses indicating that the recorders for those aircraft have been located but are, for whatever reason, being kept secret.

FDRs and CVRs are built for durability, and they are built to be able to survive fairly extreme conditions. For instance, they can: withstand g-force loads of around 3400, as well as temperatures of approximately 2,000° Fahrenheit for one hour – conditions far beyond the parameters of what can be proven, or are likely, to have occurred on 9/11 in conjunction with the Twin Towers.

FDRs and CVRs were allegedly found in relation to the events at the Pentagon and Shanksville, Pennsylvania. However, the flight data recorder material released in relation to the Pentagon event has proven to be fairly problematic (among other things, this refers to the fact there is some evidence that the data from the recorder might have been fudged – see the chapter entitled: ‘Black Box Operations’ in this volume) Moreover, only a very limited amount of the Shanksville recorder information has been released to the public for critical inspection.

However, for the sake of argument, let’s assume that the flight and voice recorders for Flight 93 (Shanksville) and Flight 77 (the Pentagon) have been found and authenticated. What happened to the four recorders associated with the two commercial jets in New York?

The charred passport of an alleged hijacker (Satam al-Suqami) purportedly survived events at the WTC. A few lifejackets and seats allegedly survived the events at the Twin Towers, but two recorders that are specifically built to withstand extreme conditions apparently did not survive those events even though they are placed in the part of a plane that is most likely to survive a crash – namely, the tail.

The foregoing considerations involve additional questions that create problems in relation to the credibility of the hypothetical case being put forth by the prosecution that is supposed to demonstrate that two commercial Boeing 767 aircraft struck the Twin Towers on the morning of 9/11. One wonders when, or if, the prosecution will begin to become embarrassed with respect to the lack of credible evidence that it seems to be able to bring to bear in support of its case.

Let’s continue on with our examination of the artifacts in the museum of evidence that is related to the hypothetical legal case at hand. For instance, the gross, physical description for Boeing 767s is as follows: 156 feet wide, 159 feet long and, discounting the height of extended landing gear, about 49 feet high.

The rough width of the hole in the South Tower is approximately: 106 feet wide. The width of the hole for the North Tower is around 125 feet.

50 feet of the Boeing 767 that allegedly struck the South Tower cannot fit into the size of the hole that is in the North Tower ... a hole

that, supposedly, was created by a Boeing 767 with a wingspan of 156 feet. Thirty-one feet of the Boeing 767 that is said to have hit the North Tower cannot fit into the size of the hole that is in the North Tower ... a hole that, supposedly, was created by a Boeing 767 with a wingspan of 156 feet.

What happened to the portion of the wings that did not fit into the respective holes in the Twin Towers? They did not tumble down the outside of either of the buildings because according to first-responders there was no plane wreckage found in the immediate vicinity of either Building 1 or Building 2 at the WTC.

Some people say that the wings of the Boeings merely folded back as the aluminum portion of the wings came into contact with the exterior steel columns that encircle the building beneath the aluminum cladding that frames the windows in those buildings. The problem with such a suggestion is that there is absolutely no evidence that can be offered to support such a contention.

In addition, there are some reasonable questions that might be raised that are capable of casting doubt on such an idea. For example, why would aluminum wings neatly fold back rather than become crumpled or torn off as they made contact with a surface that consists of glass framed by steel-framed assemblies?

The aluminum wings – bolstered by jet fuel – in our hypothetical legal case possess a great deal of kinetic energy (because they are part of a speeding commercial jet), and, therefore, are likely to easily penetrate the portions of a building's exterior that are made of glass. On the other hand, the same kinetically energized aluminum wings are not likely to easily penetrate – to the extent that they do so at all – the steel assemblies that make up the face of the building surrounding the windows.

There are very different physical dynamics taking place at each point of a wing as it encounters a surface that contains vastly different compositional components. (e.g., glass, concrete and box columns braced by steel spandrel belts). Moreover, one would have to factor in the manner in which the wings of a Boeing 767 are contoured and angled with respect to the fuselage since all of these contour and angle features are going to give rise to a different set of physical dynamics at different parts of the wing. One also would have to factor in the very

different angles at which each Boeing 767 was alleged to have hit the exterior of the two buildings.

The prosecution (in the form of the 9/11 conspiracy theory promulgated by the government) wishes to argue that the wings – along with the rest of the planes -- of the two Boeing jets were somehow able to circumvent all of the complex dynamics that are likely to have arisen when two speeding commercial jets made contact with two steel-framed buildings of different compositional character and generated precisely the same result in each case. In other words, the prosecution wishes to argue – without providing any evidence whatsoever -- that the wings of the two jets – despite travelling at different velocities and striking the two buildings at very different angles – all folded back against the fuselage of their respective planes so that the whole width of the two planes were able to disappear inside the relatively small holes (compared to the width of the two planes) in the exterior of the two buildings.

One can demonstrate in a laboratory that the sort of steel that is found in a steel-framed building – such as either of the Twin Towers -- is at least twice as strong as the sort of aluminum that makes up most of the structural form of a commercial jet. Moreover, the sort of aluminum found in a commercial jet will tend to deform three times more extensively than will steel under an appropriate set of stress conditions that are applied equally to both kinds of materials.

Thus, if one slams an aluminum object into a steel object, the item that will suffer the most damage will be the aluminum object. The steel will be affected but not nearly to the extent to which an aluminum object will be affected.

A speeding commercial jet (including cargo, fuel and people) weighing approximately 280 tons has certain inertial properties. A 110-storey building weighing 500,000 tons has certain inertial properties.

A collision brings the foregoing two sets of inertial properties together in a complex set of dynamics in which the plane and building would both suffer injuries. Yet, the sort of videos that our hypothetical prosecution might try to enter into evidence in our hypothetical legal case indicate that a commercial jet made largely of aluminum slammed into a building at – allegedly – 540 mph without the aluminum in the

aircraft showing any evidence of deceleration, deformation, crumpling, or breakage.

In other words, there are videos purporting to depict the collision of a large commercial jet with the South Tower on 9/11 which indicate, among other things, that such a collision did not exhibit any properties of deceleration. This means that those videos are, in effect, claiming that the aircraft that is purportedly striking the South Tower would have experienced no more resistance from the building than it would have experienced flying through empty space.

The laws of physics indicate that when an object that is moving strikes an object that is stationary, the speed of the object that is moving will be affected and, as a result, the speed of the vehicle will slow down to some degree – that is, decelerate. The extent to which the moving object will decelerate will depend on the inertial properties of both the moving and the stationary objects.

Air does have some inertial properties. However, those inertial properties are not even remotely like the inertial properties of a 500,000 ton steel-framed building. So, what does it say about the authenticity of videos that allegedly depict a collision between a speeding aircraft (Boeing 767 UA Flight 175) and a steel-framed building (the South Tower) as if it would occur in precisely the same way that would occur if aircraft were colliding with empty space – that is, as if there would be no deceleration (slowing down) involved in striking a steel-framed tower just as there would be no deceleration involved in traveling through empty space?

In a letter to Dr. Reynolds, a representative of NIST sought to assure Dr. Reynolds that all facets of the interaction between a speeding commercial aircraft and the South Tower had been taken into consideration in an appropriate manner. The letter goes on to say that as a result of its proper treatment of the dynamics of the interaction, one can state that there would have been no expectation of deceleration in relation to the aircraft as it struck the South Tower.

Uncorroborated assertion is not evidence. Narrative is not evidence.

Uncorroborated assertion and narrative are ways of framing evidence. Framing evidence is a way of presenting a perspective that is

meant to induce people to aesthetically engage the information being framed in one way rather than another.

Framing evidence is a way of hiding flaws in the subject matter one is presenting. Framing evidence is a way of trying to direct and orient the attention of an observer – such as a juror – so that the individual will look at the subject matter being presented in the way that one would like them to.

Don't ask messy questions about the dynamics of a collision. Don't talk about the compositional differences of a surface. Don't talk about the differential strengths of steel and aluminum. Don't talk about the inertial differences between a speeding aircraft and a building like the South Tower. Don't talk about how the angle of engagement is likely to affect the stresses felt in various parts of a wing. Don't talk about how inertial differences in speeding objects are likely to affect the dynamics of impact. Don't talk about how different kinds of stress are likely to arise in different parts of a wing or fuselage depending on the compositional character of the surface being engaged by various wing and fuselage sections consisting of different contours, densities, and angles relative to the surface being impacted.

Just accept the narrative of the hypothetical prosecution that the wings of those two commercial jets folded neatly back against the fuselage so they could fit in the undersized holes in the sides of the two buildings at the WTC. In fact, the phenomenon is so “common” (although not really), that it happened twice more on 9/11 ... Once at the Pentagon and once just outside of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. In all of these instances, the wings of the Boeing aircraft were claimed by the official government conspiracy theory to have accommodated the holes and did what was necessary to fit into those holes.

In its aforementioned letter to Dr. Reynolds, NIST did nothing more than claim that its analysis of the dynamics of the alleged collision was properly done. As noted earlier, claims do not serve as proof of anything.

If one wishes to assert that a speeding aircraft would not be expected to decelerate immediately upon striking a structure like the South Tower, and if one wishes to claim that the laws of physics are not applicable to such a dynamic, then one must offer substantial proof to be able to prove the truth of what one is stating. NIST never offered

such proof. All it offered were assertions intended to frame the evidential situation in a way that reflected its narrative concerning the events of 9/11 at the World Trade Center.

The framing process does not stop with the issue of the oversized wings and the undersized holes. Let's also talk about the length of a Boeing in conjunction with the Twin Towers.

As previously noted, a Boeing 767 is 159 feet long. The distance from: The outer perimeter of the North Tower at the alleged point of contact by AA 11, to: The 47 massive inner core beams that are cross-braced is about 60 feet. The distance from: the outer surface of the South Tower at the alleged point of contact by UA 175, to: the core structure of that building was said to be about 37 feet.

The differential in length in relation to the North Tower with respect to plane length and a building length that is measured in terms of the distance to the core structure is about 99 feet. The differential length for the South Tower is approximately 122 feet.

Why didn't we see 99 feet of AA 11 sticking out of the North Tower or broken off, crumpled up, and/or crumbling to the ground below? Why didn't we see 122 feet of UA 175 sticking out of the South Tower or crumpled up, and/or crumbling to the WTC plaza below?

One peers into the respective holes of the Twin Towers that are depicted in photographs and videos and cannot discern even one trace of commercial jets that previously were 156 feet wide, 159 feet long, 49 feet tall, and weighed 332,000 pounds (plus another 230, 000 pounds if one adds in cargo, people, and fuel loads). Where are the planes and their contents within the small distance of either 37 feet or 60 feet between the exterior portion of the building and the core columns where the two planes allegedly came to an abrupt stop?

In 2006, Corey Lidle crashed a Cirrus SR20 single-engine, fixed wing aircraft into a high-rise, condo-apartment complex in New York City. The plane was flying at a speed of about 112 mph.

The crash damaged several apartments and caused a fire that was extinguished within several hours. There was plane wreckage that fell to the ground below the point of impact and, as well, some of the fuel from the plane was splashed across the building's façade around the point of impact.

In 1945 a B-25 bomber struck the Empire State Building. The plane was travelling at a speed of about 225 miles per hour.

The aircraft left a gash-like scar in the building. Part of the plane was visible in the gash created by the impact, and other parts of the aircraft were found below the impact zone but outside the building. In addition, the crash caused some of the aircraft's fuel to be released onto the exterior surface of the building ... fuel that subsequently caught fire and burned.

Although there are obvious differences in the foregoing two crashes, nonetheless, despite differences in the size and speed of the two aforementioned planes, there also are some similarities. Both planes left wreckage outside the buildings that were hit and both aircraft spewed fuel onto the exterior of the buildings into which they crashed.

Similarly, there are obvious differences in size and speed between the foregoing two planes and the two planes that are alleged to have struck the Twin Towers. However, despite such differences, one still is inclined to ask: why was there no airplane wreckage found in the plaza area beneath either of the Twin Towers and why was there little, or no, jet fuel that spilled across the exterior of either of the two buildings due to the crash as was the case in the 2006 and 1945 crashes.

A number of mathematical analyses and computer simulations have been conducted by a variety of non-governmental individuals – some of these were done at the University of Purdue and at MIT – indicating that something quite different is likely to have happened to a Boeing 767 if it were to have collided with a steel-framed structure similar to either of the Twin Towers. Like the Lidle and B-25 crashes noted above, the studies being alluded to here suggest that a great deal of fuel would have been released when the wings shattered on impact and, as a result, much of the fuel probably would have burned on the exterior of the building and not within the building. Furthermore, these studies also suggest that much of the aircraft (although this would not apply to components such as engines and landing assemblies) would have crumpled against the exterior of the building rather than proceed through to the interior of such a building and, therefore, those portions of the aircraft likely would have fallen to the ground below the point of impact (which according to first-responders



did not occur on 9/11). In addition, such studies suggest that an aircraft would experience a drop in kinetic energy of 25% upon impact and, as a result, would – contrary to the claims of NIST -- demonstrate marked deceleration. Finally, such studies suggest that the tail fin of the aircraft would be torn off through torsion-like forces that were created by the impact, and, as a result, the tail fin should have been found somewhere on the ground below (and, again, no tail fins were found on the ground in and around either of the Twin Towers).

Some people might wish to argue that because little, or no, aircraft parts were found on the ground below the alleged points of impact, this actually serves as evidence to indicate that the foregoing analyses and computer simulations must be incorrect. On the other hand, the fact that no such materials were found on the ground beneath the points of impact could also serve as evidence that such an aircraft never struck either of the Twin Towers.

In conjunction with the first sentence of the precious paragraph, some people might wish to argue that the inertial properties of the crash would have taken the entire length of both commercial jets completely within each building. However, no proof has been offered by anyone at NIST that this, indeed, would have been the result of such collisions.

Under such circumstances, narrative is being offered as evidence rather than physics and physical data. Once again, the two commercial aircraft would inexplicably (that is, in the absence of evidence) have been required to accommodate themselves to the requirements of the dimensions of the holes ... this time, in relation to the length of such holes.

Using such logic, one would be induced to adopt a method such that if one had a problem explaining the disparity in width between a Boeing 767 and the hole in the side of a steel-framed building, then one merely frames it away by adopting a narrative that ignores such trivial details. Or, if one had a problem explaining the disparity in length between a Boeing 767 and the distance between exterior surface and the interior core columns, then one just frames it away by adopting a narrative that ignores bothersome questions concerning such disparities.

The prosecution (in the form of the 9/11 conspiracy theory being promulgated by the government) is asking our hypothetical jurors to believe that a 767 merely disappeared inside of an undersized hole without any of the more than 3,000,000 parts of such an aircraft breaking off, tearing off, or crumpling upon impact and, in the process falling to the ground below. The prosecution is asking our hypothetical jurors to believe that no part of the commercial jets would have been visible once it entered a building and stopped short 60 feet, or less (37 feet), later. The prosecution is asking our hypothetical jurors to believe that none of the jet fuel contained in the wings of the aircraft spilled outside of the building as the wings neatly folded back against the fuselage, and, instead, the fuel patiently waited until it (the fuel) was safely inside of the buildings before becoming ignited. The prosecution is asking our hypothetical jurors to believe that all of the foregoing didn't happen just once on 9/11 but twice -- within several hundred feet of one another and within twenty minutes of one another -- despite the presence of differences in kinetic energy and angle of impact associated with the two planes. The prosecution is asking our hypothetical jurors to believe that videos of a commercial jet flying into the South Tower are accurate despite the fact there is no evidence in the video that the aircraft being depicted slowed down as it came in contact with the building (that is, decelerated) as would be the case if the building offered resistance to the plane's impact and as the building surely would have done.

The prosecution (in the form of the 9/11 conspiracy theory being promulgated by the government) is asking our hypothetical jurors to believe all of the foregoing. Even more importantly, however, is the fact that the prosecution is asking the jurors to accept all of the foregoing assertions without presenting any evidence to support any of its (the prosecution's) claims.

The prosecution (in the form of the 9/11 conspiracy theory being promulgated by the government) is asking our jurors to accept the prosecution's narrative about what happened as if it were evidence. The prosecution is asking our hypothetical jurors to accept the prosecution's manner of framing what took place on 9/11 at the Twin Towers.

NIST (National Institute for Standards and Technology) claims that the two airplanes shredded upon entering the respective buildings. However, NIST offers no proof to demonstrate the likely truth of its hypothesis, but, instead, they operate on the assumption that shredding is what took place.

One might ask a question, however, about such a hypothesis. How does a plane both simultaneously shred and knock a substantial hole into the exterior of a building?

If a hole has been created through the kinetic energy of a speeding aircraft, then, there is nothing in the way of the plane that can serve to shred the plane parts that fly through such a hole. If, on the other hand, there is no hole in the building and, therefore, there are steel beams in place that might serve to shred plane parts (and there is no guarantee that even if steel beams were in place that such shredding would take place), then, how does one explain the holes in the side of the two buildings?

NIST can't have it both ways. If a Boeing 767 actually did impact such steel-framed towers, then one, or the other, of the foregoing scenarios existed, and whichever one of the two conditions occurred would undermine one premise, or another, of NIST's narrative concerning the Twin Towers.

One can assume whatever one likes. However, unless one can show in a rigorously verifiable way why such an assumption is not only possible but, as well, the most likely explanation (that is, it conforms to and reflects the available evidence) for what transpired in the Twin Towers when they allegedly were struck by two Boeing 767s, then, one has nothing to offer that has probative value in a legal case. Moreover, NIST never provided any such evidence to support its assumption about the Boeing's shredding on impact ... or anything remotely like it.

The FEMA report did not prove that two Boeing 767s collided with the two buildings at the WTC on 9/11. None of the 9/11 related reports issued by NIST proved that two Boeing 767s crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11. The Congressional investigation into 9/11 did not prove that two Boeing 767s hit Buildings 1 and 2 on 9/11. *The 9/11 Commission Report* did not prove that two Boeing 767s struck the North and South Towers on the morning of 9/11.

All of the foregoing studies worked on the assumption that two Boeing's struck the Twin Towers. None of them presented evidence proving that this is what actually happened on 9/11.

Everyone has been given a narrative about the Twin Towers. That narrative has framed and filtered all information concerning the issue of the World Trade Center and 9/11. That narrative is rooted in assumptions, not proven facts.

99.999999 per cent of all Americans have no direct evidentiary experience concerning the events of 9/11 that took place in Manhattan. They have come to believe a narrative that has been offered to them through the government and the media without corroborating evidence, and this narrative now frames the issue of 9/11 in conjunction with the WTC.

The entire set of NIST reports that encompass its study of the destruction of the Twin Towers was predicated in large part on the assumption that two Boeings of a certain description and traveling at a certain speed and approaching the towers at a certain angle struck those buildings on 9/11 and, in the process, not only exploded, but, as well spewed jet fuel and stripped insulation off of the structural beams on the floors involved in the alleged crashes. Yet, quite incredibly, there might be no reliable evidence to lend that underlying assumption much credibility.

Although the process has been rather cursory, the primary sources of possible evidence -- namely, eyewitness testimony, video/photographic exhibits, and forensic data -- have been explored in the present essay with respect to alleged plane collisions at the WTC. Nonetheless, in the material that has been addressed here, there is absolutely nothing to which one can reliably point indicating that either of the statements of the prosecution noted toward the beginning of this chapter has been proven to be true beyond a reasonable doubt.

Furthermore, if the underlying assumption is false (i.e., that two Boeing 767s struck the Twin Towers in a certain way on 9/11), then NIST has generated 10,000 pages of useless experiments and simulations. This is because all of those experiments and simulations are rooted in the underlying, unproven assumption that two Boeings struck the Twin Towers on the morning of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 and created the sort of damage that were supposedly being reflected in the

simulations being created by NIST on the basis of an array of experiments designed – supposedly – to recreate some of the conditions that NIST believed would have ensued if two Boeing 767s had struck the Twin Towers on 9/11.

Psychologists have long known that once attitudes form, they often are very resistant to being altered or changed. The formation of attitudes and their resistance to change doesn't necessarily have anything to do with truth, but it often does have a great deal to do with the need that people have to possess a narrative that gives meaning to events and alludes to what must be done to protect and act in concert with that narrative.

Attitudes play important roles in shaping the coping strategies people adopt to deal with problems. If attitudes change, then this will affect the effectiveness of any coping strategies that are shaped by such attitudes.

Attitudes about 9/11 have come to play core roles in shaping, coloring, orienting, filtering, and understanding experiential data about the nature of the world in which we live. People have been led to believe that their very survival depends on possessing such attitudes and, therefore, it is not very difficult to understand why attitudes involving 9/11 tend to be very resistant to change ... even in the face of data that suggest such attitudes might be based on false information.

If someone had not been exposed to the relentless propaganda concerning 9/11 that has inundated almost everyone in the United States since that fateful day, how would they assess the previous discussion? The foregoing question, of course, revolves around a contra-factual conditional because we actually all have been subjected to such media activity (although some of us have been subjected to this more than have others), and this is why I have proposed the formation of my hypothetical jury composed of individuals who have been living in a cave for the last ten years ... since before 9/11.

Would such a hypothetical jury be inclined to agree that: the prosecution (in the form of the 9/11 conspiracy theory that has been promulgated by the government and media for the last ten years) had met its burden and demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that two Boeing commercial jets struck the North and South Towers on 9/11? Hypothetically, I would have to say: 'no' ... but, in reality, each reader

of this chapter is actually an honorary, but secret, member of my hypothetical jury and will have to answer the foregoing contra-factual for himself or herself.

Upon hearing such a hypothetical decision, someone might ask: 'Well, if the structural damage brought about by the collision of two Boeing 767s and ensuing fires did not occur and, therefore, could not have destroyed the Twin Towers, then what did cause those towers to come down? If such a question were raised, this would be a very good issue to rigorously pursue, and it is a question that cries out to be answered.

However the foregoing question is not something Dr. Morgan Reynolds, or my hypothetical jury, or I am required to answer. It is enough that we – each in our own way – have explored evidential considerations that strongly indicate that whoever does attempt to derive a credible answer in relation to the foregoing question needs to begin looking in a different direction from the one that the 9/11 conspiracy theory espoused by the government and the media has vigorously sought to induce everyone to accept for the last ten years ... to accept without any credible, demonstrable, corroborating evidence that is capable of proving the truth of that aspect of such a conspiracy theory (namely, that two Boeing 767s hit the Twin Towers) beyond a reasonable doubt.

### **5.) A Lesson in Skepticism**

Volume 12, No. 4, 2006 of the magazine *Skeptic* displays the following words in large letters in relation to its cover story for that issue: '9/11 - Was There a Conspiracy?' Now, if I were skeptically inclined, which - to some degree - I am, I would wonder about the way in which the title for the cover story serves to frame subsequent inquiry.

For instance, what if the cover story headline was: 'What Really Happened on 9/11?'" This latter title uses the same number of words as the *Skeptic* title did, and, as well, it asks a question like the *Skeptic* cover title did and, yet, the second question frames the issue in an entirely different way.

Rather, than starting off with the sort of debate that takes one away from the evidence concerning 9/11 as the aforementioned *Skeptic* headline does - since the discussion is all about whether or not a certain kind of conspiracy can be proven instead of being about the sort of evidential considerations that precede all such discussions -- my suggested headline invites the reader to work toward the evidence ... toward that evidential point prior to the formation of any judgments concerning who is responsible for 9/11 or why they did what they did. So, without even opening the magazine to see what is inside, I have some questions about the nature of the motivations of the people who have put that particular issue of the *Skeptic* magazine together.

One of those questions I have in the foregoing regard is this: How interested are the editors of *Skeptic* magazine in the truth concerning 9/11 rather than straw dog issues concerning competing conspiracy theories with respect to the events of 9/11? After all, everyone knows that the official, government, conspiracy theory for 9/11 is that: under the direction of 'Usama bin Laden, and with the guidance of Khalid Sheikh Muhammad, 19 Arabs conspired together to hijack four commercial airliners and crash them into: the Twin Towers, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania (this part of the conspiracy was supposedly foiled), so since the question about a conspiracy has allegedly already been answered in relation to 9/11, why ask the question on the cover of their magazine?

Well, one possible reason for framing things in the foregoing way is this permits one to focus on specific theories of conspiracy and, then, go on to point out possible shortcomings with such theories and, then Q.E.D., one can conclude that it is a complete myth to suppose that anything other than the official government theory concerning 9/11 is true. Oddly enough, however, one never sees *Skeptic* magazine *Popular Mechanics*, or *Scientific American* questioning the official government conspiracy theory ... only the competitors are critically examined and, therefore, by process of elimination, we are left with the “champ” – the official government conspiracy theory for 9/11.

The official government conspiracy theory is being propagated as the default position. It is presumed to be true rather than demonstrated to be true. It is the framework through which everything else is supposed to be analyzed, evaluated, and understood.

Since *Skeptic* magazine, *Popular Mechanics*, and *Scientific American* never critically examined the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 most people are induced to draw the conclusion that the theory must be true. Why else would those who are so dedicated to skeptical, critical, and scientific inquiry simply ignore and avoid the last standing conspiracy theory in the room?

Whatever might be true about the things that the aforementioned magazines have said in conjunction with this or that particular conspiracy theory involving 9/11 – and I am not necessarily conceding that much of anything those magazines have said on the matter of 9/11 is true -- I know that because those publications completely failed to critically examine the conspiracy theory held by the government, then this tends to indicate that the people behind those magazines' coverage of 9/11 have biases that have problematically skewed their “research” ... to whatever extent such a term is warranted in relation to what they have done in relation to the issue of 9/11.

Toward the beginning of his article: ‘9/11 Conspiracy Theories: The 9/11 Truth Movement in Perspective’ that appeared in the aforementioned 2006 edition of *Skeptic* magazine, Phil Molé describes a gathering at the Hyatt Regency O’Hare in Chicago that was to be the first of a series of lectures and discussions that were to take place in conjunction with a conference about 9/11. While he, along with



approximately 400 (his figure) other people are waiting for the lecture hall to open, his article refers to someone in the crowd near him who tries to start a chant, saying: “9/11 was an inside job”. The author, Phil Molé, indicates that a few other nearby attendees begin to take up the chant before several other individuals sort of emphatically say to the chanters: “We already know.” The author then goes on to state: “... most of the crowd believes that the United States government planned and orchestrated the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.”

The fact of the matter is that the last statement of the author is not necessarily warranted. The people who Molé describes represent, at best, no more than between one and two percent of the group waiting for the lecture, and there is no indication that the author actually talked to “most” of the people in the prospective audience, so he is not in any position to know what most of the crowd believes concerning 9/11.

How many people attending the event were skeptics like the author? How many people in the group were people who are researching an article like the one that Molé was intending to write? How many of the attendees were sitting on the fence, not knowing quite what to think about the 9/11-issue? How many people in the would-be audience were individuals who didn’t know a great deal about the issues surrounding 9/11 and were just curious? How many people in the prospective audience were from the local police force or Homeland Security and were seeking to keep tabs on what such groups were saying and doing? How many people in the gathering audience had ideas about 9/11 that were different from what Molé claimed their beliefs were?

Seemingly, Molé seeks to seal the deal concerning his evaluation of the mind-set of the audience by quoting another person who sat next to him once they finally were admitted into the lecture hall. According to the author, the person said: “We already know this stuff, we’re here to reconfirm what we already know”, and, therefore, aside from the presumptuousness of the person being quoted to assume that he knows why the rest of the people in the audience are there, Molé compounds the mistake and uses the quote as evidence for the state of mind of everybody in the audience – namely, that all of the people in the audience think and believe in, more or less, the same way -- even

though Molé's sample is extremely small and, therefore, one could question whether it accurately captures, or is representative of, what is going on in the minds and hearts of the people in the audience.

Molé indicates in his article that he has an objective that is different from the other people in the audience. He stipulates that: "... as someone who does not share the views of the 9/11 Truth Movement ... I want to listen to their arguments and view their evidence, and understand the reasons why so many likeable and otherwise intelligent people are convinced that the United States government planned the murder of nearly 3,000 of its own citizens."

In other words, the author already has formed his opinion concerning 9/11, automatically assumes that he is correct in the matter, and then wants to criticize the arguments and evidence of other people through the filters of his existing biases. Such thinking and reasoning invites the reader to be somewhat skeptical of the individual through whom such thinking and reasoning are given expression, and, yet, the editors of *Skeptic* magazine -- who share the biases of Phil Molé in relation to 9/11 -- never raise a question about the problematic character of the premise underlying Molé's article ... thereby giving some credence to the idea that all too many skeptics love to be skeptical about everything except themselves and their own ideas, methods, purposes, and behaviors.

The next section of Molé's article is entitled: "The Collapse of World Trade Center Buildings 1 and 2". Shortly thereafter, the author proceeds to state: "When most of us recall the events of 9/11, we think of the image of those two seemingly indestructible World Trade Center towers crumbling to the ground. Not surprisingly, their collapse is also a central issue for the 9/11 Truth Movement."

Aside from Molé's annoying tendency showing up again in which he seeks to try to say what most people think, he also has mentioned the idea of a "collapse" twice within a very short period of time. The fact of the matter is that if most people are anything like me (and, they might not be), then just experiencing the sheer horror of observing the demise of the Twin Towers doesn't permit one to think about much of anything ... one's vision, hearing, emotion, and thoughts are almost entirely consumed by the physicality of what is transpiring and by the visceral understanding that there are thousands of human beings

whose fates are inextricably caught up with what is happening to those buildings.

Only later, after having watched the destruction of those buildings a number of times, does one begin to think and realize – at least, this was the case for me -- that one is not watching the collapse of two buildings but, rather, one is watching the disintegration of two buildings. At one moment, the buildings are there, and then inexplicably, much of the upper stories somehow seem to have become converted into a giant cloud of exploding dust spreading out from what used to be the central structure of the building.

One is not witnessing the collapse of two buildings. One is witnessing something else ... an exploding, disintegrating structure that is crumpling at free-fall like speeds.

If the theory of NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) which eventually surfaced were true and, as a result, the two Twin Towers were falling due to a progressive collapse set in motion by failing floor panels near the points of plane impact that had been weakened by fires, then one should have seen the ‘stutter’ behavior of the floors as they crashed down on the floors below and were resisted by those underling floors until the latter were, themselves, forced to collapse. This stutter behavior gives expression to the physical principle of the conservation of momentum, and it was nowhere in evidence in the videos of the disappearance of the Twin Towers on 9/11, but, instead, one is seeing structures weighing hundreds of thousands of tons disintegrate and crumple at near free-fall velocities.

If the Twin Towers were collapsing as the result of – once initiated -- a gravity driven event, one would not have seen multi-ton steel beams being ‘thrown’ some 300 to 500 feet in a lateral direction. If the Twin Towers were collapsing as the result of – once initiated – a gravity driven event, one would not have seen much of the buildings being reduced to dust as they disappeared.

The foregoing statements are true because, there is not sufficient energy available in a gravitational collapse to simultaneously pulverize such structures and cast out multi-ton steel beams hundreds of feet, while also causing floors to pancake their way down the height of the building. The physics being propagated by the engineers and scientists

at NIST in conjunction with the Twin Towers destruction is completely in error.

There is further evidence indicating the incorrect nature of the NIST characterization of the destruction of the Twin Towers. First, NIST had to fudge its final results by proposing scenarios that were complete distortions, if not fabrications, of the physical situation within the two Twin Towers on 9/11 and, in the process, made assumptions about conditions in the Twin Towers for which they had no, little, or only circumstantial empirical evidence. (For details that substantiate the foregoing assertion, please read the chapter: ‘The Two Towers’ in my book: *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2nd Edition*.) Secondly, NIST did not produce a final computer simulation that demonstrated how their model of events was precisely reflected in the actual observed conditions (whether through video or still photographs) concerning the destruction of the two towers.

Whatever happened to the Twin Towers on 9/11, NIST did not provide a plausible account of what transpired in relation to those events. Consequently, Molé’s use of the term “collapse” in relation to the Twin Towers is actually both misleading and unsupported by the available evidence.

Molé indicates that people in the 9/11 Truth Movement believe that the Twin Towers were brought down by controlled demolition. He, then, goes on to say that the reason why the people in the 9/11 Truth Movement think the foregoing is because the “collapse of the towers *looks like* the result of a controlled demolition.”

Once again, Molé seeks to homogenize the thinking of all people who reject the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 by claiming that they all share precisely the same opinion concerning the towers’ destruction and that the opinion that those individuals share is largely because the destruction of the Twin Towers “looks like the result of a controlled demolition.”

Actually, one of the biggest pieces of evidence that suggests that not all is well with the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 is the free-fall-like character of the disappearing Twin Towers. Whatever theory someone comes up with in an attempt to try to explain the character of the destruction of the Twin Towers,

one is going to have to be able to account for that free-fall-like quality, and the government pancake theory does not accomplish this.

Buildings that collapse through a process of floors that pancake on one another do not resemble buildings in free fall. The conservation of momentum that occurs in the former will result in a considerable set of delays in the collapse of the buildings as one floor crashes into the next in successive order ... temporal delays that are nowhere in evidence in relation to the destruction of the Twin Towers.

In a related point, buildings that are brought down through the pancake effect of one floor impacting on the floor below are not likely to come down in a symmetrical fashion as was observed on 9/11. For such an explanation to be plausible in conjunction with the pancake theory, one would have to explain how all of the structural features that support a standing building would come to fail at exactly the same time on each floor so that the “collapse” would have been smooth and symmetrical like that which is observed in the videos of the Twin Towers coming down.

The official, government conspiracy theory (as augmented by the various NIST reports) does not accomplish the foregoing. So, why does Molé assume that such a theory is correct?

According to Molé:

“The parts of the towers below the impact point do not begin to fall until the higher floors have collapsed on them. This is not what we would expect if the towers collapsed from controlled demolition, but it is exactly what we would expect if the building collapse resulted from damage sustained by the impact of the planes and subsequent fire damage.”

The author’s reason for saying the foregoing is that in controlled demolition: “... all parts of the building are simultaneously in motion, free-falling to the ground” but in the videos of the Twin Towers coming down one sees that, first, the upper floors of the towers above the impact points begin to fall, and, only then do the lower floors begin to fall.

To begin with, in the foregoing argument, Molé is working on the assumption that the reason why the Twin Towers came down was due to the combined effects of plane and fire damage. Molé's theory cannot be assumed to be true but must be shown to be true, and for many, many reasons, NIST was never able to plausibly demonstrate the truth of the claims inherent in the pancake theory, and, therefore, Mole's position is rooted in a set of problematic experimental simulations, along with a variety of analytical errors involving the interpretation of such simulations.

Just as importantly, while one might be willing to stipulate that the portions of the buildings that are at, or above, the impact points begin to move first, one does not necessarily have to stipulate that the upper floors then began to collapse on, and impact, the lower floors. If one follows Molé's advice in his article and closely examines the videos of the Twin Towers being destroyed, one sees that the portion of the buildings at, or above, the impact points, begin to disintegrate and explode.

How does a building that is just beginning to "collapse' due to the combined effect of plane and fire damage' suddenly explode with sufficient force to not only pulverize upper portions of those buildings but to rip apart and, then, hurl multi-ton beams hundreds of feet. Where does such energy come from? Certainly, this kind of energy could not be generated through the gravitational forces at work in an alleged pancake "collapse" that has been going on for less than a second, or so.

Moreover, if what the visual, video evidence seems to indicate is true – that is, the upper portion of the Twin Tower buildings are disintegrating and being pulverized in an explosively violent manner as they crumple – then, this raises a further question concerning the pancake theory. More specifically, how do we know there is sufficient mass left in the higher stories of the buildings following their rather explosively destructive beginnings to be able to bring about a progressive collapse in the portions of the buildings that are below the points where the planes supposedly impacted the respective towers?

Molé and NIST have made assumptions about what is going on in the upper stories of the Twin Towers when the buildings begin to fall apart. What and where is the evidence in support of those assumptions

– especially given the explosively anomalous character of the visual evidence with respect to how each of the buildings begins to come down?

The author of the *Skeptic* article claims that he can account for the differential nature of the way in which each of the Twin Towers came down – which in the case of the North Tower was, more or less, straight down, and in the case of the South Tower, the descent began by the upper stories of the buildings above the impact points twisting toward the point of impact. Molé says that the foregoing differences are a function of the way in which each of the planes impacted the respective buildings, with the plane that hit the North Tower supposedly hitting head on, while the plane that struck the South Tower sliced through the building in a downward angle.

If one closely watches the video of the South Tower, one does see the higher stories above the impact point begin to twist as Molé indicates. However, one also notices something else – namely, the twisting stops at a certain point.

The twisting refers to angular momentum. The question is why does that angular momentum suddenly come to an end since physics indicates that angular momentum is conserved and, therefore, will continue to move in the direction of the established trajectory giving expression to such a force unless acted upon by a some greater force ... so, what is the source of the greater force that suddenly comes into the picture and alters the character of the angular momentum in relation to the disintegrating upper stories of the South Tower and brings it to a halt?

Molé does not address the foregoing problem. Neither does NIST.

Moreover, with respect to Molé’s alleged ability to explain some of the observed differences in the way the two towers came down, one should note that his account – as does that of NIST -- rests on a large set of assumptions. These assumptions involve such things as: the extent and nature of the destruction caused by the plane impacts; the length, intensity, and location of ensuing fires, as well as the condition of fire insulation that had been affixed to the steel beams throughout the buildings.

NIST has made assumptions about all of the foregoing and has virtually no evidence to lend support to any of those assumptions. They ran experiments in their labs that they claimed simulated conditions in the Twin Towers, but their experiments were rooted in little more than relatively arbitrary assumptions that are highly questionable.

When Molé claims to be able to explain the differential character of the way in which the two towers came down, what he really means is that he has a theory about what caused those differences. However, neither Molé's theory nor NIST's theory concerning the destruction of the Twin Towers can plausibly account for: the near free-fall character of the disintegrating buildings; nor why angular momentum was not conserved in the South Tower once it began to twist; nor why the general principle of the conservation of momentum was not reflected in the manner in which the buildings crumpled; nor why the destruction of the buildings had an explosive character to them such that most of the buildings' structure and contents were pulverized, if not disintegrated; nor why multi-ton steam beams were thrown hundreds of feet in a lateral direction when, supposedly, only gravitational forces were at work; nor why there was a largely symmetrical character to the crumpling buildings; nor how – when experiments run by Underwriters Laboratories have proven otherwise – the floor panel structures allegedly failed and led to the progressive collapse of the buildings; nor why the debris piles for the two buildings were so small if they supposedly contained hundreds of thousands of tons of steel, concrete, and office supplies; nor why if the buildings contained hundreds of thousands of tons of material, virtually no damage was done to the so-called 'bathtub' structure – said to be relatively fragile -- that sits beneath the Twin Towers and keeps the Hudson from flooding into Manhattan; nor why so little damage was done to many of the stores in the shopping complex below street level and beneath the Twin Towers; nor why so little damage was done to the subway tunnels running beneath the Twin Towers when, supposedly, hundreds of thousands of tons of material was raining down on the ground surface.

Not everyone who takes issue with the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 necessarily believes that the Twin



Towers were brought down by controlled demolition. Those people who have questions about the idea of controlled demolition being 'the' reason why the Twin Towers came down – and I count myself among such people -- do so not necessarily because they have a demonstrable theory ready to offer that explains how the buildings came down, but because they have a fairly good idea – based on considerable evidence – about how the buildings did not come down, and, therefore, the search for a plausible explanation for what caused the destruction of the Twin Towers remains an open problem.

What people know who reject the official, government, conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 but who do not necessarily claim that controlled demolition is what brought the Twin Towers down (although it might have played some subsidiary role) is that NIST does not have a remotely plausible account about what brought the Twin Towers down because there are an array of essential questions that NIST cannot satisfactorily answer in conjunction with the destruction of those buildings – problems that were outlined previously in this essay. Furthermore, there is reason to withhold assent in relation to the idea of controlled demolition as being 'the' reason for the destruction of the Twin Towers – although it might have had a partial role – because there are a whole set of problems that the controlled demolition hypothesis cannot satisfactorily address – such as, why were the debris piles for the Twin Towers so small (and there are photographs that show the height of those piles prior to the point when evidence in a criminal case began to be hauled away), and given that hundreds of thousands of tons of debris supposedly rained down on the ground of the World Trade Center, why was there not more extensive damage done to the stores, subway tunnels, and protective 'bathtub' structure beneath the Twin Towers, and how did controlled demolition cause the 'dustification' of materials that has been observed in conjunction with the World Trade Center buildings that were destroyed, and how did controlled demolition bring about the strange 'toasting' effects that were observed in relation to hundreds of cars in and around the World Trade Center – cars that had missing engines and door handles and, yet, showed no evidence of having been on fire, and why were there strange circular holes – some of them quite big -- in and around Ground Zero (including in some of the smaller buildings in the Center) -- especially given that those holes

were not filled with any debris that might have caused such holes to appear.

By being unable to account for such empirical data, both the NIST perspective and the controlled demolition idea constitute either incorrect and/or incomplete theories concerning the destruction of buildings at the World Trade Center. Proper scientific procedure requires one to establish a framework that is capable of accounting for as much evidence as possible, and when some given theory shows inadequacies in this regard, then one must go in search of more rigorous, comprehensive, and nuanced accounts for what might have transpired on 9/11.

Many people who are under the influence of the ideas of NIST or the ideas of controlled demolition have more research to do. Neither position is adequate as it stands.

In his article, Molé says: “The 9/11 Truth Movement often states or implies that steel would have needed to melt in order for the structure to collapse at the speed of a free fall. While there are varying assessments of the temperature of the fire at WTC, most agree that the temperature probably reached 1,000° Fahrenheit and possibly higher than 1,800° F.”

Quite frankly, I don’t know of anyone in the so-called 9/11 Truth Movement who “states or implies that steel would have needed to melt in order for the structure to collapse at the speed of free fall.” Free fall and the melting of steel are two entirely different issues.

In order for free fall to have occurred in relation to buildings not once, not twice, but three times on 9/11 (i.e., World Trade Center 1, World Trade Center 2, and World Trade Center 7), there would have had to have been some set of forces that permitted those buildings to do an end around the physical principle that should have governed the “collapse” of those building if the official, government conspiracy theory is to be considered plausible – namely, the conservation of momentum. What does the issue of whether, or not, steel melted have anything to do with the issue of free fall since, for the sake of argument, one could stipulate that steel melted and still ask the question: how did melted steel enable the process of free fall?

Secondly, while Molé is correct that there are “varying assessments of the temperature of the fire at WTC”, he is quite wrong to claim that “most agree that the temperature probably reached 1,000° Fahrenheit and possibly higher than 1,800° F.”

Who are the “most people” to whom Molé is alluding? They are the people who accept the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 – that is, they are people who are inclined to go in search of data – and not necessarily evidence – that supports their conspiracy theory.

The reason why there are “varying assessments of the temperature of the fire at WTC” is because there is a lot of guessing and speculation going on concerning the character of the fire. Nobody in the Twin Towers on 9/11 was conducting precise measurements with respect to: where the fires were; how long they lasted; how intense they were; how effective the fire insulation and sprinkler systems were; how hot any of the external or core steel beams became; how hot the floor assemblies became, or what damage was done by any of this.

After the fact, and based on a few, limited samples from the Twin Towers, NIST made some conjectures concerning the possible temperatures of the fires and coupled this with some experiments that purported to simulate the fires in the Twin Towers. Those conjectures and experiments rested on a variety of assumptions ... assumptions for which there was little direct or indirect evidence to justify making them.

Extrapolations and interpolations of data were made and projected onto the events in the World Trade Towers. However, in point of fact, the people at NIST do not know precisely where the fires burned, or for how long, or how intensely, or with what effect.

The authors of the NIST reports did say that if the insulation in the buildings held and served the purpose it was intended to, then few, if any, of the beams would have been able to have been heated sufficiently even for substantial weakening of the steel to have occurred. As a result, NIST ran some experiments concerning the extent to which insulation on the steel beams might have been likely to be able to withstand impact by the planes, and, yet, the experiments they ran in this regard (shooting shotguns at steel beams covered with

insulation) are pure conjecture as far as trying to claim that such experiments simulated actual conditions in the Twin Towers.

Nonetheless, on the basis of their so-called simulation-insulation studies, the NIST engineers and scientists claimed that the impact of the planes would have stripped insulation from many of the steel beams and, as a result, left them vulnerable to the effects of fire. Molé adopts this same perspective when he argues in his article that: “The impact and explosion of the airplane crashes probably knocked off most of the insulating material intended to fireproof the steel beams”, but he fails to explain why his belief in this regard is “probable” ... although there is an allusion to an a priori sort of rhetorical question that says something like: “Doesn’t it just make sense that all of the insulation would have been knocked off the steel beams when the two planes collided with the two buildings? But, the fact of the matter is that the rhetorical question is a priori in character, and for anything of a definitive nature to be determined, reliable empirical data must be established.

Even if one were, for the sake of argument, willing to concede that the NIST simulation experiments involving the staying power of insulation were accurately reflective of what took place within the Twin Towers, -- and I do not concede this -- one also has to assume that the existing fires burned long enough and hot enough in precisely the right places to be able to weaken enough steel beams to initiate the sort of progressive collapse that supposedly occurred in relation to the Twin Towers.

NIST did run some experiments involving the spread of fires that it claimed simulated what took place in the Twin Towers. However, all of their experiments in this respect, together with their analysis of those simulated fires, are largely rooted in a variety of assumptions, speculation, and conjecture ... with precious little, if any, hard data to back up such flights of fancy.

Physical evidence indicating that intense, long-lasting, properly located fires (that is, in close proximity to steel beams stripped of their insulation) were actually occurring in the Twin Towers is largely non-existent. The fact of the matter is that aside from the first ten or fifteen seconds following the alleged impact of planes and the ensuing rapid burning of jet fuel, all visual and physical indications in relation to the

Twin Towers is that the fires were largely oxygen deprived – and, possibly, fuel starved as well -- and, therefore, not capable of reaching and maintaining the sort of sustained temperatures in any one place that would have been necessary to lead to an appreciable degree of vicoplastic deformation in any of the steel beams in a way that would be consistent with – but not necessarily, thereby, prove -- the official, government, conspiracy theory concerning the destruction of the World Trade Center buildings.

Some of the conversations between the command structure of the New York Fire Department and firefighters inside the South Tower -- the first building to “fall” even though it was the second building to be hit – were recorded. Those conversations indicate there were few fires in the building, and those fires were small, not intense, and could be easily knocked down.

Another factor to consider is that the Twin Tower steel structures were huge heat sinks. In other words, if one were to begin to heat a steel beam, there would be a tendency for such heat to be radiated out, or transferred along, the steel beam being heated as well as to other connecting beams, and therefore, in order to be able to heat the point of original contact to any appreciable degree, one would have to be able to sustain the heat for a fairly long period of time.

Temporarily reaching a certain temperature is not enough to be able to weaken steel. The requisite temperatures must be sustained for a period of time.

There really is virtually no evidence to indicate that the existence of such massive heat sink properties in the Twin Tower structures would have been able to be overcome by the fires that were observed to have existed in the two buildings. This statement remains true even if one were to concede that all insulation had been stripped from key steel beams – a concession that I do not make and for which there really is no evidence to warrant such a concession.

Molé goes on to claim: “Best engineering estimates tell us that steel loses 50% of its strength at 650° C. (1200°F.), and it can lose as much as 90% of its strength at temperatures of 1,800° F. Even if we assume temperatures of no higher than 1,000° F. during the fire, we still would have more than enough reasons to expect damage severe

enough to result in eventual collapse.” The foregoing claim is extremely problematic.

The author of the *Skeptic* article provides absolutely no information about how long a piece of steel would have to be heated at a temperature of 650° C. to lead to a loss of 50% of its strength. Similarly, Molé offers no information about how long a piece of steel would have to be heated at a temperature of 1,800° to lose 90% of its strength.

Moreover, Molé says nothing about the extent to which insulation might add to the amount of time that would be needed to weaken steel to either 50% or 90% of its original strength. As well, Molé says nothing how the sink properties of a piece of steel might affect the amount of time needed to heat an area of steel to the requisite temperature. And, finally, Molé offers absolutely no evidence to demonstrate how just the ‘right’ pieces of steel in the Twin Towers would have been raised to the necessary temperatures for the appropriate length of time to have been able to lead to significant weakening in such key pieces of steel that would have led to a progressive collapse of the buildings.

Even if one were to grant Molé every one of his points concerning the weakening of steel beams – and, again, I do not concede those points but believe them to be problematic in the context of the Twin Towers – nonetheless, none of this would necessarily prove that the weakening of steel beams would have led to a progressive collapse of the buildings. The fact of the matter is that NIST is playing some games of semantics with respect to its account of the destruction of the Twin Towers.

NIST never actually explains the “collapse” of the Twin Towers and states as much in its various communications to the public. The focus of their reports was to account for what might have initiated the set of steps that, eventually, led to a progressive “collapse” of the Twin Towers. So, to be precise, NIST is concerned with issues surrounding the initiating of such a set of steps rather than the actual nature of the progressive collapse.

However, even the theory of initiation is on shaky grounds. NIST presupposes that the floor assemblies in certain critical floors in the Twin Towers failed under the stresses created by a combination of

airplane damage and fires. This combination of factors tended to pull perimeter columns toward the center of the buildings and, this, in conjunction with some fire-weakened and sliced core beams, led to the collapse of the buildings.

Unfortunately, for NIST's theory, Underwriters Laboratories experimentally demonstrated that the floor assemblies in the Twin Towers would not have failed – even if the conditions in the Twin Towers were more severe with greater stresses than actual evidence indicated was the case. Therefore, a central component in NIST's theory has proven to be untenable.

Furthermore, even if, for purposes of argument, one were to grant NIST its entire thesis – despite the considerable evidence which serves to bring that thesis into serious question -- one still has difficulty understanding how such a set of initiating conditions would have led to what is clearly observable on video with respect to the demise of the Twin Towers. In other words, how does one go from: the NIST hypothesis concerning the initiating sequence, to: a free-falling building that exhibits no properties of pancaking and that is able to contravene principles of physics such as the conservation of momentum and the conservation of angular momentum and that is exploding and disintegrating in ways that a supposedly gravity-driven event cannot explain?

In the Molé quote given earlier, he stated: “Even if we assume temperatures of no higher than 1,000° F during the fire, we still would have more than enough reasons to expect damage severe enough to result in eventual collapse.” Actually, Molé has no justified reason for assuming that there were sustained temperatures of even 1,000° F. in the right places within the Twin Towers that were able to weaken certain steel beams in a way that would have led to the collapse of the buildings.

More importantly, even if one were to grant this point to Molé – which I don't – this is not enough of a reason “to expect damage severe enough to result in eventual collapse.” In fact, Molé cannot reasonably and plausibly demonstrate that even if such damage had occurred in the Twin Towers that this would have led to a progressive collapse of the two buildings. And still more importantly, if such damage had led to a progressive collapse, he cannot provide an explanation for why

the observed character of the destruction of the two buildings at the World Trade Center is so different from what his theory of progressive collapse would have predicted with respect to issues such as: the near free-fall velocity of the buildings; the explosive character of certain aspects of the fall; the way in which much of the structure of the building just disintegrates, and so on.

Molé goes on to argue that: “The expansion and warping of the steel would have been particularly significant due to temperature differences within the burning structure. Thus the trusses went limp much like a slackened laundry line, providing little or no resistance to the weight of the floors overhead.” I believe that it is quite symbolic for Molé to cite the source he does in relation to his claim in the first sentence of the quote above because the paper source that he references was written by two guys at MIT – namely Professor Thomas E. Eager and a graduate student, Christopher Musso – who dashed off a quick paper about what caused the collapse of the Twin Towers within a few weeks of 9/11 and did so with almost no empirical evidence to back up their claims ... Molé seems to have caught the disease in relation to much of what he has to say about 9/11.

Beyond the foregoing point, one might also indicate that Molé’s belief that the “trusses went limp much like a slackened laundry line, providing little or no resistance to the weight of the floors overhead” is not only contraindicated by the experiments run by Underwriters Laboratories concerning the viability of such trusses, but even if one were to concede Molé’s point in relation to a few of the floors of the Twin Towers, this offers absolutely no explanation for why at least 80 to 85 of the floors below the points of impact in the buildings would have gone “limp much like a slackened laundry line” when most, if not all, of those lower floors did not have any fires on them.

Next, Molé proceeds to the issue of Building 7 and intends to dispatch conspiracy theories concerning that structure just as he intended to do in relation to the Twin Towers, Since Molé wasn’t in the least successful in realizing his intention with respect to the Twin Towers, let us see if he fares any better in the matter of Building 7.

Molé wishes to argue that people from the 9/11 Truth Movement claim: “that any damage from falling debris from WTC 1 and WTC 2



would have needed to be symmetrical to trigger the pancaking collapse of WTC 7.” There are a number of problems in such a claim.

First, I know of no prominent, or non-prominent, person in the 9/11 Truth Movement who claims that falling debris from WTC 1 and 2 would have had to be symmetrical to trigger a pancaking collapse of WTC 7. Molé is confusing issues.

There are many people within the so-called 9/11 Truth Movement who point out that the demise of Building 7 is highly symmetrical in character and they wonder how this came about since no conventional theory of progressive collapse – such as the pancake theory – can plausibly account for such observed symmetry. In addition, there are few, if any, opponents of the official, government conspiracy theory who subscribe to the idea that WTC 7 was destroyed through a pancake collapse and, therefore, it really makes absolutely no sense to try to claim – as Molé does in the foregoing quote – that “Truthers” require debris falling from WTC 1 and 2 to land symmetrically on Building 7 in order to be able to trigger a “pancake collapse” to which few, if any, of them subscribe.

Molé continues with: “First, the fires burning in WTC 7 were extremely extensive, as Figure 3 shows.” Unfortunately, the figure that Molé displays in his article does not support his contention that the fires in WTC 7 were “extremely extensive.”

In the photograph accompanying the article, fire can be seen to be emanating from some of the windows on one floor, and there might be smoke coming from the windows of several other stories above the foregoing floor (in the photograph it is hard to determine what is going on in the floors above the one where the fire is flicking through the window), but this is not evidence of “extremely extensive” fires. In fact, all of the windows on the right side of the building in the photo are intact and not broken as one might expect if there were “extremely extensive” fires on the floors where there are, indeed, some fires ... just not “extremely extensive” ones.

Molé next quotes Richard Binaciski, a firefighter, as saying: “We were told to go to Greenwich and Vesey and see what’s going on. So, we go there and on the north and east side of 7 it didn’t look like there was any damage at all, but then you looked on the south side of 7 there had to be hole 20 stories tall in the building with fire on several floors.”

One might begin by noting that not even Molé's source – namely Richard Binaciski – substantiates Molé's version of things concerning the idea that fires were “extremely extensive” in Building 7. Mr. Binaciski speaks only in terms of fires being “on several floors” which hardly demonstrates that the fires were “extremely extensive”. In fact, Mr. Binaciski actually supports the position of many “Truthers” who Molé claims – and with whom he wishes to take issue -- have argued that while there were fires in Building 7, those fires were “isolated in small parts of the building.”

In addition to the foregoing point, there is also the issue of the 20-storey hole in the side of Building 7 that is mentioned by Mr. Binaciski. What caused that hole?

Molé alludes to falling debris from WTC 1 and 2 in relation to Building 7, as if the Twin Towers were right next to Building 7. The fact of the matter is that Building 7 is hundreds of feet away from the Twin Towers.

So, what caused a mass (or several masses) to have sufficient velocity to be thrown hundreds of feet from either of the Twin Towers and, then, cause the sort of damage to which the firefighter is referring with respect to the side of Building 7? If the demise of the Twin Towers is a gravity-driven event, where did the energy come from to hurl massive objects several hundred feet to do such extensive damage.

Better yet, can one necessarily assume that such damage was done by debris from WTC 1 and 2? Was the 20-storey gap filled with visible debris, and, if not, then, why automatically assume that the hole was created by debris from WTC 1 and 2?

Maybe the massive hole was created in some other way. Maybe, the existence of the hole constitutes an unsolved mystery. Maybe, Molé is just assuming his way to questionable connections that serve his biases.

Molé maintains that: “Video footage shows that when collapse occurred, the south wall of the building gave in first, which is exactly what we would expect based on the location of the most extensive damage.” Actually, video footage doesn't really show anything of the

kind since the first indication that Building 7 was coming down was a kink in the central portion of the roof structure.

Moreover, if what Molé claims is true – that is, the south wall of the building supposedly gave in first – then why is the fall of the building so symmetrical in character? Indeed, there is no observed, asymmetrical skewing of the falling building as one might expect if the building were simply beginning to crumble at its most weakened part on the south side.

In addition, one would like to know why, for at least several seconds, the building is in free fall? This point was acknowledged by NIST when a high school physics teacher, David Chandler, forced NIST to revise its report concerning Building 7 to reflect this condition of free fall.

Molé speaks about the 20-storey gash in one side of Building 7 in very limited terms. He doesn't say how deep the gash goes, and he doesn't say what damage has been done to the interior of the building – especially, the core steel support beams that run up the center of the building.

Consequently, anything he says about the condition of the interior of the building is really just speculation. So, how do we know that the 20-storey gap appearing on one side of Building 7 did enough damage to create conditions conducive to a progressive complex as Molé attempts to suggest is the case in his article?

Molé does say that: “Emergency response workers at Ground Zero realized the extensive damage to the lower south section of WTC 7 would cause collapse as early as 3 PM on 9/11.” Aside from wishing to know the identities of such workers so that they can be questioned in a transparent fashion, one also would like to know the precise character of the structural information that led them to conclude that Building 7 was going to come down?

Molé doesn't provide answers or corroborating information in relation to any of the foregoing matters. Consequently, why should either Molé, or the workers to whom he is referring, be believed with respect to these issues? Why isn't Molé more critically skeptical about the sort of information that he is putting forth in his article to support his position?

What is rather ironic with respect to the foregoing “explanation” in relation to the destruction of Building 7 is that in his article Molé is really only mouthing a provisional, preliminary hypothesis of NIST concerning the demise of Building 7 – a hypothesis that was being floated by NIST at the time that Molé wrote his article in 2006. The reason this is ironic is that NIST no longer believes that the gash on the side of the Building 7 had anything to do with its collapse and has come up with, yet, another fire-based theory – a theory that is replete with its own problems -- concerning the fall of Building 7, so, I guess that Molé’s ideas about what he believed brought down Building 7 are not as ‘proven’ as he seemed to suppose at the time he wrote his article.

In addition, given that NIST, by its own admission, now claims that its original ideas about how Building 7 came down were incorrect, and given that NIST’s current theory about how Building 7 came down was arrived at after only many years of rigorous analysis and experimentation – and, there are many problems still inherent in their present theory – then one would like to know how emergency response workers on 9/11 knew that Building 7 would likely come down around 3 PM in the afternoon after only a few hours of study and despite the “fact” that their structural investigation of Building 7 likely would have been interfered with by the “extremely extensive” fires that allegedly had been raging throughout the building on 9/11? Quite frankly, nothing about Molé’s account of what happened at, and to, Building 7 on 9/11 makes a great deal of sense, and one wonders why the editors of *Skeptic* magazine were not more, well, skeptical of his account?

Finally, Molé takes issue with the assertions of some of the people within the 9/11 Truth Movement who indicated that: “WTC fell straight down into a convenient pile” by claiming that, in actuality, the debris pile was 12 stories high and 150 meters across.”

Even if one were to accept Molé’s contention that the debris pile for Building 7 was 12 stories high – which is, I believe, a questionable estimate – nevertheless, one would like to know what happened to the material from the other 35 stories. Molé claims that the debris pile was distributed across a length of 150 meters, but he doesn’t say how wide or deep that 450+ foot debris pile is, and, in any case, given the nature

of the buildings crowded around Building 7, I am having some problems with figuring where over 450 feet of open space came from to accommodate the debris pile being described by Molé. The photographs that I have seen in relation to the debris pile for Building 7 do not correspond with Molé's aforementioned claims.

Moreover, even if one were to concede the accuracy of Molé's description with respect to the debris pile for Building 7 – which I don't -- that pile did not display evidence suggesting that a process of pancaking had destroyed the building. Like WTC 1 and 2, the debris pile for Building 7 gave little evidence that the structure had collapsed in the way indicated by the official, government, conspiracy theory, and, among other things, this includes the fact that there were no pancaked floors to be found in the debris pile ... a point that is totally inconsistent with Molé's theory about what brought Building 7 down.

The attentive reader will have noticed that I did not advance any kind of conspiracy theory in the foregoing with respect to how Building 7 came down. It is enough that evidence and arguments have been put forward that overwhelmingly indicate that Molé's account of what transpired on 9/11 is not capable of being evidentially or empirically verified, and, therefore, the problem of what happened to Building 7 – as well as WTC 1 and 2 – not only remains an unsolved problem, but, perhaps, more importantly, tends to point in a direction which indicates that the presence of crashing planes and ensuing fires are not sufficient to account for what brought down those three buildings in the way that is claimed – and required – by the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11.

The next section of Molé's article deals with the Pentagon. He begins by alluding to ideas that first appeared in the book, *Pentagate*, by a French journalist, Thierry Meyssan – a book that, according to Molé: "claims that the damage done to the Pentagon was too limited to have resulted from the crash of a Boeing 757."

Actually, the argument put forth in Meyssan's book is much more complex and nuanced than Molé suggests in the foregoing quote. In fact, *Pentagate*, includes a chapter by Pierre-Henri Brunel, an artillery officer and explosives expert who, among other things, served alongside of Norman Schwarzkopf during the first Gulf war and wrote an analysis for *Pentagate* that examined two pieces of evidence.

In the article by Brunel, the former artillery officer does not state that: “the damage done to the Pentagon was too limited to have resulted from the crash of a Boeing 757.” Rather, he breaks down the five video frames – that were anonymously released to CNN -- of something allegedly hitting the Pentagon on 9/11 and stipulates that: the nature of the ensuing fire-ball, its color, the presence of a vapor cloud, the speed and character of propagation of the ensuing shock wave, along with other features of that explosion could not have been caused by a commercial jet loaded with jet fuel and that the latter sort of event would have left an entirely different physical and visual signature than what was observed in the video.

Brunel distinguishes between a detonation and a deflagration. The former arises in conjunction with certain kinds of munitions, while the latter has to do with combustible materials such as the burning fuel of a jet plane engine.

According to Brunel, the 9/11 video of the Pentagon event gives evidence of a detonation and not a deflagration. More specifically, Brunel says that the evidence in the video, together with several other pieces of evidence, suggests that the form of munitions used in 9/11 Pentagon event might have been some sort of anti-concrete hollow charge.

One of the other pieces of evidence that led to the foregoing conclusion concerns the hole in the wall of Ring-C. Such evidence involved both the shape of, as well as the black smudge above, the hole in the wall.

Brunel discounts the idea (advanced by some) that the radome nose of a plane – a very fragile part made of carbon and housing electronic equipment -- would have been able to create such a hole or even would have been able to survive its alleged journey through the two outer hardened rings of the Pentagon structure. Instead, Brunel suggests that the structural character of the hole is consistent with the way in which a hollow charge detonation device would project a mixture of gas and melted materials – known as a ‘jet’ -- at several thousand feet per second and at a temperature of several thousand degrees and, as a result, be capable of penetrating multiple walls of a reinforced concrete structure like that in the Pentagon.

Moreover, he states that the black smudge above the hole is a signature of the foregoing kind of munitions, and that form of black smudge is not what one would expect from a hydrocarbon fire. If the latter had been the case, the whole wall would have been smudged with residue left by burning hydrocarbon fuel instead of just the area above the roundish hole. On the other hand, the smudge marks are quite consistent with what happens if an anti-concrete hollow charge had been detonated within the Pentagon.

Brunel indicates that in the sort of denotation device he is talking about, the melted material in the jet tends to travel further than does the gaseous portion of the jet. When those melted materials penetrate to their farthest point, they begin to cool and since heat rises, one is likely to find smudge marks like those observed in Ring-C of the Pentagon – that is, just above the point where the melted materials are cooling.

According to Brunel, a hollow charge device is intended to detonate inside of a building rather than at the point of impact. This idea is consistent with the testimony of April Gallop, a person with top security clearance, who was in the offices where the Pentagon event took place.

She has testified in a sworn video affidavit that as she touched her computer to turn it on, the entire room around her exploded. When she was able to gather herself following the explosion, she picked up her young infant who was with her and helped lead a number of other Pentagon employees out of the hole that had been created in the exterior façade of the Pentagon by whatever actually occurred at the Pentagon on 9/11.

She reports that the explosion knocked her shoes off and when she finally was able to walk out of the Pentagon in her bare feet, nothing that she touched with either her hands or feet was hot and there were no fires in the area. Furthermore, she states that she saw no plane parts, luggage, or dead passengers.

April Gallop also testifies that when she was in the hospital recovering from the ordeal, a number of men in suits visited her on several occasions and kept insisting to her that a plane had hit the Pentagon. However one wishes to interpret these interludes, they tend to border on the surreal especially given that those people weren't at

Ground Zero in the Pentagon when whatever happened, happened -- while she, on the other hand, was present and has testified to what she experienced on 9/11.

Molé states: "... the contention that no remains of Flight 77 were found at the crash site is simply absurd. Many pictures taken of the area around the Pentagon crash site clearly show parts of an airplane in the wreckage."

The many pictures taken of the area around the Pentagon do not show many parts of plane wreckage but, rather, keep showing the same few pieces. One would like to know where the rest of the plane is.

One can acknowledge that a few pieces of something are on the lawn outside the Pentagon, but with respect to those pieces that are sufficiently big enough to identify as possible airplane parts, those pieces don't actually match the color scheme and design that is found on American Airlines commercial jets -- and people have tried to match what was found in relation to the designs on the exterior of such planes and have come up empty. Furthermore, in relation to some of the mechanical plane parts that were found -- such as between Ring-C and Ring -D, there are a number of airplane technicians who have indicated that such parts are not consistent with a Boeing 757.

In addition, the latter plane parts should have had identification numbers that would have been logged into a record of the parts that make up any given plane. To the best of my knowledge, I have not seen any evidence that the plane parts found in and around the Pentagon have been proven to belong to the commercial jet that is alleged to have crashed at the Pentagon.

Molé tells about a blast expert, Allyn E. Kilsheimer, who, supposedly, was one of the first structural engineers to arrive at the Pentagon following the 9/11-event. According to Kilsheimer:

"I saw the marks of the plane wing on the face of the building. I picked up parts of the plane with the airline markings on them. I held in my hand the tail section of the plane, and I found the black box."

The telemetry from the black box found by Kilsheimer has since been analyzed by a variety of independent pilots -- both military and



commercial – and they have come to the conclusion that the telemetry has been fudged and does not reflect the actual physical conditions through which the claimed flight path supposedly ran. So, whatever black box Kilsheimer might have discovered, there are some very important questions about its authenticity.

Furthermore, one could take Kilsheimer at his word when he says that he saw some kind of striation marks on the face of the Pentagon. However, whether his inference is correct that what he saw was from the impact of a 757 Boeing jet is another matter, altogether.

Kilsheimer is described in the *Skeptic* article as a blast expert. This does not make him an airplane crash expert, and, therefore, he is not necessarily qualified to say, with any degree of certainty, whether, or not, the striation marks he saw were from a Boeing 757.

Moreover, neither Molé nor Kilsheimer indicate the height of the striation marks that supposedly came from the commercial jet. Although the official, government conspiracy theory maintains that the jet plane struck the first floor of the Pentagon, nevertheless, there are just too many facts that run contrary to such a scenario, not the least of which is that there is no indication on the Pentagon lawn that engines scraped along the grass as they would have had to do in order for the plane to strike the Pentagon on the first floor.

So, at what height were the striation marks that Kilsheimer claimed to see? In addition, one wonders what the striation marks would look like that came from a Boeing 757 that, allegedly, was flying at more than 500 miles per hour near ground level – a feat, incidentally, that is aerodynamically improbable, because of such physical phenomena as the ground effect, wing-tip vortex, drag-thrust problems, and the like.

In the foregoing quote, Kilsheimer claims to have “picked up parts of the plane with airline markings on them.” One would like to know what parts these were and what, precisely, the character of the markings were because anything small enough to be picked up by hand is not likely to contain enough information to be able to identify, with any degree of justification, such markings as being from American Airlines 77.

Later in his article, Molé quotes Kilsheimer as saying: "I held parts of uniforms from crew members in my hands, including body parts. Okay?" This statement gives rise to a few questions.

Given the extensive nature of the damage from the alleged plane impact and ensuing fires, one wonders how Kilsheimer was able to identify the uniforms as belonging to crew members from AA 77, or how he was able to identify the body parts as belonging to actual crew members of that Flight? Of course, he might point to the autopsy results that, allegedly, identified all the crewmembers and passengers from Flight 77 ... identifications that reportedly were based on DNA analysis.

The problem with the foregoing is that if one is going to accept the DNA, autopsy evidence as proof of the identity of the crew member body parts that supposedly were held by Kilsheimer, then one is also going to have to accept the fact that under a Freedom of Information Act, a former naval medical officer also found that none of the DNA analysis showed any evidence indicating the presence of Arab genetic markers among the dead bodies ... and, one might add to this, that none of the commercial flight manifests listing passengers that were released by the respective airlines - including American Airlines -- contained the names of any of the alleged hijackers.

One point that is not mentioned in Molé's article - and, it couldn't be since the evidence was unearthed several years after his article was written - involves some 10-12 witnesses - including two Pentagon police officers -- who have come forth with testimony indicating that the alleged flight path - recorded, supposedly, by the black box found by the aforementioned, Allyn Kilsheimer - that is being advanced through the official, government conspiracy theory concerning events at the Pentagon on 9/11 is incorrect. These witnesses all indicate - and have done so independently of one another - that the large jet which they saw head toward the Pentagon and disappear in a billowing, explosive cloud at the Pentagon approached the Pentagon on the north side of the Citgo station that, at the time, sat about a quarter of a mile away from the south west side of the Pentagon.

The foregoing is significant because the flight path being propagated by the official, government conspiracy theory has the plane approaching the Pentagon from the south side of the Citgo

station. Yet, the 10, or so, individuals who claim otherwise indicate that there was no other plane in the air at the time of the Pentagon event and that the plane which was in the air definitely approached the Pentagon along the north side of the Citgo station.

If the plane that those ten, or so, individuals saw actually hit the Pentagon, there would have been an entirely different *Pentagon Performance Report* than the one that was officially published because the angle of impact would have been much different than the one that was described in such technical detail in the aforementioned report. However, since no other plane was visible in the sky near the Pentagon other than the one that approached the Pentagon on the north side of the Citgo station, then how does one explain the character of the data in *The Pentagon Performance Report* that is based on the idea that whatever hit the Pentagon approached along the south side of the Citgo station?

Now, there might be evidence that is capable of showing that all of the foregoing questions might be answerable in a credible and plausible manner. However, such material is not in evidence in Molé's article.

What is troubling about Molé's allegedly skeptical approach to the issue of 9/11 is that it is so flagrantly biased and lacking in balance. In other words, he raises all manner of questions in relation to the so-called 9/11 Truth Movement – some of which are legitimate and some of which are problematic – and not one (not one) question is raised in conjunction with the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11.

I don't see the foregoing, uneven, skewed treatment of data as an expression of skepticism. Rather, I see it as the actions of someone who already has made up his mind about what the truth of 9/11 is and, as a result, fails to do due diligence with respect to all of the evidence that exists ... evidence which raises possibilities that, like Condoleezza Rice infamous statement at the 9/11 hearings, Molé has not even been able to conceive, let alone address.

Molé states that: "Much of [his] discussion has focused on explanations given by the 9/11 Truth Movement, but we should note that the explanations that they don't give are just as problematic. I have not been able to locate any significant discussion of al-Qaeda,

radical Islamic terrorists or the modern history of the Middle East in any of the 9/11 Truth Movement's writings."

All I can say is that Molé's inability "to locate any significant discussion of al-Qaeda, radical Islamic terrorists, or the modern history of the Middle East in any of the writings of the 9/11 Truth Movement writings" might be symptomatic of his inability to do research in general – at least as far as 9/11 is concerned. Without even straining myself, I can think of three authors who do not accept the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 but who have explored, to varying degrees, the topical areas to which Mole is referring.

These books were all written before Molé wrote his article for *Skeptic* magazine, and, therefore, they would have been available to Molé if he had made even a little effort with respect to following minimal standards for research. The works to which I am referring are: "*The War on Freedom: How and Why America was Attacked September 11, 2001*, as well as: *The War On Truth: 9/11, Disinformation, and the Anatomy of Terrorism*, both by Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed – released in, respectively, 2002 and 2005; *9/11 Synthetic Terror* by Webster Griffin Tarpley – originally released in 2005; and, finally, *Drugs, Oil and War* by Peter Dale Scott – published in 2003.

One can agree, or disagree, with the perspective of any, or all, of the foregoing books. This is not the issue.

The issue is this: Molé foregoing statement is simply wrong when he suggests that such writings do not exist. The only thing preventing him from locating such works is connected to his apparently considerable problems with knowing how to conduct research properly.

However, in another sense, Molé's complaint against the 9/11 Truth Movement in relation to al-Qaeda, terrorism, and a modern history of the Middle East is something of a rather gargantuan red herring. More specifically, Molé is basing his foregoing quoted statement on his belief that it has been proven that al-Qaeda was responsible for 9/11.

What is the nature of that proof? The FBI – both on its website and through its Director – have publically stated that it does not possess one piece of reliable evidence tying ‘Usama bin Laden to 9/11. The tortured confessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and several other detainees concerning the alleged operational details of 9/11 are tainted, highly suspect, and cannot be independently verified. None of the passenger manifests for the allegedly hijacked airlines contained the names of any of the alleged hijackers. The autopsy of airline passengers supposedly killed at the Pentagon did not contain any genetic markers indicating the presence of Arab passengers. The so-called video confession of ‘Usama bin Laden concerning 9/11 have been proven to be a fraud, and, furthermore, twice bin-Laden has gone on public record in newspaper interviews indicating that he had nothing to do with 9/11. The alleged phone calls from various passengers/crew members on some of the hijacked planes that supposedly identified a number of the hijackers– at least as far as their seat numbers are concerned – is of questionable authenticity since in relation to the phone technology existing at the time of 9/11, such calls could not have been made via cell phones, and the model of Boeing that supposedly hit the Pentagon did not carry air-phones (In fact, in the court trial of Zacarias Moussaoui almost all of the alleged phone “messages” involving passengers on Flight 93, which supposedly crashed in Pennsylvania, were discarded because cell phone records indicated that no connection with ground phones had been made during those calls). The provenance of the charred passports of several alleged hijackers found, respectively, in the vicinity of the World Trade Center and near the so-called crash site in Pennsylvania is highly questionable. A number of flight instructors of the alleged hijacker pilots independently indicated that the latter individuals did not have sufficient skill to be able to fly the Boeing jets in the manner that would have been required on 9/11. There is absolutely no evidence demonstrating how the “hijackers” allegedly gained access to the four cockpits, or overpowered the pilots, or prevented the pilots from sending a standard transponder number code (7500) indicating that the planes were being hijacked. The testimony of three FBI agents or employees: Colleen Rowley, Sibel Edmonds, and Robert Wright, all indicated that something strange was going on within the FBI and that the Counter Terrorism Unit in Washington seemed to be interfering in

on-going investigations. Three FBI agents gave testimony to a prominent lawyer, David Schippers, which indicates that the: date, time, place, and means of attack on 9/11 were known by a relatively large number of people within the Bureau prior to September 11, 2001, but nothing has been publically said about how this information was obtained and who, precisely, it was that supposedly was going to carry out the attack or why, if such information was known, nothing was done about it before the planes took off. There is evidence that at least 5, and possibly as many as 7 or 8, of the alleged hijackers are alive and have been living in various parts of the Middle East.

So, what is the evidence that al-Qaeda is responsible for 9/11? This question can be raised without having to presuppose that al-Qaeda is unconnected to 9/11, but rather the question is this: What is the evidence that they carried out the attacks on 9/11?

Skeptics like Molé tend to want to remain in attack mode. In other words, they want to keep pointing out shortcomings in this or that theory concerning 9/11.

However, when asked to do so, they cannot plausibly defend the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 because they really have almost no evidence to construct a rigorous, consistent, plausible account of the events of 9/11. In fact, the supporters of the official, government conspiracy theory can't even come up with a plausible account of the physical evidence in conjunction with the destruction of the Twin Towers, Building 7, or the damage to the Pentagon. People like Molé seem to want to follow the advice of former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara that he gave in the documentary, *The Fog of War* -- namely, never answer the question that is asked of you, but, rather, always answer the question that you wished you had been asked.

Those who support the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 -- that is, people such as Molé -- always seem to proceed by assuming that any criticism about that "official" theory must, in reality, be a question requesting such supporters to point out what is wrong with other conspiracy theories. In reality, the real questions of 9/11 are not about advancing a conspiracy theory of any kind, but, rather, such questions are entirely about the inadequacies inherent in the official government conspiracy theory -- inadequacies

that are never addressed but are, instead, turned around and converted into an attack on all -- to quote George W. Bush -- “outrageous conspiracy theories” – whether, or not, one is advocating such a theory.

The al-Qaeda angle concerning 9/11 that is mentioned by Molé in his article is, to a large extent, a red herring because the physical evidence associated with the Twin Towers, Building 7, and the Pentagon all indicate that even if one accepted every aspect of the official, government conspiracy theory concerning the identity of the alleged hijackers – and the official government conspiracy theory has not credibly proven any of this – nonetheless, neither the events at the Twin Towers and Building 7, nor the events at the Pentagon, can be credibly accounted for by citing merely damage from crashing planes, falling debris, or ensuing fire. Therefore, ipso facto, there is more to 9/11 than the official government conspiracy story would have everyone believe.

More specifically, there are crucial aspects of 9/11 involving three buildings in New York and one near Washington, D.C., which transcend the ability of 19 Arab hijackers – even if they were part of things -- to have orchestrated and that cannot be explained by crashing planes, falling debris, and/or fires. Consequently, before we move on to conspiracy theories involving al-Qaeda, radical Islamic terrorism, and the Middle East, why don’t we first explain what actually happened to the Twin Towers, Building 7, and at the Pentagon on 9/11 since the official, government conspiracy theory has not accomplished this in any rigorous, credible, plausible, or defensible fashion.

Molé started out his article by making a reference to a chant that some of the attendees at the weekend 9/11 conference being held in Chicago began to voice while waiting for the lecture hall to open. The phrase mentioned by Molé is: “9/11 was an inside job.”

The phrase is short, catchy, and easily lends itself to being chanted. I never cared much for the phrase because I felt it induced people to look away from the ‘what’ of 9/11 and become preoccupied with the ‘whom’ of 9/11. In turn, the issue of ‘who’ often, all too easily, leads to the formation of many conspiracy theories – the very thing that so many supporters of the official, conspiracy theory love to pick apart in one way or another – and, thereby, this tended to place people

who questioned the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 in a defensive posture where they were always required to defend this or that conspiracy theory rather than being able to concentrate on the inadequacies of the official, government position.

I believe this was a tactical and strategic mistake. Unfortunately, many of the people who did not accept the official, government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 fell into the same trap again and again, and, as a result, this has led to a great deal of lost time, resources, and traction with respect to reaching more and more people with respect to informing them about the inadequacies of the official, government conspiracy theory.

Consequently, in closing, I propose a new chant, if you will, in relation to 9/11. Instead of “9/11 was an inside job”, why not say: ‘T – Double S – Triple T’ stands for methodology ... (T)ake (S)mall (S)teps (T)o (T)he (T) ruth – for this is the essence of any reliable methodology. Why not take the advice of George W. Bush – and I was never a fan or supporter of his – and stop promulgating outrageous conspiracy theories and stick to the facts ... facts that demonstrate that the existing official, government conspiracy theory is not tenable, credible, or plausible? Once the true character of the events on 9/11 have been established in greater detail, then, we can take the next small step beyond that and, as a result, bring about a public investigation run by the people, rather than the government – an investigation that might be able to establish who actually was responsible for 9/11.

Evidence is not about: ideology, politics, religion, or philosophy. Evidence gives expression to the truth, and it is our task, both individually and collectively, to come to correctly understand the character of such data and, therefore, its significance in relation to developing increasingly accurate renderings of the truth in any given set of circumstances.

Skepticism can play an important role in the quest for truth. The problem is that for some people – such as Phil Molé and the editors of *Skeptic* magazine – they do not seem to be sufficiently skeptical about their own ideas concerning 9/11 and, apparently, feel they only have an obligation to critically examine the ideas of others in this regard. Physician, heal thyself.



-----

I sent a copy of the foregoing essay to *Skeptic* magazine. I still have not received any reply.



**6.) A Pseudo-Interlude with Matt Taibbi or Matt Taibbi's  
Derangement of Truth**

I was awoken early on the afternoon of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 by the ringing of my cell phone. Sleepily I picked up the device and said: "This better be good!"

The voice on the other end of the connection said: "Look out your window."

I stumbled from bed, staggered to the other end of the room, and there below me was a tall man walking back and forth on the sidewalk in front of my house. The gentleman was carrying a sign, but since I didn't have my glasses, I couldn't quite make out what it said.

I spoke into the phone that I had carried with me to the window. "Hold on a minute will you?" and then, I went foraging for my glasses, put them on, returned to the window, and studied the sign that the guy was carrying.

It read: "Whitehouse is clinically insane." At first, I thought the guy was a bit off in his sense of direction and believed he was in Washington, D.C., at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, rather than in Bangor, Maine.

I raised the window, and, yelled out: "Who are you, and what are you up to?"

The individual turned around, looked up and, after a brief pause, asked me: "Are you Anab Whitehouse?"

I nodded in the affirmative.

A smirk appeared on his lips. He pointed up at his sign, admiring it as he did so and, then, pointed to me and, then, toward the sign again. He said: "You're a nut job, Whitehouse" and continued on with pacing back and forth in front of my house in a leisurely manner.

I put the cell phone I had been holding in my hand back to my ear and said: "Look, I'm going to have to call you back. I have to go talk to the guy who is parading in front of the house."

I terminated the connection, threw the cell phone on the rumpled bedding, and looked around for some pants and a shirt to put on. I

pulled a pair of socks out of the drawer, put them on, and headed for the bathroom.

Turning on the sink faucet, I splashed some water on my face, looked in the mirror, and tried, as best I could, to get rid of the bed hair. The guy out front already thought I was a nut job, and, consequently, there was no point in providing him with circumstantial, visual evidence that might encourage him to believe that, perhaps, his diagnosis was correct.

I walked out of the bathroom, opened the bedroom door, skipped down the stairs leading to the landing below two at a time, slipped on my loafers hanging out near the bottom of the stairs, turned the knob for the front door and pulled. As I walked through the opening left by the ajar-door, I saw that the individual was still walking back and forth with his sign.

I headed down the walkway leading to the sidewalk and waited for the person to come back my way during his picketing rounds. When he reached me, I said: "Who are you?"

"Matt Taibbi," he explained.

The name didn't register. I shrugged my shoulders and asked: "So, who is Matt Taibbi?"

He stopped dead in his tracks and looked at me with a degree of puzzlement. "I write for *Rolling Stone* magazine. I was the winner of the 2007 National Magazine Award for Columns and Commentary. My father works for NBC. I played basketball overseas. I'm against the war. I've been interviewed by Chris Matthews. The *Los Angeles Times* thinks I'm hilarious."

"Wow," I said in mock admiration. "Why would somebody as famous and as well-connected as you want to walk back and forth in front of my house carrying a sign that says that 'Whitehouse is clinically insane'?"

He put the sign down for a moment, resting his hands on the top of the stick to which the sign was affixed, and said: "Oh, I wouldn't make too much of it. I sometimes write half-assed things and throw out offhand comments without putting a whole lot of thought into the matter. I admitted as much in my recent book: *The Great Derangement*."

“However,” he continued, “you must admit that your views on 9/11 are, well, ‘clinically insane’.

“Are you referring to my book: *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*” I queried?

He shook his head and said: “I didn’t know you had written anything on the subject, but I have heard from different sources that your ideas concerning 9/11 are certifiably insane, so, I thought I would come here and let other people know what kind of a neighbor they have.”

“Did you bother to verify any of the information you were getting from your sources concerning me?” I asked.

“Now, why would I want to do that?” he responded. “Everybody in the news business knows that if you have two or three sources confirming something, then that something is likely to be true. There is no need to do actual research ... Stephen Glass and Jayson Blair proved that ... and they were doing quite nicely with it until they were tripped up by a few inconvenient facts.

I looked around. Apparently everybody in the neighborhood was shopping, or doing something somewhere else, because no one seemed to be paying attention to what was going on.

I sighed. Motioning toward the open door of my house, I inquired: “Can I offer you a cup of coffee or a soft drink? Maybe, we could talk more about my sad condition inside.”

He started to walk with me toward the front door and, then, stopped. “This is not some kind of attempt to shut me up, is it?

“When we’re done inside, I’m likely to come right back out here and continue on with my exercise of First Amendment rights ... in fact, I’m liable to write a scathing, hilarious expose in some future edition of *Rolling Stone* – one dripping with sarcasm and populated by witty ways of framing what was said during our conversation. So, as they say in the military: ‘Be advised!’

“I’ve never tried to interfere with anyone’s First Amendment rights,” I indicated, “So I see no reason why I should start with you. If you want to continue on with your campaign against me after we talk, then by all means be my guest, but you should know that just as I previously indicated that I didn’t know who you are, most people in

the United States don't know who you are and don't really care what you have to say about much of anything ... so, if, and when, you write whatever you write, you are aware, I hope, that you are mostly just preaching to the choir and, really, that's all you are getting paid to do ... to write for a demographic that is resonant with your style of writing and which helps bring in the advertising dollars for your magazine ... and if you started to write things that were not amenable to your advertising patrons, you would be out of a job very quickly."

Matt gave me a look that seemed to suggest that the sign he had been carrying was right on the money. He pointed to the house and said; "If the offer still stands, I could use a cold drink. It's hot out here."

Quietly, we went into the house. I took him into the kitchen and said: "Have a seat."

While he was seating himself, I opened the fridge and quickly scanned the contents. I iterated some possibilities, and he selected orange juice from the list of choices.

I poured us both a glass of orange juice, added a few ice cubes, and placed the drinks on the table. I sat down opposite him.

We each took a sip, and, then I said: "So, what leads you to believe that I am 'clinically insane'?"

He moved the glass in his hands a little in the direction of the front of the house. "Like I said outside ... your views on 9/11. You're a conspiracy nut ... fringe city ... in outer space when it comes to rational thinking about the issue."

I angled my head in a sort of indication of incredulity and replied: "Since we've already established that you have not read my book, on just what are you basing your judgment concerning me?"

"Well, for one thing, you have been on American Freedom Radio several times being interviewed by Kevin Barrett, and everyone knows how I feel about Kevin's views on 9/11 ... in fact, I once wrote about Kevin Barrett on the *Rolling Stone* web site under the heading: 'The Most Obnoxious Thing On the Internet This Month' in relation to the Ground Mosque controversy. I'm tired of his 'lunatic-ass' views concerning 9/11, and I let everyone know as much."

I nodded my head and said: "Yes, I have been interviewed several times by Kevin, but what has that got to do with anything?"

Matt shrugged his shoulders. "You know what they say: 'birds of a feather flock together.'" He gave me a: 'I-rest-my-case-look'. "Kevin's a conspiracy theorist, and, therefore, this would lead one to assume that you are a conspiracy theorist as well concerning 9/11."

"Did you actually listen to what I said on any of those programs? I asked."

"Not really," he sniffed. "What's the point? You're all the same ... if a person has heard one of you 9/11 conspiracy idiots, then such a person has heard what you all have to say on the matter."

"Well." I began, "I hate to be the one to shatter the 'rules of engagement' section of your media guidebook, but there actually are a lot of different points of view concerning 9/11 that are being offered by those who seek to take issue with the evidentially challenged types who run the government and media ... you know, people like yourself."

I continued: "I will admit that there are some individuals who, for whatever reason, like to run with conspiracies, and, to be fair about the matter, one might remember that someone -- I forget who -- once said that not every conspiracy is a theory. Moreover, although conspiracies are hard to prove, there are criminal cases -- both federal and state -- that are tried and won every month of the year and those cases sometimes center on charges of conspiracy."

"So, as much as you might like to try to frame the idea of conspiracy as a sign of mental illness, there is, on occasion, more than a little truth in such ideas ... in fact, one might say that the U.S. government is an ongoing conspiracy in which people come together to push their respective agendas ... one might even say that the editorial board for magazines like *Rolling Stone* is an active conspiracy in which a group of people regularly get together behind relatively closed doors to discuss, explore, and implement editorial policy ... and all of this constitutes a set of activities that satisfies the basic conditions for qualifying as a conspiracy ... a legal conspiracy, of course,-- that is, unless, Matt, you know something about *Rolling Stone* that I don't."

"In any case, I'm not a conspiracy theorist of any kind -- especially in connection with 9/11. I have my views on 9/11, but they are almost

entirely about the issue of gathering, sifting through, and trying to evaluate the quality of evidence concerning what happened on 9/11.

“As far as Kevin Barrett is concerned,” I added, “I don’t want to speak for him. He has his own approach to things, and, if you want to engage him on the matter, he is quite capable of defending himself in a very articulate way. Have you ever sat down with Kevin and talked with him about 9/11?”

“No,” Matt said and, then, with a grin added: “But I did sleep in a Best Western Motel last night.”

“Priceless,” I replied.

Matt was silent for a minute. Then slowly at first, but picking up a bit of speed as he went along, he said: “I’ve read a letter of Kevin’s concerning the Ground Zero Mosque.” With pride, he noted: “How’s that for doing research?”

“Not very impressive,” I indicated. “One might hazard a wild guess that you were reading Kevin’s letter through the filters of a preconceived bias concerning 9/11. Research is when you actually investigate something with no preconceived notions and permit the facts to take you where they will. Have you ever done that in relation to 9/11?”

With a certain amount of constrained indignation expressed through slightly clinched teeth, Matt said: “Of course, I have!”

“Just to give you one example -- and you would know this if you had read my book: *The Great Derangement*, -- there were a couple of sisters from Dearborn, Michigan that I interviewed about 9/11. I mean, those two girls were sweet, college-educated, and were even pretty well-informed concerning America’s policy in the Middle East, but they were a couple of cult groupie space-cadets when it came to the issue of 9/11.

“They were just spewing out the conspiracy garbage. It was utter nonsense. I was shocked.”

“Gee,” I mused, “it must have been hard-hitting research like that which garnered you the 2007 National Magazine Award. “ I took a drink of orange juice and proceeded: “I’m not quite sure what you were so shocked about in relation to the young Lebanese women in Dearborn.



“It sounds like you felt that the two ladies were college-educated and had a good grasp of what was transpiring in the Middle East, and, therefore, you apparently believed they would agree with you on 9/11. When this was not the case, your sensibilities somehow went into shock because ...”

I left the question unanswered. I wanted Matt to fill in the blank in a way that would explain to me why he had such a sense of shock concerning the two young women and their views about 9/11.

“Well,” Matt replied, “I guess, I couldn’t believe the poor quality of their arguments. They seemed capable enough intellectually, and, yet, when it came to 9/11, their intelligence just seemed to be absent.”

I raised my eyebrows in surprise and said: “It is funny that you should say that because I was just thinking the same thing about you. You seem to be quite intelligent in so many ways, and, yet, when it comes to 9/11, your intelligence just seems to have gone on sabbatical.” I added: “You still haven’t told me what research you have done into the physical facts of 9/11, because what two, young, college educated, Lebanese sisters from Dearborn Michigan think about 9/11 – whether correctly or incorrectly -- really has nothing to do with forensic evidence concerning the events of 9/11.”

Matt waived his hand at me in a dismissive way. He paused for a moment and then said with some intensity as he kept jabbing his index finger toward me: “You know what I have discovered about 9/11? If there is one consistent characteristic of the 9/11 Truth Movement, it’s a kind of burning, defensive hypersensitivity and a powerful inclination to be instantly offended.”

He pulled his chair closer to the table and leaned in a little toward me. As he did so, he said: “Do you know that when I wrote a 9/11 anniversary column some time back and, in passing, just sort of threw in the phrase: “clinically insane” with respect to the 9/11 conspiracy people, I received all kinds of hate mail taking exception with my use of the phrase: “clinically insane” ... I mean ... talk about hypersensitivity and a willingness to be instantly offended ... who could have known that people might take exception to being talked about in those terms?”

He spread his hands in exasperation and added: “So, I lost my temper as a result of the sort of hate mail I was getting and taught them all a lesson by writing a column that trashed the 9/11 Truth Movement.” Grinning, Matt leaned away from the table.

Somewhat perplexed, I said: “So, let’s see if I understand what you are telling me. Are you saying that it is okay for you to pass judgment on people in a way in which you are neither clinically qualified to do, nor are you in a position to factually substantiate with respect to the millions of people who do not accept the conspiracy theory being offered by the federal government, and that it is okay to pass judgment on such people in a way that, as well, seems to be based on little more than your own ignorance concerning the actual facts of 9/11, and, therefore, you believe that other people should find it perfectly understandable why you would lose your temper over how a few people responded to you as a result of your unprovoked name-calling concerning a much larger group of them and, as a result, you were motivated to write a column trashing the 9/11 Truth Movement ... a motivation that was rooted mostly in your emotional invective, yet, somehow, it is the people in the 9/11 Truth Movement who have a “burning, defensive hypersensitivity with an inclination to be instantly offended”, while you are just being , what ... an ‘innocent reporter’? Have I got that about right, Matt?”

I went on. “Did it ever occur to you, Matt, that there is a huge differential in power between you and the great unwashed masses out there that you are so eager to trash? I don’t know what those people wrote to you, but if it is anything like some of the e-mail I get, then, I imagine that, on occasion, it is not very pleasant. So, I’m not condoning the nastiness that people can, and do, exhibit from time to time.

“However, the fact of the matter is, those people write to you as individuals ... individuals who, for the most part, have very little power and who might feel that the only thing they can do is vent and give you a piece of their mind and, perhaps, say things that they have no intention of doing ... although, of course, there is always a very real worry that one of them does mean what they say with respect to taking punitive action against you, and I empathize with you for that worry. Such problem cases aside, maybe if the people who write to you are really stirred up, they let a few other people see what they said to

that so-and-so, Mark Taibbi. There might even be a few of them who turn their e-mail into a blog entry and reach an audience of roughly ten or fifteen people ... or let's be generous and say a few hundred people.

“On the other hand, when you write something for *Rolling Stone* and, in the process, you vent your anger concerning those who have offended your sensibilities through their various written communications to you, then you reach hundreds of thousands – maybe millions -- of people. Isn't what you are doing a little like trying to wipe out all cats because a few happened to hiss at you? Wouldn't it be fair to say that your actions in this regard lack a certain amount of perspective, proportionality, and equanimity?

“Those people are quite powerless relative to you. Yet, by your own admission, you felt a need to exercise your considerable power to avenge what ... your ego? If you are trashing all 9/11 Truthers due to anger over what a few people said to you, then how much of your commentary is rooted in an actual concern for the truth of things?

“You likely would be critical of government officials if they abused their power in such a fashion with respect to the many powerless individuals they supposedly were serving ... powerless individuals who probably were upset with the officials because of the way the latter were arbitrarily and abusively exercising their power. Why do you seem to want to apply such a different standard to yourself – one which appears to say that it is okay to take advantage of your power and be abusive toward a large collection of mostly powerless people who never bothered to contact you just because there were a few individuals, relatively speaking, who angered you?

“Whether, or not, those people in the 9/11 Truth Movement know what they are talking about, those people are not the issue. It is the facts, and only the facts, of 9/11 that have any probative value ... facts about which I still have not heard any indication from you that you have even the flimsiest of acquaintance with.”

He was silent for a minute as he studied his hands. Eventually, he said: “You are quite wrong in your assessment of me. I have a great deal of knowledge about 9/11.”

He paused for a few seconds and, then, continued with a question: “Did you know that I actually had a face-to-face encounter with Nico

Haupt, the so-called mad genius of the 9/11 Truth Movement? Not only that, I have read some of his blogs concerning 9/11 and found them to be laughable masterpieces of conspiratorial paranoia and unintentional comedy ... pieces replete with acronyms like LIHOP (let it happen on purpose) and MIHOP (made it happen on purpose) ... so, don't go telling me that I haven't done my homework."

Matt glared at me for a few seconds. He proceeded with: "I should have been given a Purple Heart for my encounter with Herr Haupt. He kept spitting on me, and I told him to stop it. When Haupt wouldn't stop spitting on me and wouldn't let me or anyone else at the restaurant table get a word in edgewise, I challenged him to take our 'disagreement' outside, but the little weasel just slithered uptown away from me."

I intervened and asked: "Did you challenge the young ladies in Dearborn to a fight as well?"

"Nah," Matt said. "I knew I could beat up on them pretty good in my book ... so, there was no need for any physical, rough stuff when I talked with them."

"You're a fearless warrior for the truth, aren't you, Matt?" I said. "No, wonder, so many people seem to consider you a hero."

A small flash of annoyance rolled across his face. "Look, all I was trying to explain to those two girls in Dearborn, as well as Herr Haupt and the other straggly looking 9/11 protesters at the table in the restaurant in New York, was that there was no concrete evidence that the government had orchestrated the 9/11 attacks. However, no matter what I said, they just came back with some other sort of conspiratorial nonsense."

Peering down at the top of the table, he shook his head a little. "It was kind of sad, really, because most of the people with whom I talked in relation to the 9/11 issue seemed to be decent human beings. But they couldn't answer any of my questions such as: 'Why would the government plan such an operation and, then, spill the beans through some document written back in the 1990s (i.e., the Project for a New American Century) by calling for a 'new Pearl Harbor' to galvanize the American public to support the agenda of the neo-cons? Why shoot a missile at the Pentagon and call it a commercial jet? Why crash a plane

in the middle of an empty field in rural Pennsylvania? Do they really think that local television stations are in touch with the government to coordinate censorship concerning 9/11?"

He took a long drink of orange juice. When he had momentarily quenched his thirst, he said: "I wrote a little parody of the whole issue in my book: *The Great Derangement*, and I had all of the alleged inside jobbers – you know, Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and the rest of the gang – get together in a pre-9/11 conspiratorial-like meeting to strategize about all of the ridiculous things that the conspiracy theorists are spouting nowadays just to point out how stupid the whole idea was."

Matt gave a sigh of exasperation. "The irony of this whole thing is that I believe that the entire Bush government was totally inept and corrupt for a whole set of legitimate reasons. Those people in the Bush gang are quite capable of hanging themselves all on their own in relation to any number of matters, and, consequently, there is no need to go inventing conspiracy fantasies concerning 9/11."

I waited to make sure that Matt had finished saying what he wanted to. When I was convinced this was the case, I began to respond to some of what he had related to me.

I began with: "I don't know Nico Haupt, and, furthermore, he doesn't speak for me, anymore than Kevin Barrett or the two Lebanese sisters in Dearborn, Michigan, or anyone else you care to mention speaks for me. This doesn't mean that I necessarily would reject what they have to say, but, whether, or not, I would agree with them would depend on what it is that they had to say and whether, or not, I feel the available evidence and/or my own experience supports their words.

"The same is true with respect you, Matt. I don't know you, and whether, or not, I would agree with your claims depends on the nature of what you have to say. For instance, I might agree with you that many so-called 9/11 Truthers have had a difficult time constructing anything more than a circumstantial case concerning the connection between Bush, et al. and their alleged complicity (active or passive) in the events of 9/11, and, as a result, there are a plethora of theories floating about concerning who was involved in 9/11 and why ... and, yet, there is precious little hard evidence concerning such matters.

“On the other hand, I’ve never been much interested in the who of 9/11 since whoever they are – Muslim and/or non-Muslim – they are deserving of everyone’s condemnation. As I stated earlier, I have been more focused on the ‘what’ of 9/11 ... that is: what is the available evidence, and what is the best way to evaluate that evidence, and what does that evidence entail, and what is the next step in the process once certain evidence has been established and substantiated?

“What you have said to me tends to suggest that you have talked with a fair number of people and that, to a degree, you have reflected on those conversations and, as a result, have come to the conclusion that there is nothing which you have seen, heard, read, or thought that demonstrates that the events of 9/11 were anything other than what the official government conspiracy theory states – namely, that 19 Arab hijackers conspired with Osama bin Laden to orchestrate the events of 9/11. However, what you have said to me also tends to suggest that you haven’t done a lick of independent investigation into the nuts and bolts of accounting, in a plausibly and rigorously defensible way, for how – technically speaking -- the Twin Towers or Building 7 came down or accounting for what happened at the Pentagon.

“You have given no indication in anything that you have said to me that suggests: you have gone through the NIST reports concerning the Twin Towers and Building 7; or, that you have a working knowledge of *The Pentagon Performance Report*; or, that you have done any independent research concerning an array of technical matters and hard evidence that entail facts that are contrary to the ones that are expressed through those reports; or, that you have done any of your own thinking with respect to such matters.

“For instance, you might be surprised to find that April Gallop, who at the time of 9/11 had top security clearance, was in the offices at the Pentagon where ‘the event’ took place and has since given sworn testimony that within minutes after ‘the event’ took place there were: no fires, no plane, no luggage, and no dead passengers to be found as she led a number of people out of the Pentagon through the hole created by ‘the event’. You might also be surprised to learn that ten, or so, people have given testimony – including three members of the Pentagon Police and an individual connected with the Naval Annex

-- that the plane which, allegedly, hit the Pentagon did not follow the flight path indicated in *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

“The Pentagon report claims that the flight path would have been to the south of the Citgo station that is situated about a mile from the Pentagon’s west façade. Nonetheless, there are a considerable number of people – and I watched them in the process of recounting their testimony -- who had clear vision of the entire west side of the Pentagon and who have stated, in no uncertain terms, that the flight path of the plane they saw was on the north side of the Citgo station and, therefore, completely inconsistent with the claims of *The Pentagon Performance Report*. In fact, if the plane they saw heading toward the Pentagon actually struck the Pentagon, then the entire description of the damage given in *The Pentagon Performance Report* has been completely fabricated.

“The people giving the foregoing testimony saw the plane head toward the Pentagon, and, then, when the plane was at the Pentagon, they saw an explosion, and, then, the plane was gone. They saw no other planes approaching the Pentagon at the time of the explosion, and, therefore, what they saw in relation to a commercial jet flying toward the Pentagon was completely inconsistent with the government report.

“Now, I understand there supposedly were many other eyewitnesses who claim that they saw a commercial jet fly along the flight path indicated in *The Pentagon Performance Report*. However, I have never seen any of those people give testimony and describe in detail what they saw ... I have just heard it alleged that such is their testimony.

“More importantly, I have never heard anyone give a plausible explanation for why there are such discrepancies in eyewitness testimony between those who dispute the government version of things and those who support the government version of things. Is everyone wrong? Are only some people wrong, and, if so, which ones and based on what evidence?

“The one thing that I do know is this: All of the individuals who indicated that they saw a plane fly toward the Pentagon on the north side of the Citgo station are independently supported by a great deal of information that has been forthcoming from a variety of commercial

and military pilots concerning the aerodynamic problems associated with a flight along the path that is cited by the government, whereas none of the people who reported seeing a plane fly along a flight path to the south of the Citgo station have any such aerodynamic data to back them up except the telemetry readings provided by the government.

“The aforementioned group of pilots has indicated that the claimed flight path of the plane that was given through *The Pentagon Performance Report* was not aerodynamically feasible. The lack of feasibility is due to, among other things, g-forces, wing-tip vortices, the ground effect, various obstacles on the ground, and so on. Consequently, they believe that important data – for example the telemetry from the black box of the plane that allegedly hit the Pentagon – might have been fudged in the aforementioned report. (See Chapter 3 entitled: ‘Black Box Operations’)

“In addition, every part of any given plane has a number associated with it that is recorded in a log for each of those planes – whether private, commercial, or military. Unfortunately, there has been no transparently verifiable process that has demonstrated a proper matching of plane parts and logbook numbers for any of the four flights that supposedly went down on 9/11.

“Or, you might be surprised to learn that NIST’s theory for the collapse of the Twin Towers hinges on the idea of failing floor assemblies that, supposedly, initiated conditions that led to a global collapse of the Twin Towers. The only problem with the NIST theory is that Underwriters Laboratories empirically demonstrated that those floor assemblies would not have failed even if they had been subjected to conditions far in excess of the stresses that are likely to have existed on 9/11 in the Twin Towers.

“Moreover, you might be surprised to discover that David Chandler, a high school physics teacher from New York, forced NIST to amend its report on Building 7 and, in the process, acknowledged that there was, at a minimum, several seconds of free fall that took place during the demise of Building 7. This is something for which NIST has absolutely no explanation and that only makes sense if one understands that something eliminated the thousands of tons of iron and concrete building materials that otherwise would have served up



resistance to the alleged progressive collapse of the upper floors of the building as they crashed down on the lower floors.

“Furthermore, a growing number of architects and engineers have also established, in many different ways, that the NIST reports cannot withstand rigorous critical or empirical scrutiny. For example, NIST authorities have developed no plausible model to explain the virtually complete disintegration – not collapse – of large portions of the Twin Towers that has been recorded in videos that almost everyone in America, if not the rest of the world, has seen.

“There are many, many, many more hard, physical facts of the foregoing kind that could be cited in relation to the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in conjunction with 9/11. None of them can be adequately accounted for by the official government theory concerning that day.

“There is no mention of government conspiracy in any of the foregoing. It is all about a person’s or an organization’s or a government’s or a media outlet’s ability to establish verifiable facts ... and, in this case, neither NIST nor *The Pentagon Performance Report* is able to accomplish this in relation to 9/11.

“Just as you have argued, Matt, that there is no plausibly reliable body of evidence that convincingly ties Bush and company to the orchestration of the 9/11 tragedy, there also is no plausibly reliable body of evidence to tie Bin Laden or any of the alleged 19 hijackers, to the manner in which three buildings disappeared in New York on 9/11 or to the story that the government is trying to propagate in relation to the events at the Pentagon on 9/11 – that is, one cannot explain what caused the World Trade Center buildings to disintegrate by trying to argue for some scenario involving planes and/or fire (because the evidence does not support such an assertion), nor can one explain what happened at the Pentagon by trying to claim that a commercial jet hit the building in the way the Pentagon report has stated.

“A number of controversies have arisen in the so-called Truth Movement in conjunction with trying to explain just how what happened on 9/11– namely, the disappearance of three buildings in New York and the damage at the Pentagon -- actually took place. However, none of these controversies undermine the basic issue: There are many, essential, unanswered questions concerning the

events of 9/11 and that the account given by the government, at best, is terribly incomplete and, at worst, is totally indefensible.

“I don’t have to speculate about why the government wants to tell the sort of problematic story that they do in relation to 9/11. What I do know is that the facts of the matter do not corroborate their position vis-à-vis the destruction of the three buildings in New York or the damage to the Pentagon on 9/11, and, therefore, the government’s account of what transpired on 9/11 is unacceptable. The alleged actions of the so-called 19 hijackers – even if one were, for the sake of argument, prepared to grant that those individuals were somehow involved in the events of 9/11 (and there is much to indicate that such a concession is not necessarily warranted), their collective actions on that day could not have brought down the three towers in the way the government wishes us to believe, nor could their actions have caused what took place at the Pentagon.

“Now, Matt, maybe you’re the sort of guy who would be willing to take the government at face value, but you have indicated in a variety of ways that you believe the government lies about an awful lot of things. I bet you even said as much in your book *The Great Derangement*. Consequently, I find it rather curious why you believe the government is telling the truth about 9/11 ... especially given the extensive amount of hard, physical evidence that is available to indicate that the government did not tell the truth about almost anything concerning the events of 9/11.

“If you actually had done real research into the essential facts of 9/11 instead of interviewing a few hapless individuals whom you believe to be wanting in various ways and, as a result, concluded that because those people can’t answer your questions, then therefore, you must be right about everything in relation to 9/11 and, consequently, there is no need to actually do any real research into the matter, then, you might have had a little more compassion for some of the members of the so-called 9/11 Truth Movement who were disappointed in what you had to say concerning 9/11. If you actually had done real research concerning 9/11, then instead of getting angry toward them and trashing them, you might have tried to artfully educate them -- and, dare I say it, yourself -- to find better, more defensible ways of searching for the truth.

“By failing to display any evidence that you are actually familiar with the real issues of 9/11, I feel you might be a deserving candidate for the Blair/Glass memorial award for reporters who can’t be bothered to treat their readers, viewers, and listeners with any degree of respect and, as a result, fail to display an inclination to dig for real evidence in conjunction with 9/11 ... deserving individuals who would rather write the sort of stuff that can be made up out of their imagination without having to consult the facts. However, I wouldn’t get your hopes up for winning the award since in the matter of 9/11 you have a lot of competition from your colleagues in relation to that award ... people with names like: Keith, Brian, Chris, Joe, Mika, Ed, Chuck, Savannah, Richard, Jonathan, Lawrence, Dylan, Pat, Mike, Katie, Charles, Joan, Dana, Howie, Cal, Thomas, Eugene, Anderson, George, Dianne, John, Rachel, David, Fareed, Andrea, Bill, Sean, Glenn, Geraldo, Greta, another Chris, another Charles, another Bill, Morley, Steve, Bob, Lesley, Scott, Lara, another Mike, Dan, Charlie, Rush, Wolf, Neil, Katrina, Amy and others.

“Oh, come on,” Matt said with indignation. “You surely can’t suppose that all of the people you mentioned are somehow culpable with respect to 9/11.

“With respect to perpetrating the acts of 9/11,” I asked, and, then, I answered: “No.” Then, continuing on, I said: “But with respect to perpetuating falsehoods concerning the perpetration of 9/11, most definitely ... they are all – each and every one of them – guilty of that offense ... although whether they did so knowingly or unknowingly is a separate matter.

“Matt, neither you nor any of your media cronies have given the slightest bit of credible evidence that either individually or collectively you have studied, analyzed, reflected on, and evaluated any hard data concerning 9/11. Many of you tend to use a priori and ad hominem arguments in your presentations concerning 9/11 ... as a result, many of you are inclined to let fly with pejorative names like: “nut job”, “wing nuts”, “clinically insane”, “conspiracy whackos”, “lunatic fringe” and so on in an attempt to marginalize what people have to say about 9/11, and, in addition, many of you use techniques of undue influence - - such as the way in which you frame issues in unflattering and biased ways with respect to the manner of presenting 9/11 material – in

order to discredit people before anyone hears what they have to say. You make sure that whatever discussion occurs is not open and free flowing but closed and managed by people with specific biases concerning 9/11.

“I have heard Chris Matthews say on several occasions that the Jersey girls have let their grief for their September losses overshadow good judgment, and, as a result, this has prevented them from letting go of their questions concerning 9/11. It never seems to occur to Chris – the great media guru that he apparently believes himself to be – that the questions that the Jersey girls have concerning 9/11 are concerns that are, in many ways, quite independent of their grief ... their grief started on September 11, 2001, but their questions are the result of research and evidence rather than the result of being emotionally distraught. Meanwhile, Chris feels he has been able to move on with respect to 9/11, and his ability to do this is precisely because he hasn’t done any original research into the actual physical evidence entailed by 9/11.

“What are you media people basing your opinions on with respect to 9/11? Your opinions are largely driven by a priori considerations ... you’re like Noam Chomsky who has said on a number of occasions that he buys the conspiracy theory that 19 hijackers conspired with ‘Usama bin Laden to attack the United States on September 11, 2001 because no one could keep the sort of secret that is being alluded to. This is not an argument based on evidence, but, rather, it is an argument based on a priori theories about what Noam believes can and can’t happen in the world.

“Even in the context of such an a priori, non-evidentially based theory, Noam is wrong in at least two major ways. First, there have been historical precedents for thousands of government employees keeping secrets from the American public ... the Manhattan Project being one such example, but there are many others instances of this that have occurred within the military, the CIA, NSA, and the FBI – secrets that were kept for a long time before coming to the surface much later. Secondly, and, perhaps, more importantly, Noam seems to be unaware that there have been quite a few whistleblowers who have come forth to try to inform the public about 9/11, but those individuals have been muzzled by the government in a variety of ways

... and just to refer to a few of these individuals, one might mention: April Gallop, several Pentagon police officials (William Lagasse and Chadwick Brooks), Robert Wright, Sibel Edmonds, Indira Singh, Colleen Rowley, Anthony Shaffer, three FBI agents who came to David Schippers indicting that there was widespread foreknowledge within the FBI of the date, time, place, and means of attack in relation to 9/11, as well as five air traffic controllers from Boston whose testimony was destroyed by a superior who claimed that the individuals were distraught over 9/11 and didn't understand what they were saying.

"Matt, you seem to think that just because you have raised some questions that no one can answer to your satisfaction, you have solved the problem of 9/11. The fact is, one could acknowledge that all of your questions concerning 9/11 are fairly legitimate questions for which, at some point, there might, or might not, be plausibly verifiable answers, but the level toward which your questions are being directed has little probative value concerning the most important questions an investigator could and should be asking concerning 9/11.

"More specifically, before you ask about who did something or why they did it, why not try to find out what actually happened? Once you have done that, then you are in good evidential position to try to determine if those facts carry any implications for the idea that if the alleged 19 Arab hijackers were, indeed, part of some plot on 9/11, is there anything in the evidence to suggest that they did not act alone – in other words, is there any evidence to indicate that more people than those 19 individuals were needed to, say, bring down the Twin Towers and Building 7 or to bring about the destruction at the Pentagon?

"You can't answer those questions until you stop basing all of your 9/11 thinking on ad hominem, biased, filtered, manufactured, a priori arguments. You can't answer those questions until you start looking at actual physical data concerning 9/11 ... something that, by all appearances, you, and all the other media-types I mentioned earlier, have not done.

"You people in the media talk among yourselves and have come to the conclusion that there is nothing more to 9/11 than meets the eye. Your evidence for coming to such a conclusion is – surprise, surprise -- that you have talked about it among yourselves through largely a priori and ad hominem arguments, raised a few unanswerable

questions that are irrelevant to the physical evidence, talked to a few so-called experts who have said things that you have not independently verified for yourself, and, then, they have proceeded to hermetically seal the 9/11 discussion within the bubble of their own collective ignorance.

“Or, maybe some of you in the media believe that the 9/11 Commission proved what went on during 9/11. Oddly enough, the 9/11 Commission has almost nothing to say about the physical evidence of 9/11. In fact, they don’t even mention Building 7. So, aside from all the many problems inherent in that flawed commission process (such as: (1) giving extensive space to the un-cross-examined, third-party representations of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed’s alleged confession concerning 9/11 after only 180+ water-boardings, together with (2) an executive director – namely, Philip Zelikow -- who was not forthcoming about his extensive conflicts of interests prior to being hired and who, once hired, wrote a draft of *The 9/11 Commission Report* before deposing even one witness), the 9/11 Commission Report is useless when it comes to determining what brought down the Twin Towers or Building 7, or what actually happened at the Pentagon, or even what happened in Pennsylvania; and, therefore, if the ideas that the media has concerning 9/11 are based on *The 9/11 Commission Report*, then, the ideas of such media individuals are almost entirely rooted in irrelevant opinions and ideas even as such people try to act as if they have the inside scoop on 9/11.

“You – that is, the media as a collective group -- should be ashamed of yourself for perpetrating such a scam on the American people. However, if you had the decency to even feel shame with respect to what you have done, and failed to do, in relation to 9/11, you probably would have had the decency to actually rigorously investigate 9/11 to begin with instead of just drawing paychecks and building careers for, among other things, perpetuating falsehoods concerning 9/11.

“What the media has, and hasn’t done, in relation to covering 9/11 is not a conspiracy. It is a collective failure and a testimony, individually speaking, to incompetence, cowardice, or some combination of the two when it comes to searching for the truth in relation to 9/11.

“The media’s failures with respect to 9/11 – both individually and collectively – have played significant roles in helping to get over 5,000 U.S. soldiers and tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of Iraqis and Afghani citizens killed for no good reason ... as if there ever would really be a “good” reason for getting such people killed. For, whatever the mistakes, crimes, or misdemeanors of this or that government official might be with respect to 9/11, one can place a great of the responsibility for many of the horrible things that became possible after 9/11 right at the feet of the media ... horrible things that might have been avoided if the media had done its job properly in relation to the events of 9/11.

“Now, Matt, if you want to take our differences outside, we can certainly do that if that is the only way you know how to handle such matters – and if it is, then I would suggest you might consider getting some anger-management counseling -- but your pounding me with your fists or your words is not going to change the truth in relation to your ignorance about 9/11.”

Looking at his empty glass, I said: “You want anything more to drink before going outside?”

-----

I sent a copy of the foregoing material to Matt Taibbi. I didn’t hold out much hope that he would become aware – to some degree – of my e-mail to him, and, moreover, I hardly dared entertain the possibility that he might actually respond to my overture.

However, a week, or so, later, I received an e-mail from him. It was very brief.

With a modicum of sarcasm, Mr. Taibbi indicated that I was right and that I had all the answers. However, in saying this, Mr. Taibbi actually missed the entire purpose of my literary exercise.

I am not the one who claims to know what took place on 9/11. Matt Taibbi (along with others within the media, the government, and academia) is the one who is making such assertions.

I am merely asking questions and would like people such as Matt Taibbi to provide me with credible, plausible answers. He hasn’t done this ... nor have his brothers and sisters in the media at large done so.

In a classic case of projection, Mr. Taibbi's way of responding to my essay about him was to try to assert that I am the one who is claiming to have all the answers. In truth, what I am saying is that Mr. Taibbi has few, if any, of the answers, and his inability to provide satisfactory answers in conjunction with such questions demonstrates as much.

In his short e-mail to me, Mr. Taibbi also wished me good luck in getting someone to publicize my essay. Well, Bilquees Press has leaped to my defense in this regard, and I am sure that Mr. Taibbi will find this a very gratifying piece of news ... obviously, his wishes of good luck concerning this was the force that turned the tide.



### **7.) New Rules for Bill Maher**

#### Preliminary Remarks

I have heard that Bill Maher is a member of the advisory board for Project Reason. Project Reason is the name of a foundation that seeks to promote scientific knowledge and secular values within society.

I find Bill's possible relation to Project Reason rather startling, and, as a result, I worry for the welfare of Project Reason with people like Bill Maher advising it. There are a number of reasons for my concern on behalf of Project Reason.

For instance, I wonder how anyone who believes that planes and fires brought down the Twin Towers on 9/11 – as Bill has claimed publically on his own show, *Real Time* -- can maintain (with a straight face) that he is interested in promoting scientific knowledge. After all, a statement like the foregoing one that pretends to explain how the Twin Towers were destroyed is completely devoid of real scientific knowledge and, moreover, it gives expression to a conclusion that is based on something other than scientific methodology (Please read the article: 'The Two Towers' in: *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* as well as the article: 'Rebel With A Cause' in the current volume for proof of the foregoing claim.)

Neither FEMA nor NIST had a plausible, scientific explanation for how the three towers at the World Trade Center were destroyed. In fact, NIST only actually offers an unproven hypothesis/model for what it believes to have been the initiating events that might have led to the progressive global collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Center, and even that hypothesis/model is not rationally or scientifically defensible.

Moreover, the American Society of Civil Engineers had no plausible, scientific explanation for what caused the destruction at the Pentagon but merely worked on the unproven assumption that the damage to the building was caused by American Airlines 77. The foregoing ASCE assumption was blown out of the water when a group of military and commercial pilots demonstrated that the Flight Data Recorder (i.e., Black Box) information presented by the National Transportation Safety Board depicts the flight path of an aircraft

(allegedly Flight 77) that could not possibly have hit the Pentagon as claimed (See Chapter 3: 'Black Box Operations' in the current work).

Apparently, Bill's hypothesis that the three towers in New York were brought down by crashing planes and burning fires is nothing more than either: (1) an example of folk science at its worst (the intuitively appealing but false belief that crashing planes and fires could destroy steel-framed buildings in a matter of hours); or, (2) a critically undigested regurgitation of the sort of junk-science published by NIST in its various reports concerning the three World Trade Buildings. Either way, Bill Maher has no idea what he is talking about ... whether in relation to 9/11 or in relation to the nature of scientific knowledge or how such knowledge is generated.

In 2002, Bill Maher made statements on his -- since cancelled -- show, 'Politically Incorrect', that the 9/11 hijackers showed courage in what they did. From time to time during those days he also indicated a certain amount of grudging admiration with respect to the way in which the 9/11 hijackers were able to defeat the military might and technology of the United States with just box-cutters.

In another words, from a very early period of time relative to 9/11, Bill Maher had formed a conclusion about: what happened on 9/11; who did it, and how they did it. Unfortunately, none of what Bill believes about 9/11 can be backed up with verifiable evidence, and there is a wealth of resources that can be assembled in support of the foregoing contention.

In more than nine years, Bill hasn't changed his opinion about the nature of 9/11, despite the fact that a great deal of evidence has been established since that time to indicate: how completely wrong his ideas concerning 9/11 are. Such intransigence toward changing one's understanding -- or lack thereof -- in the face of overwhelming evidence is not part of the process through which scientific knowledge is acquired ... in fact, what Bill Maher is doing in this respect in relation to 9/11 is in complete opposition to the process of science.

Bill has been extremely careless, and mentally undisciplined in how he has approached 9/11 issues. Contrary to the principles espoused through Project Reason, Bill has not used much: reason, common sense, critical thinking, or scientific method in arriving at his position vis-à-vis 9/11.

Furthermore, this same kind of mental sloppiness has manifested itself in other ways. For instance, recently, on his show, *Real Time*, Bill Maher indicated alarm that the most popular name in Britain this year was Muhammad. He then went on to say: “Am I a racist for being alarmed at that? Because I am, and it is not because of the race, it is because of the religion. I do not have to apologize, do I, for not wanting the western world to be taken over by Islam in 300 years?”

In a follow-up interview on CNN with Wolf Blitzer, Bill said: “I don’t feel that I have to apologize for being a proud Westerner, and when I say a Westerner, I mean someone who believes in the values that western people believe in and that a lot of the Muslim world does not ... like separation of church and state, like equality of the sexes, like respect for minorities, free elections, free speech, freedom to gather. These things are not just different from cultures that don’t have them ... It is better. I am not saying that every Muslim society subscribes to all of these ... but a lot more than western democracies do. And, I would like to keep those values here, and if Muslim people are in these societies having babies at a rate of ... I don’t know ... six or eight times what the other people are having ... you know, you can project ahead and say that in two or three hundred years ... you know if Muhammad is the most popular name now ... I don’t want England to lose those values that, of course, became our values here in America.”

Evidently, the sorts of values that Bill would like to promote (in relation to Project Reason and his show) involve considerable ignorance and arrogance. While I would agree with Bill that all too many Muslims subscribe to a set of values that are antithetical to democracy and/or a search for truth, the reason why such Muslims believe as they do, is because they have fallen prey to the same set of undue influences as Bill Maher has in relation to 9/11.

For example, just as Bill Maher seems to have failed to rigorously and critically investigate the many facets of 9/11 for himself and, instead, has relied on the words and ideas of others for his opinions concerning 9/11, so too, many Muslims have failed to rigorously and critically investigate the many facets of Islam (including the Qur’an) for themselves and, instead, have relied on the words and ideas of others for their opinions concerning Islam. Furthermore, Bill has displayed the same lack of investigatory diligence when it comes to

making the necessary effort to discover the actual nature of Islam since he has permitted his ideas in this regard to be manufactured and constructed for him by others who, themselves, have failed to grasp the actual character of Islam.

Islam is not a religion. It is a methodology.

Shari'ah is not a legal system. Shari'ah refers to a path or process through which to seek knowledge about the ontological principles that govern life, reality, and human potential.

Islam is an individual pursuit. It is not a collective pursuit.

All the western values that Bill holds dear are consistent with Islam ... at least Islam as it is in reality and not as it has been construed by all too many Muslims whose understanding of Islam has been warped by a variety of abusive techniques of undue influence used by those with political, moral, economic, military, and/or social power. Furthermore, the real values of Islam were in place more than a thousand years before the Enlightenment -- so much admired by Bill -- and those Islamic values already existed during a period when the Western world was still mired deep in ways of doing things that were quite contrary to the sorts of freedoms that Bill Maher champions.

Unfortunately, all of the principles that Bill advocates are values that have been decimated, shredded, and destroyed by the myth concerning 9/11 to which he adheres and that has been imposed on America. Just as the mythology surrounding the official conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 has had a destructive impact upon basic democratic values, so too, values inherent in Islam have been decimated, shredded and destroyed by the myths about Islam that have been perpetrated by all too Muslim theologians, mullahs, muftis, leaders, or qadis and, then, oppressively imposed on Muslims.

Although I do understand that Bill is not an atheist or agnostic and his position vis-à-vis religion is more one of being against the theocratic and religious bureaucrats who have sought to arbitrarily dictate what constitutes the truth in matters that are way above their pay-grade -- and I agree with him on this -- nonetheless, like Sam Harris, Bill Maher won't permit Islam to be anything other than what he and misguided Muslims want to insist that Islam must be ... just as Bill won't permit 9/11 to be anything other than what he and other

misguided individuals insist that 9/11 must be. In a sense Bill wants to do to Islam and 9/11 exactly what he criticizes religious autocrats for doing – namely, he wants to reduce Islam and 9/11 down to his arbitrarily constructed sense of things.

One ought not to accept Bill Maher’s version of 9/11 as a scientific gospel, anymore than Bill Maher should accept the actions and sayings of ignorant Muslim theologians or Muslim leaders or a majority of Muslims in some locality as tantamount to being equivalent to an Islamic gospel. In both cases one will be led far from the truth.

For someone who is very intelligent, savvy, insightful, and funny about so many things, it is rather disconcerting to note what a complete fool Bill seems to be when it comes to understanding the actual nature of either: 9/11 or Islam. Like so many others, he has allowed himself to be duped on both issues.

He has permitted his understanding of Islam to be shaped and colored by all too many Muslims who, themselves, are ignorant about the actual nature of Islam. Moreover, he has permitted his understanding of 9/11 to be shaped and colored by all too many people (within the media, in academia, and among the purveyors of junk science) who themselves are ignorant – or pretend that they are - - about the actual nature of 9/11.

Therefore, in honor of the portion of the *Real Time, with Bill Maher*’ show known as “New Rules”, the following recommendations are offered with a sense of hopeful skepticism that Bill might change his mind about 9/11 and, in so doing, demonstrate that he offers something more to Project Reason than just a name.

-----

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – before advising others about scientific knowledge, he should understand the nature of that which he is proposing to advise such people about.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he needs to learn how to go about properly collecting evidence, analyzing that evidence, and drawing appropriate conclusions that are consistent with such evidence in relation to 9/11 ... this is, after all, the actual nature of science, and this is not all what he has done with respect to either 9/11 or Islam.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should take the time to read the NIST reports, the Pentagon Performance Report, the 9/11 Commission Report, as well as the FEMA report about 9/11, and, then, read a variety of critiques of those reports, and, then, actually, do some independent thinking of his own concerning the whole matter.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should stop talking about things he doesn't understand with respect to 9/11 ... things like the idea that crashing planes and ensuing fires are all one needs to know to understand what happened to three buildings at the World Trade Center and to the Pentagon on 9/11.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should develop a little humility with respect to his substantial lack of knowledge concerning the facts of 9/11.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should start referring to himself as a conspiracy theorist since he supports the government's official conspiracy theory.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should devote an entire show (preferably several since his ignorance really is that extensive with respect to 9/11) ridiculing his own lack of knowledge with respect to this conspiracy theory on 9/11 ... and if he is not prepared to make fun of himself on this issue, then, he is really being a hypocrite when he points out the foibles of others who, like him, are often only acting out of ignorance – factual, moral, and/or spiritual.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should stop serving as a source of propaganda for false information concerning 9/11.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – he should do a show with Dr. Judy Wood and any shill of his choice representing the government's conspiracy theory for 9/11 – other than himself that is ... Judy is more than sufficiently capable and knowledgeable to deal with the disparity in numbers (after all, with respect to Bill's dynamic duo side of the discussion, two times zero knowledge is still zero).

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – rather than have people thrown out of his audience for saying things about 9/11 and, thereby, disrupting Bill's quest for control, he should consider the possibility that there might have been people in the audience who knew more about 9/11 than he did and, as a result, democracy and the truth might have been

better served if he brought them up on stage and talked to them rather than censoring them ... after all, Bill says he believes in free speech and freedom of assembly ... so, why doesn't he reduce the disparity between the values he claims to cherish and the nature of his behaviors.

**New Rules for Bill Maher** – when he jokes about any, and all, of the mistakes that are being made with respect to the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, perhaps he should try to remember his personal role in helping to perpetuate those conflicts through the manner in which he has promoted his ignorance concerning many facets of 9/11 that have helped to create a climate of ridicule toward anyone who questions the official conspiracy theory – Bill's conspiracy theory -- in relation to the events of 9/11 ... the conspiracy theory that, with Bill's help, brought about the deaths of hundreds of thousands of people through the obvious superiority of Western values.

In summary, Bill's ramblings concerning 9/11 and Islam entail the kind of thinking about which no one in the West should be proud. In addition, while I agree with Bill that I wouldn't want misguided Muslims over-running things in 300 years, I also wouldn't want misguided people like Bill Maher over-running things in 300 years either ... in fact, I find it deeply disquieting that such anti-rational and anti-scientific 9/11 conspiracy Islamophobes like Bill are in positions of influence today.





### **8.) Conspiracy and Other 'C'-Words**

If one were asked to think of a word or phrase beginning with the letter 'C' that is most associated with the issues surrounding September 11, 2001, the overwhelming response is likely to be "conspiracy". Starting with President Bush's edict: "Let there be no outrageous conspiracy theories" concerning the events of 9/11, and continuing on with an array of media gurus, both left and right, who have sought to ridicule, dismiss, and marginalize anyone who so much as hints at the possibility that the narrative being promulgated by, say, *The 9/11 Commission Report* is fundamentally and essentially flawed, the one word that has been used to try to frame and control the discussion about 9/11 has been the term "conspiracy".

Of course, one can point out that *The 9/11 Commission Report* is, from beginning to end, nothing but a conspiracy theory. However, when one does this, the response is likely to lead to some form of cognitive dissonance in which the person who previously has been railing away at the "conspiracy nuts" will pause for a second as his or her mind seeks to find a way out of a conundrum in which the term "conspiracy" no longer seems to apply to just the people who reject the "official story" concerning 9/11 but applies, as well, to the proponents of the "official theory" about September 11, 2001. This pause in the conversation will go on until the person caught-up in the conundrum can find a way to re-frame the discussion in terms more favorable to the individual or until that individual can invent a suitable form of rationalization or evasion as to why her or his form of "conspiracy" is so much more acceptable to the light of reason than the childish fantasies of the usual bunch of conspiratorial rabble.

Oftentimes, the people in such an emotional conundrum enter into some form of dissociation because they are cognitively unable to deal with the information concerning 9/11 that is being placed before them. Because the condition of dissociation in which such people tend to find themselves is very, very disconcerting as a result of the feelings of de-realization, de-personalization, anxiety and stress that permeate that state, quite frequently, these people become angry since they feel their basic sense of identity and worldview is being called into question.

In any event, one of the factors why the term "conspiracy" has such a powerful regulatory hold on any discussion concerning the

events surrounding September 11th is because there are a considerable array of "undue influence" techniques being used by almost every facet of the media, educational institutions, and the political spectrum to oppress people in the United States by preventing the latter from thinking about 9/11 in an open, rigorous, and critically reflective manner. Undue influence entails all processes that give expression to social, cognitive, and emotional methods and tactics that are used with the intention of restricting, directing, undermining, impeding, confusing, or stopping people from examining information that might lead such people in a direction other than what is desired by the people who are exercising the techniques of undue influence.

More precisely, techniques of undue influence are used to induce people to cede their moral, intellectual, and spiritual authority to another individual, group, political organization, or corporate entity so that the latter might make all moral, political, and spiritual decisions on behalf of those who have been led to believe, through techniques of undue influence -- that the latter have no inherent right to make up their own minds and hearts about any given issue while simultaneously holding that the so-called "leaders" have every right to strip people of such a right.

In short, with only a small set of exceptions here and there, the media, educational institutions, and politicians (both federal and local) in America are all engaged in using the very same kinds of technique as are religious or political cults who seek to influence the members of such a cult in ways that will prevent those members from ever having access to data that might interfere with the attempts of the cult to keep people thinking, feeling, and doing precisely what the cult wishes its members to think, feel, and do.

Among other things, the media, educational, and political cult leaders in America use emotional terms like "freedom", "democracy", "patriotism", "terrorism" and /or "conspiracy" as conceptual weapons or branding irons. Thus, if a person seeks to communicate information about, say, 9/11, to other human beings -- information that is in opposition to the desires of the cult leaders in the United States, -- then, the purveyors of such information are branded as anti-

democratic, unpatriotic, terrorist sympathizers, and/or conspiracy nuts.

If the political, educational, and media cult leaders of America have their way, then, the conversation concerning 9/11 is never intended to go beyond the application of epithets leveled against the informational miscreants who wish to critically explore the issues surrounding the events leading up to, during, and following 9/11. Once labeled, people are dealt with in accordance with those labels, and, consequently, quite apart from whatever the merits of the information being communicated by such an individual might be, that information can be ignored because the operative factor in the affair becomes the label with which the individual has been branded by the cult leaders who head the media, political offices, and educational institutions.

Moreover, once a few people have been crucified in this manner and strung up along the pathways of educational, political, and media activity, then, as was the case with the Roman imperial cult leaders of old, the appropriate message of fear has been delivered to anyone else who might be so foolish as to seek to communicate anything about such taboo subjects as 9/11 to other individuals. Furthermore, like the Roman imperial cult leaders of old, although the cult leaders of the media, political office, and educational institutions in the United States are the actual oppressors and terrorists, these perpetrators of domestic terror and oppression have re-framed the situation to give the impression that only those who seek to throw off the yolk of oppression of the occupying forces of the educational, media, corporate, and political cults that rule America are the ones with whom fault should be found.

The previous comments serve as something of a prologue to that which is to follow. What comes next is an exercise, of sorts, to show how, in reality, there are a lot of other words and phrases beginning with 'C' that are appropriate to use in conjunction with issues concerning 9/11.

In fact, some of these c-words already have surfaced in the foregoing prologue -- for example, "cognitive dissonance", "cult", "conundrum", and "crucify". However, let's not bring the exercise to an end before surveying a variety of other possibilities.

-----

**Censorship:** Naturally, the media cult leaders in America, whether left or right, will never admit that what they are engaged in are vigorous forms of censorship concerning 9/11. Instead, they will seek to re-formulate the issue in terms of having a duty to maintain standards of journalistic integrity such that the information that comes to their attention is properly vetted to ensure that the public has access to only the very best information available.

This sounds nice, but, in truth, the vetting process that takes place consists of a radical censoring of anyone who poses a threat to the vested interests -- whether left or right -- that the media helps to keep in place and in power. One hears almost nothing in the media about the many commercial pilots, architects, scientists, engineers, scholars, ex-military personnel, and everyday common people who are talking about "facts", "information", "data" and reasoned arguments concerning 9/11 that often cannot be credibly countered by the "official" narrative of the power elite in relation to September 11th.

The media will respond with something along the lines of: The reason why you hear nothing about such pilots, architects and the like is because what they have to offer is not credible. However, the public never gets to witness a fair airing of the alleged reasons why such testimony is not credible. Rather, the public tends only to hear the unelaborated conclusions/judgments about the matter (like the Supreme Court rejecting a case without comment) or the public gets a very unfair, biased, and one-sided characterization of the data and arguments that run counter to the "official" government conspiracy theory.

When the media is unwilling to put forth the various sides of an argument in a judicious manner, then, the media is engaged in censorship. They can try to re-frame what they are doing in any way they care to in order to try to make themselves look good, but they have become, in effect, censors for the power elite.

-----

**Career:** While many of the political, media, and educational cult leaders in America will try to convince the public that they have only the noblest of intentions with respect to their handling of the matters surrounding 9/11, the ugly fact of the matter is that many of these cult leaders are preoccupied with self-serving intentions in relation to maintaining their careers, along with the comfortable perks entailed by such careers such as substantial paychecks, retirement benefits, health care, social status, fame, power, and so on.

Unfortunately, while engaged in finding ways to perpetuate their own careers, many of these power elite cult leaders are not at all averse to sacrificing truth, justice, or the public in their attempt to survive in the style to which they have become accustomed. They further try to shore up their shaky sense of integrity by, sometimes, arguing that if others were in their shoes, they would be doing the same thing.

However, such a contention is not true. There have been many people who have been trying to communicate with the public concerning 9/11 who have lost their jobs as engineers, scientists, and educators because of their willingness to treat the search for truth and justice as having a greater priority than that of career.

I once had an animated discussion with an individual who rejected the idea of there being any other account of 9/11 that is true except that of the "official" power elite. The person in question argued that there are so many media people who hate the existing government administration that such people would be dancing in the streets if they had an opportunity to bring down the present government with any kind of scandal involving 9/11. And, given the fact there are no such people who are dancing in the streets, this is prima facie evidence that there aren't any credible arguments capable of disproving the official narrative of the power elite.

The aforementioned individual is, to say the least, a little naive when it comes to the sort of calculus that people employ when their lives and career might be at stake. There are very few, if any, media types -- whether left or right -- among established newspapers, magazines, radio stations, television stations, or scholarly journals that are willing to pursue matters concerning 9/11 because, both

individually and collectively, they understand such an undertaking likely would lead to career suicide in one form or another.

Journalists and columnists are answerable to editors. Editors are answerable to senior editors and editorial boards. Editorial boards are answerable to media lawyers, owners and/or boards of directors. They are all answerable to advertising revenues.

In these sorts of environment, there are many points of entry through which vested interests can make the weight of their interests known. People who work in such environments are acutely aware of who butters their bread, and they quickly learn how to work in accordance with the degrees of freedom existing in those environments or they find themselves out of a job or they find themselves losing advertising revenue.

There are any number of "left-leaning" media people who refuse to rigorously pursue the issues surrounding 9/11 because they fear being labeled as card-carrying "conspiracy nuts" or "terrorist enablers" or members of the "lunatic fringe". Once labeled in this manner, they believe this would cast a shadow over, or doubt upon, everything else they do or report or about which they write -- which is just another way of saying that they are worried about their career as leftists.

Many of these so-called left-leaning or liberal or progressive media types will gladly engage in any manner of administration-bashing -- and, quite frequently, with considerable justification -- for whatever constitutional, economic, or political sin is the soup de jour that has been concocted by the various chefs of the current administration. However, those same media types will not venture into the tricky waters of 9/11 because they fear the labeling process that is likely to ensue and which would tend to marginalize all that they have to say about other matters of importance as their entire body of work is reduced down to "why, he or she is just one of those conspiracy nuts, or one of those terrorist lovers, or one of those unpatriotic people who hates freedom and America."

Good-bye credibility. Good-bye Career. Good-bye influence. Good-bye paycheck. Good-bye perks.

However, one is likely to get very limited and limiting truths from someone who is more concerned about her or his reputation and career than such an individual is concerned with matters of truth and justice. Unfortunately, the issues of truth and justice that are caught up in the actual nature of 9/11 underlie virtually every problem in which the United States is currently embroiled -- from: Iraq and Afghanistan, to: energy policy, military spending, the deficit, health care, the "intelligence community", public debt, education, the Constitution, civil liberties, and the economy.

Currently, there is no more important topic to explore than the realities of 9/11. Yet, while educational institutions, the media elite, as well as elected and unelected officials are willing to explore a vast array of issues, nonetheless, the one topic -- namely, 9/11 -- that is not critically pursued encompasses a set of forces which is relentlessly destructive in relation to democracy, the Constitution, human rights, freedom, truth, justice, and the economy.

-----

**Courage:** There are all too many individuals in the media, in government, and in education who lack courage concerning the events of 9/11. Apparently, they feel or believe that if they can continue to ignore the problems surrounding and permeating the "official" account of 9/11 as communicated through documents like *The 9/11 Commission Report*, NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, and *The Pentagon Performance Report* then, perhaps, they will be able to avoid ever having to put their life, reputation, and job on the line for the sake of truth and justice.

The line that comes to mind with respect to a lot -- but not necessarily all -- of the foregoing individuals is from the movie *The Rainmaker* based on a John Grisham book of the same name. During a meeting intended to generate some depositions, the Matt Damon character, Rudy Baylor, a lawyer for the plaintiff, asks a question of the big corporate lawyer played by Jon Voight whose firm is representing a life insurance company that is refusing to pay out on a claim made by the plaintiff. After continuously being given the run-around by Jon Voight's character, the Matt Damon character poses the following question: "Do you even remember when you first sold out?"

Do the individuals who do the nightly news on television and who are news television commentators and opinion makers, or do the columnists and editorial page writers, or do the individuals who are running for the presidency of the United States or for other political offices in the forthcoming elections, or do the individuals who are supposedly educating the youth and hope of tomorrow even remember when they first sold out to the myth makers of 9/11? Unfortunately, the sordid condition of American public life is such that, for the most part, only those who lack the courage to serve truth and justice are permitted to have ready access to the rest of the American people so that the latter might become infected with the same sort of cowardice that governs the former.

Many from the media, political life, and educational institutions have become like Jayson Blair, the disgraced journalist who was fired from the *New York Times* because, among other things, he fabricated data and failed to do his own, independent investigations on any number of stories while, instead, uncritically borrowing from the work of others. Similarly, all too many media representatives, educators, and politicians have failed to exercise due diligence with respect to 9/11. Their critical, investigative skills, along with their moral integrity, appear to have gone on an extended hiatus, and they tend to just go with whatever they are told by "official" sources concerning 9/11, and, in the process, they all have betrayed the public.

There might be a variety of reasons why the people being alluded to above have decided it is in their best interests to betray the public's trust on the 9/11 issue. However, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that many of the people involved fail to do due diligence in relation to their jobs because they lack the courage to stand up and fight on behalf of the citizens of the United States rather than on behalf of the members of the power elites who wish the matter of 9/11 to be understood in a way that advances their own self-serving goals rather than the public good.

-----

**Complicity:** One doesn't have to resort to the word "conspiracy" in order to understand the nature of the failure of educational institutions, the media and elected officials to critically, thoroughly, competently, and rigorously investigate the issues surrounding 9/11



[and neither *The 9/11 Commission Report*, NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, The FEMA report, *The Pentagon Performance Report*, nor the *Popular Mechanics'* article/book are critically competent, thorough, or rigorous efforts]. For the most part, these various sectors of the power elite did not gather together to conspire about anything. Rather, they are all, each in its own idiosyncratic manner, complicit in, among other things, the on-going censorship with respect to almost all of the important facets of 9/11.

All of the individuals and groups making up the collective power elite have their own individual vested interests, agendas, values, goals, needs, and resources. At some point, the issues of 9/11 impinge upon their activities, and they make individualized judgments about how to handle such issues.

They look at what different branches of the government are doing. They examine the current political landscape. They consider the activities of the military. They assess the activities of various competitors or players in the business and corporate world. They take the pulse of the media and educational institutions. They poll the public or do marketing research. They reflect on their resources, liabilities, and needs. They do: risk assessments concerning an array of political and economic situations in various regions of the world. They think about the future. They make assessments about the meaning, nature, and significance of 9/11.

They take all these factors and run them through their models, formulas, and methodologies. The result is a judgment about how to proceed.

For a variety of reasons virtually all of the players who participate in the collective power elite have -- somewhat independently of one another -- arrived at very similar and, in certain respects, overlapping decisions. They believe that the easiest, least problematic way for them -- as individuals, groups, institutions, parties, or organizations -- to move forward is to avoid looking at the events of 9/11 too closely.

Arriving at such a decision is not because they have definitive evidence that the "official" government narrative concerning 9/11 is true or viable. Most of these people have never read *The 9/11 Commission Report*, nor have they gone through and reflected on NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers*, nor

have they perused *The Pentagon Performance Report*, nor have they read the book *Debunking 9/11 Myths* issued through *Popular Mechanics*, nor have they read the 20 or 30 other major works that critique all the foregoing, nor have they viewed the many videos that critically examine the available data entailed by 9/11.

Furthermore, arriving at such a decision is not because they have sat around in some boardroom or participated in a teleconference or met clandestinely with fellow conspirators and worked out a narrative for 9/11. In fact, in many ways, these individuals and groups probably don't care, one way or the other, about the realities of 9/11, but, instead, they just want to know how they effectively can use or adapt to whichever way the political, economic, and judicial winds seem to be swirling with respect to that issue in order to be able to successfully advance their individual agendas, goals, aspirations, programs, and bottom lines.

Are such individuals, organizations, corporations, institutions, and so on complicit in, among other things, maintaining an environment of censorship concerning the realities of 9/11? Of course, they are.

However, they didn't have to conspire with one another in order to reach such an arrangement. All they had to do is arrive at a decision in which it was considered prudent to leave 9/11 alone and run with the "official" government version of the matter.

Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in wrongdoing linked with 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in many different kinds of injustice linked with 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in the censorship that has gone on in relation to 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in the oppression that has arisen in relation to 9/11. Various members of the media, as well as an array of educators and political officials (both elected and unelected), might be complicit in the shredding of the American Constitution and its Bill of Rights that have taken place in conjunction with the events of 9/11.

None of the foregoing, however, necessarily means that those who are complicit in the ways indicated are conspirators. On the other hand, there might be some individuals -- not yet definitely identified -- who are hidden among those who are complicit in matters concerning 9/11 and who actually are conspiring against Americans -- including some of the individuals and groups that are merely complicit -- and, perhaps, quite unknowingly involved -- in helping such conspirators to achieve their aims and ambitions.

-----

**Confabulation:** In psychological terms, to confabulate is to create a memory of a supposed past event that, in point of fact, did not necessarily take place. Alternatively, if the event on which the confabulated memory is based did take place, then, the act of confabulation might mean that the event did not actually occur in the way in which one remembered it as happening.

Sometimes confabulation occurs in the context of what is known as a "flashbulb memory". A flashbulb memory is an extremely vivid and clear recollection of a purported past event.

Sometimes, however, one might not have had the necessary experience or could not have been in a position to be able to have a reliable and true memory of whatever event one clearly and vividly is remembering. In such a case the flashbulb memory episode is an instance of confabulation in which the content of the "clear and vivid" memory has been invented, either partially or wholly.

For example, Jean Piaget, the famous Swiss developmental psychologist, had a vivid memory of having been kidnapped as a child. He carried this memory with him for many years until the nanny who looked after him early in his life finally confessed that the kidnapping event never occurred.

Elizabeth Loftus, who has done a lot of groundbreaking research involving eyewitness accounts and false memory syndrome, also had a vivid recollection of seeing a dead relative floating face down in a backyard pool. The problem was, as she found out years later, the event that she remembers so clearly and vividly never took place.

President Bush had a confabulated flashbulb memory with respect to the North Tower of the World Trade Center in relation to September

11, 2001. He reports -- and I have seen the video news coverage of his speech -- that he had been waiting outside the elementary classroom in Florida where he was scheduled to meet with children and hear them read from a now famous book about a pet goat. He recalled that he had been watching a television set that was located outside the classroom, when he saw the first plane fly into the North Tower and, recalls, at the time, making a remark to the effect of: "Boy that was one bad pilot."

The problem with the foregoing recollection is that he could not possibly have been in a position to witness what he claimed to have remembered. The first (one of two) video/film coverage of the North Tower event was by the Naudet brothers of France who were in Manhattan on September 11, 2001 doing a documentary on New York fire fighters.

The Naudet brothers' video/film footage of the North Tower September 11th event was not released until September 12, 2001. Consequently, President Bush could not possibly have witnessed what he claimed to remember while waiting to go into the elementary classroom on the morning of September 11, 2001.

Was there a television set outside the elementary classroom? I don't know.

Was President Bush watching television before he entered the classroom? I don't know.

However, irrespective of whether there was or was not a television outside the classroom and irrespective of whether he was or was not watching the television, the one indisputable fact is that he could not possibly see what he claimed to have seen on the morning of September 11, 2001 because the film/video concerning the crash of Flight 11 into the North Tower of the World Trade Center was not released until September 12, 2001.

Similarly, there are many people who claimed to have seen, on the morning of September 11, 2001, a large commercial jet plane flying between 10 and 50 feet off the ground knocking over lampposts along the highway as the airplane approached the Pentagon, skimmed over the grassy area in front of the west façade of the Pentagon, hitting a construction transformer truck, before slamming into the

Pentagon. *The Pentagon Performance Report* seems to corroborate such accounts because the report indicates that the airplane struck the first floor of the Pentagon going at more than 500 miles per hour.

The problem with all of the foregoing is that due to aerodynamic factors such as "the ground effect", wing-tip vortex effects, g-forces drag and thrust issues, it is not physically possible for a 200-ton plane flying at 500 miles per hour to follow a relatively level flight path that permits such a plane to get closer than about 65 feet above the surface of the ground -- in contradistinction to eyewitness accounts that positioned the plane as being between 10 and 50 feet off the ground over the last two to four hundred yards before allegedly striking the Pentagon. What people claimed to have seen in this respect is in violation of known laws of physics, and, therefore, one suspects that, to varying degrees, what one is dealing with in relation to these kinds of report involves some form of confabulated memory.

Just as President Bush, Jean Piaget and Elizabeth Loftus all claimed to have clear memories of something that did not or could not have happened, so too, many of the eyewitnesses who claimed to have seen a large commercial plane flying at some 500 miles an hour (according to *The Pentagon Performance Report*) and running between ten and fifty feet above the ground as it approached the Pentagon on 9/11 were providing an account that could not have happened in the way in which they remember. Furthermore, physical laws of aerodynamics are such that what *The Pentagon Performance Report's* claims to have been the case -- namely that the commercial plane that hit the Pentagon did so on the first floor of the building -- also could not have been true because a 200-ton plane traveling at 500 miles per hour would not have been able to strike the first floor in the manner in which the Report claimed due to the aforementioned aerodynamic factors.

Were the people who gave such accounts lying? Not necessarily. The fact of the matter is -- and this is a well-established phenomenon in courtrooms across America -- eyewitness testimony is often inaccurate, and part of the reason for this is a direct result of the human tendency to confabulate, to varying degrees, with respect to our memories of past events.

In addition, there is a further problem with many of these eyewitness accounts in relation to the precise direction from which the alleged plane was coming as well as in relation to the nature of the angle of the plane when it allegedly hit the Pentagon. More specifically, there is detailed, videotaped testimony from three individuals -- namely, two Pentagon police officers (Chadwick Brooks and William Lagasse) as well as Robert Turcios who was working at the Citgo gas station about a quarter of a mile away from the west façade of the Pentagon -- which directly contradicts the testimony of a number of eyewitnesses concerning the flight path of a large commercial airliner that appeared to strike the Pentagon.

The issue has to do with the location of the commercial jet in relation to the Citgo station when it flew over that area as the craft headed for the Pentagon. Did the plane fly to the north of the Citgo station or did the plane fly to the south of the Citgo station?

If the commercial jet in question flew to the south of the Citgo station as it headed for the Pentagon, then, this would be consistent with a flight path in which lamp posts were allegedly knocked down along the highway running past the Pentagon, -- one of supposedly fell on a taxi and punched a hole in the car's windshield as the plane made its way toward the Pentagon. Such a flight path also would be consistent with The Pentagon Performance Report that purportedly reconstructed what would have been necessary with respect to the plane's flight path in order to be able to account for the pathway of damage inside the Pentagon.

However, if the plane's flight path took the craft across an area to the north of the Citgo gas station, then, at least two things are not true. First, the individuals who claim they saw the plane follow a flight path to the south of the Citgo gas station are mistaken (possibly another case of memory confabulation), and, as a result, this leaves one in need of an explanation for what knocked down the lampposts because those lampposts are in a location that is entirely away from any flight path that went along a line to the north of the Citgo gas station. Secondly, if the plane that allegedly hit the Pentagon followed a flight path to the north of the Citgo gas station, then *The Pentagon Performance Report* is incorrect with respect to its account of what caused the pathway of internal damage in the Pentagon because its report requires a plane

that came at the Pentagon from a direction that was to the south of the Citgo station ... not the north side of the Citgo gas station.

Finally, irrespective of who is correct in her or his memory of what transpired on the morning of September 11, 2001 in relation to events at the Pentagon, the foregoing discussion indicates that there are those among the witnesses who are enveloped in confabulated or invented memory, in part or in total, with respect to the flight path of the plane in question. The large commercial jet that people claimed to see hit the Pentagon on 9/11 could not simultaneously have approached the Pentagon on both the north side and the south side of the Pentagon.

Although the two Pentagon police officers who, independently of one another, claim to have seen a commercial plane traveling toward the Pentagon on the north side of the Citgo gas station both believe that the plane in question did strike the Pentagon, there is some other information that might be inconsistent with the striking part of their account. First, although *The 9/11 Commission Report* claims that Flight 77 hit the Pentagon at 9:37-38 a.m., there is evidence that the Pentagon was struck by an earlier event that had a sufficiently violent shockwave to stop all battery operated clocks in and around the so-called "crash" area at 9:32-33 a.m., some five minutes before the alleged plane crash took place.

Furthermore, April Gallop, an employee at the Pentagon with top security clearance, was seated at her desk within 60 feet of the alleged crash site. As she hit the start-up button for her computer, there was a tremendous explosion that buried both her and her infant child who she was going to be taking to daycare shortly after starting up her computer.

After pulling herself and her daughter out of the rubble, as well as helping a few other people who had been buried during the blast, she exited the Pentagon via the hole that had been created by whatever the nature of the event was that had caused the explosion. She was in her bare feet because she had lost her shoes during the explosion.

She reports that there were no fires. Nothing was hot to the touch. There was no plane wreckage -- not fuselage, not people, not luggage, not engines.

Were there fires later on? Yes, there were. Nonetheless, despite whatever might have caused those subsequent fires, initially, the explosion that April Gallop lived through involved no fires and no plane wreckage.

Secondly, a number of military personnel who were caught up in the initial Pentagon blast indicated that they smelled cordite, not jet fuel, and these individuals had sufficient training and experience to know the difference. Cordite is associated with the explosion of munitions not jet plane crashes. Consequently, irrespective of whatever else might have happened at the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, there was at least one -- possibly two -- explosions at the Pentagon that were munitions-related and not jet crash-related.

Finally, exploding jet fuel does not cause blast injuries. Yet, the medical first-responders at the Pentagon reported that they had been treating a lot of blast injuries as well as burn injuries on the morning of September 11, 2001. For example, Captain Stephen S. Frost of the Medical Corps stated: "We saw many blast injuries" -- such as pulmonary blast injuries, gastrointestinal blast injuries, concussions, as well as secondary (being hit by debris propelled by a shock wave) and tertiary blast injuries (being injured as a result of being thrown by the force of the blast's shock wave.).

-----

**Credibility:** A document such as *The 9/11 Commission Report* that fails to include the testimony of, among others: Sibel Edmonds, Coleen Rowley, Kenneth Williams, and Robert Wright -- all of the FBI and all of whom had vital information about the events transpiring before, during, and following 9/11-- or a document that fails to include the testimony of David Schippers, William Rodriguez, Norman Mineta, Pierre Bunel, April Gallop, and Indira Singh -- all of whom had relevant testimony concerning the events leading up to and/or transpiring on 9/11, or, as well, a document that fails to include the testimony of Lt. Colonel Anthony Shafer or former Army Major Erik Kleinsmith (both of the Abel Danger project that had been gathering data relevant to terrorist cells in the United States) fundamentally undermines its own claims, and those of others on its behalf, concerning the issue of credibility. A document like *The 9/11 Commission Report* that fails to interview the FBI's David Frasca, Mike Feghali, and M.F. "Spike"



Bowman [all of whom seemed to play major roles in obstructing investigations into terrorist activity by other FBI agents both before and after 9/11], or a document that fails to interview Kevin Delaney of the Federal Aviation Administration who destroyed taped interviews concerning the events of 9/11 by five flight controllers who were on duty that day fundamentally undermines its own claims, along with those of others, to possessing credibility. A document like *The 9/11 Commission Report* that fails to investigate why thousands of tons of evidence in Manhattan pertinent to a criminal investigation had been destroyed undermines its own claims to, or the claims of others on its behalf, concerning credibility. A document like *The 9/11 Commission Report* that bases many of its pages on the testimony of captured individuals who endured torture such as water-boarding before giving "testimony" concerning 9/11 and who were not made available for questioning by the 9/11 Commission researchers does not deserve to be thought of with any sense of credibility concerning its findings. A document like *The 9/11 Commission Report* that completely fails to investigate what was behind the message received by the Secret Service on 9/11 that not only said that "Angel was next" ["Angel" being the code word for the President on 9/11] but gave substantial indication, as well, of having hacked into many of the top security codes of the government/military does not deserve to be considered a credible account of 9/11.

A document like NIST's *Final Report* on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers that consumes some 10,000 pages and still cannot provide a plausible, coherent, consistent, rigorous explanation for why basic laws of physics -- such as the law of conservation of energy or the law of conservation of angular momentum -- can be violated and permit three supposedly pancaking buildings [namely World Trade Center 1, World Trade Center 2, and World Trade Center 7] to collapse in nearly free-fall time is not deserving of any sense of credibility. Quantity is no substitute for quality, accuracy, or evidence.

A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that throws out experimental results because such data constitute problems for the specific theory that the scientists at NIST wish to support -- due to political and not scientific considerations -- is not deserving of any sense of credibility. A report like NIST's *Final*

*Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that fails to pursue, rigorously investigate, and report on the more than 118 witnesses (fire fighters, police officers, journalists, WTC employees, and medical personal) who claim to have been witnesses to explosions within the twin tower complex on 9/11 does not deserve to be considered as a credible document. A report like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that claims that the perimeter columns in WTC Buildings 1 and 2 were pulled in toward the center of the buildings and this led to a progressive collapse of the buildings due to a failure in the floor assemblies in the buildings, despite the fact that Underwriters Laboratory proved that such floor assemblies would not have failed under the conditions existing on September 11, 2001, is not deserving of any sense of credibility. A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that has no plausible, evidence-based, explanation for why, or how, Building 7 collapsed in nearly free-fall time -- despite the fact that the building had not been hit by an airplane, and despite the fact there is no empirical evidence of substantial fires having spread throughout the building, and despite the fact that no steel-framed building anywhere in the world had ever collapsed due to fire, despite evidence in a number of these cases that some buildings burned for as long as 17 hours without causing the structures to collapse -- is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that has no explanation for why so much symmetry was present in the way the three World Trade Center buildings collapsed on September 11, 2001-- that is, pretty much straight down into its own "footprint" -- rather than in the sort of asymmetric manner one would have anticipated if the three buildings actually had collapsed as a result of the pancaking of floors whose assemblies, bolts and rivets are not likely to simultaneously have come apart -- such a report is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like NIST's *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Towers* that completely ignores the obvious video data showing that World Trade Buildings 1 and 2 did not just collapse but, rather, exploded and disintegrated is not deserving of being considered credible.

A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that completely ignores the considerable evidence that explosions ripped through the Pentagon and were munitions-based, rather than jet-fuel based, is not

deserving of being considered credible. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that completely ignores the fact that many of the injured at the Pentagon suffered from the primary, secondary and tertiary effects of munitions-based explosions not jet-fuel explosions (which do not carry a shock wave that has concussive-properties) is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that completely ignores the testimony of April Gallop, an individual with top security clearance, who said that following the explosion, there were no fires and there was no plane wreckage despite the fact that she was 60 feet from where the plane supposedly entered the Pentagon is not deserving of being considered credible. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that seeks to put forth an account that ignores the fact that -- due to aerodynamic properties such as "the ground effect", wing-tip vortices, and so on -- a 2000-ton commercial jet flying at speeds in excess of 500 miles per hour could not possibly have struck the ground floor as *The Pentagon Performance Report* claims -- such a report is not deserving of being considered a credible document. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that cannot plausibly or adequately explain how the hole in the building's Ring-C could have the characteristics and singe pattern it did is not deserving of being considered a credible document. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that does not consider or discuss the fact that there are major contradictions among eye-witness testimonies concerning the flight path of the alleged jet that supposedly crashed into the Pentagon's west façade -- contradictions that carry major ramifications concerning the tenability of *The Pentagon Performance Report* -- then, such a document is not deserving of being considered a credible report. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that fails either to explore or provide an explanation as to why an array of battery-operated clocks in the west wing of the Pentagon stopped at 9:32-33 a.m. -- some five minutes prior to the time when the official time of a jet impact with the Pentagon allegedly took place -- such a document is not deserving of being considered a credible report. A document like *The Pentagon Performance Report* that fails to investigate the reports of trained, experienced military personnel that they smelled cordite after the explosion at the Pentagon and not jet fuel is not deserving of being considered a credible report.

-----

**Casualties:** The count begins at around 3,000 individuals. This encompasses the approximate number of people who died on, or about, 9/11 due to the events at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

However, many thousands more individuals will have to be added to the foregoing number. For example, there are an increasing number of people who are exhibiting symptoms from an array of debilitating, if not lethal, diseases that have arisen as a result of the numerous toxic substances released into the environment on 9/11 through the events at the World Trade Center. These substances include: asbestos, benzene, dioxins, cadmium, polycyclic aromatics, PCBs, lead from computers, mercury from florescent light bulbs, and Freon [which when vaporized becomes phosgene gas].

Many first responders -- such as firefighters, police, and medical personnel -- as well as those involved in the cleanup of Ground Zero have already become seriously ill with diseases that can be linked to 9/11. An increasing number of individuals are dying from such diseases.

Some believe that in the not-too-distant future there will be epidemics in the greater New York area -- such as mesothelial cancer (related to asbestos) -- due to, among other things, the numerous kinds of carcinogens that were spread all across Manhattan and other parts of New York City on September 11, 2001. In fact, some medical professionals believe that the number of deaths resulting from environmental contamination on 9/11 will exceed the number of immediate casualties of 9/11 by one, or more, orders of magnitude.

To the foregoing must be added the more than 4,000 soldiers who have, to date, died in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with the roughly 15,000 seriously wounded soldiers whose lives will never again be the same. One must also add in to the total the increasing number of suicides that are being committed by soldiers who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as the epidemic of cases involving posttraumatic stress disorder that might have adverse, destructive ramifications for the individuals, their families, and their communities in the near future.

One must also add in to this running total the tens of thousands of innocent Iraqis and Afghanis [and estimates run anywhere from 80,000 to 600,000] who have perished as the result of conflicts that are said to be the advanced front of the "war on terror". This is a war on terror that moved into high gear as a direct result of the way in which the events of 9/11 have been interpreted and propagandized by most of the media, government officials [both elected and unelected], and so-called educators.

There is, of course, terrorism in the world. For example, there are the amateur terrorists like al-Qaeda, and, then there are the professional terrorists such as the United States government and all too many multi-national corporations.

It is a well-established fact (see: *Charlie Wilson's War* by George Crile and *The Ghost Wars* by Steven Coll) that elements of the United States government established, funded, and supported the individuals who now are collectively referred to as al-Qaeda [even though, in reality there are a disparate set of independent individuals and groups that are included under this umbrella term]. In the beginning, what is now known as al-Qaeda was used against the Soviets in Afghanistan, and, now, what is referred to as al-Qaeda is being used as the *raison d'être* for being in both Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as being in other geographical locations around the world.

Again and again the American public has been, and is being, told by the media, as well as government officials, that al-Qaeda was responsible for 9/11. Yet, the white paper that Colin Powel promised to make available to the United Nations that would prove such claims has never been released, and when the Taliban indicated that it was prepared to hand over Usama bin-Laden to the U.S. if the latter would provide the Taliban with the evidence demonstrating bin-Laden's involvement with 9/11, the United States had nothing to show them, and even Rex Tomb, Chief of Investigative Publicity for the FBI, and Robert Mueller, Director of the FBI, both have said that there is no evidence to link Usama bin-Laden with 9/11.

While there might (or might not) have been individuals who were linked, in some way, with al-Qaeda and who had roles to play with respect to 9/11, what also is becoming increasingly clear -- at least to all but the self-serving obtuseness of various dimensions of the media,

government officials, and educators -- is that to whatever extent individuals associated with al-Qaeda might have been part of the tragedy of 9/11, those individuals received considerable financial, tactical, and strategic assistance from treasonous elements within the United States power elite. Former FBI agent Robert Hanssen, and former CIA agent Aldrich Ames, and former United States Naval civilian intelligence analyst Jonathan Pollard all constitute recent exemplars indicating that some U.S. citizens are quite willing to betray their country and fellow citizens in order to serve their own treasonous agenda. Consequently, and most unfortunately, one is not broaching an unthinkable and impossible topic to argue that when the total body of available evidence concerning 9/11 is taken into consideration, there is an overwhelming portion of that evidence that strongly suggests there are traitors -- as of yet, unidentified in any definitive manner -- that are in our midst and who are responsible, in part or in whole, for the events of 9/11.

If such individuals are permitted to get away with 9/11, one can be sure of one thing. There will be more 9/11-like events, and these subsequent 9/11s will bring with them an unknown number of individuals -- both in the United States as well as in other parts of the world (for example, possibly in Iran and Pakistan) who will have to be added to the casualty list that began to be tabulated on September 11, 2001.

One might also want to add a few other items to the casualty list. For example, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, democracy, and America's moral compass all have been casualties because of the way in which the events of 9/11 have been propagandized, and out of such institutional casualties, much collateral damage to human beings is likely to ensue.

-----

**Corporatism**: There can be little doubt that many corporations are complicit in helping to maintain the ascendant dominance of convenient fictions concerning the events of 9/11. These corporations range from: the media conglomerates that seek to ensure that disconcerting facts about 9/11 do not reach the ears, eyes, minds, hearts and souls of the American public, to: the defense contractors, oil companies, and private military contractors that are earning record

profits all stemming from the fabrications, distortions, and untruths that have been promulgated concerning the actual facts surrounding 9/11. Such corporations also include many educational institutions of higher (and lower) learning that either fire individuals who wish to speak out on the issues surrounding 9/11 or that seek to muzzle/censor those who would speak out about such matters by failing to grant tenure to them or by trying to deride such individuals -- as Robert Gates sought to do in relation to Professor Emeritus Morgan Reynolds when the former individual was the President of Texas A & M prior to becoming Secretary of Defense.

All of the foregoing sorts of corporation have a vested interest in preventing representatives of the media, government officials (both elected and unelected), as well as professors and other educators from exploring the complex terrain of 9/11. All of the foregoing sorts of corporation seek to intimidate, bully, marginalize, isolate, contain, and/or penalize any threat to the status quo vis-à-vis the "officially sanctioned" narrative concerning 9/11.

Corporations like the foregoing have polluted the landscape of American democracy. They have been permitted to do this by politicians, both elected and unelected, as well as a judiciary at all levels that has illegitimately conferred a legally enforceable status of "personhood" upon corporations.

The precedent for entitling corporations to be treated as persons allegedly stems from an 1886 Supreme Court decision between Santa Clara County and the Southern Pacific Railway. However, in point of fact, the Supreme Court decision in relation to that case did not confer "personhood" on corporations but explicitly excluded such matters from consideration despite the attempts of lawyers for the railroad to argue that corporations should be considered as people who had rights under, for example, the 14th Amendment.

Unfortunately, subsequent jurists have failed to differentiate -- conveniently so it would appear -- that there is a difference between the head notes that are written by the court reporter transcribing the proceedings (in this case, J. C. Bancroft Davis) that have absolutely no legal weight and might not even be true (and in this case the head notes were incorrect), and the actual body and content of the Supreme Court decision. It was the court reporter, J.C. Bancroft Davis, a former

railroad executive, who added, entirely on his own, unrequested (??) initiative, that the case in question involved the fact that "The defendant Corporations are persons within the intent of the clause in section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which forbids a State to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." [See Volume 118 of the *United States Reports: Cases Adjudged in The Supreme Court at October Term 1885 and October term 1886*, published in New York in 1886 by Banks and Brothers Publishers and written by J.C. Bancroft Davis).

The Supreme Court did not rule in 1886 that Corporations are persons. Since that time however an egregious legal fiction has been established that has continued to permit corporations to be treated as if they were the equivalent of human beings and should have all rights attendant thereto -- which has led, in turn, to the undermining of a great many facets of democracy.

The events of 9/11 are like the 1886 case between Santa Clara County and the Southern Pacific Railroad. The truths of these respective matters have been replaced by fictions that serve vested and well-entrenched interests.

-----

There are a lot of other C-words that come to mind with respect to the events of 9/11 and especially in relation to the manner in which the power elite is complicit in helping to perpetuate myths, fictions and false narratives concerning those events. For example, criminal, cynical, comatose, corrosive, churlish, conceited, childish, closed-minded, callous, craven, crude, cold-hearted, careless, cavalier, confused, creepy, crazy, controlling, catastrophic, cruel, catatonic, cancerous, connivance, counterfeit, cupidity, and callow are all appropriate terms to apply to what the power elite among the media, government officials (both elected and unelected) and educational institutions is, and has been doing, in relation to 9/11.

However, based on what already has been said in the previous pages with respect to the more lengthy C-entries, readers will, I believe, be able to intuit the drift of where my commentary might go in conjunction with such additional C-entries. Consequently, I will leave you with one final unelaborated c-entry with respect to my feelings



about whatever the power elite might have to say in response to the foregoing material: caveat emptor -- let the buyer beware -- a term that should have guided the thoughts of many individuals before, during, and after the events of 9/11.



### **9.) A Swedish 9/11 -Interview**

The following interview took place in September 2010 as the result of a request from someone – Mohamed Omar -- within the Facebook.com population who is a Muslim from Sweden. The individual had, at one time, been a journalist and wanted to translate the interview into Swedish and publish it through, among other possibilities, his blog.

The individual who conducted the interview sent me a number of questions for which he sought some sort of response from me. Below are both the questions and my replies.

-----

#### **Question: How did you convert to Islam?**

As a war-resister during the Vietnam era, I had gone to Canada. During the early part of my stay in Canada (I lived there for nearly thirty years before moving back to the United States just before 9/11) I became interested in exploring a variety of mystical spiritual traditions – both through an extensive reading program as well as through making contact with some actual teachers of a few of the traditions about which I had been reading.

My interest in spirituality was a continuation of sorts of how my university life began. More specifically, I had gone to university with the idea of becoming a minister in conjunction with one, or another, Christian denomination, and although, for a variety of reasons, I abandoned this career idea, I remained very interested in many of the sorts of questions most of us ask ourselves: Who am I? Why am I here? What is the purpose of life? How should life be lived? What is the nature of my potential?

At varying points in my life I engaged the foregoing questions through science, philosophy, and spirituality. While I have retained an interest in, and affection, for both: science and philosophy, my heart was most drawn to the spiritual side of things.

After reading works by, on, and in relation to Gurdjieff, I became involved with a Gurdjieff group in Toronto. At some point during this period, I became aware that some of Gurdjieff's teachers apparently had been from the Sufi tradition.

As a result, I began to read a great deal about the Sufi path. Through a strange set of circumstances, I was provided with an opportunity to meet and talk with a Sufi shaykh or teacher who also was professor of Middle East and Islamic Studies at the University of Toronto.

Based on these meetings I decided to focus on the Sufi path. Consequently, I disengaged myself from the Gurdjieff group, and began to associate with the aforementioned Sufi teacher.

In time, I came to understand that the Sufi path could not be separated from the practice of Islam. Although many Muslims seem to think that the Sufi path is sort of an illegitimate, backdoor way of becoming Muslim, I like to think of the Sufi path as the servant's entrance.

-----

**Question: What made you doubt the official story of 911?**

I did not come to the issue of 9/11 right away. My life circumstances had been in turmoil for quite some time, and these circumstances forced me to have to struggle in a variety of ways just to survive.

On September 11<sup>th</sup>, my clock radio awakened me to the news that a plane had crashed into one of the World Trade Towers. I immediately got up and turned on the television and was greeted by some of the ensuing events. However, because there were a number of things happening in my life that, for the most part, kept me away from television, radio, newspapers, and the Internet for some time, I wasn't really able to immerse myself in the 9/11-issue at that time.

Nevertheless, there was some collateral damage that filtered into my life within days of 9/11. Someone who had been attending some public discussion groups concerning the Sufi path that I had been conducting on and off in the area where I lived reported me to the FBI.

The person who reported me – and I found this out from a friend in whom the individual had confided – indicated that I there were many suspicious things about me. For instance, the person told the FBI that I had no visible means of support ... I was unemployed at the time and collecting unemployment insurance benefits but, apparently, that person was not aware of this and, therefore, seemed to conclude that I

must be funded by some terrorist organization. The person also told the FBI that I had state of the art computer equipment – apparently indicative of a high-tech connection to various terrorist groups ... although the reality was that the person didn't know about computers and failed to understand that although my computer was new, it hardly was state of the art. Finally, the person who reported me to the FBI said that I was very secretive – presumably to hide my allegedly terrorist activities from the public ... but the reality was that I lived in an area where there were few Muslims, and even fewer Sufis, and, therefore, I tended to keep to myself and pursue my practices – both Islamic and Sufi – in private.

Initially, I had no problem believing that a group of Muslims might have conspired together to perpetrate the tragedies of 9/11. I had been a Muslim for over twenty-five years and had both traveled in the Muslim world on a number of occasions and, as well, I had been a close witness to the sort of back-stabbing, cut-throat politicking, and jockeying for power that often goes on among the so-called 'leaders' within the Muslim community, so I was well aware of extremist elements within that community.

At some point during the hearings being held by the 9/11 Commission, I caught some of the televised testimony – especially that of Condoleezza Rice and Richard Clarke – and, as well, I heard some of the so-called Jersey Girls (individuals who had been widowed through the events of 9/11 and who had been instrumental in pressuring for an allegedly public investigation – i.e., The 9/11 Commission -- into the events of 9/11 to take place) on the Chris Mathews cable television show on MSNBC. The questions that were being asked by the women who were referred to as the Jersey Girls struck me as both perceptive and important, and they were raising some fundamental questions about the tenability of the “official conspiracy theory” being promulgated by the government.

At about this same time, I began to have some telephone conversations with a fellow Muslim – an emergency room doctor – who had been among the first responders who assisted at Ground Zero. He told me about his own experiences, and, then, suggested that I read several books by Nafeez Ahmed, a British writer.

I did read those books, and, then, I began to read pretty much everything about 9/11 that I could get my hands on. Eventually this included: *The 9/11 Commission Report*, *The Pentagon Performance Report*, and various NIST (National Institute for Standards and Technology) reports concerning the collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Center. In addition, I read the Popular Mechanics book: *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, which was an expanded version of an earlier article that had been written in their magazine. I also read a lot of material that was critical, in one way or another, about all of the foregoing analyses concerning the events of 9/11.

From the very beginning of my research into 9/11, I was not all that interested in the question of who perpetrated 9/11. I thought that all those who were pointing accusing fingers at Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and many others were getting the cart before the horse. First, one must establish the facts – that is, the ‘what’ -- and, then, one follows those facts wherever they might lead with respect to the ‘who’ of 9/11.

Furthermore, all of the individuals who were getting caught up in the ‘who’ of 9/11 instead of the ‘what’ of 9/11 were having trouble connecting the dots and showing, in any sort of rigorous way, how Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and the others actually did what they were alleged to have done. As a result, many rather flimsy and problematic theories concerning the ‘who’ of 9/11 were generated, and, consequently, a whole conspiracy theory industry was generated that led many people to conclude that anyone who questioned the conspiracy theory being promulgated by the government was, oddly enough, a conspiracy theorist who dealt in wild, fringe, ridiculous ideas concerning the events of 9/11.

From the beginning, I was interested in the official government accounts concerning the technical issues surrounding the collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Tower and the events at the Pentagon. Few people have taken the time to look at the NIST reports concerning the collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Center or to look at *The Pentagon Performance Report* concerning what, allegedly took place at the Pentagon on 9/11, and, then, compare those accounts with a wealth of data that is in the public domain and that runs counter to what those different reports have asserted.

There are many things that might be said in this regard, but let me mention just a few things. The essence of NIST's theory concerning the collapse of the two Twin Towers is that the floor assemblies in the Twin Towers failed (due, supposedly to the effects of intense fires) and, as a result, pulled the outer walls inward until a progressive collapse was initiated that brought the two buildings down. However, Underwriter Laboratories tested the floor assemblies and demonstrated that the theory of NIST was incorrect – that is, the floor assemblies would not have failed under the conditions existing in the Twin Towers on 9/11.

In addition, the simulation studies that NIST ran in conjunction with various facets of their investigation into the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings are not capable of withstanding close, critical analysis. This is true not only with respect to the simulation studies that sought to re-construct the spread and intensity of the fires in the Twin Towers, as well as the simulation studies that focused on the issue of fire-preventing insulation on the iron beams, but the problems with NIST's simulation studies includes the very important fact that NIST has not been able to construct a computer simulation of the collapse of the Twin Towers that starts from first principles of engineering and material sciences that can be shown to be consistent with what television and still photographs clearly show happened on 9/11.

There have been a variety of theories besides the one put forth by NIST that have been advanced by different scientists and engineers that purportedly explain why the buildings at the World Trade Center collapsed. None of those theories can properly account – that is consistently and in a way that is rigorously and plausibly rooted in actual physical evidence -- for the observed facts.

Among other things, basic laws of physics are violated in all of the foregoing explanations. These include laws such as the conservation of momentum and the conservation of angular momentum.

In fact, NIST was forced to revise its theory concerning the collapse of Building 7 at the World Trade Center when a high school physics teacher, David Chandler, demonstrated that for several seconds the collapse of Building 7 was in free fall. This fact of free fall cannot be explained by NIST or by any other supporter of the official

government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11, and the presence of such free fall indicates that there is no conventional, natural way of explaining such a collapse based solely on the a heat-based theory of why Building 7 collapsed – i.e., fires that heated iron beams did not bring down the building, and, so, it leaves open the question of how did Building 7 collapse.

There are many, many, many other facts concerning the disintegration of the Twin Tower – and if a person looks carefully at what happened to the Twin Towers on 9/11, one sees a disintegration of the buildings and not a collapse – that indicate that none of the official theories concerning the cause of the demise of the Twin Towers can account for what has been observed by most of the world. There are many, many other facts concerning the disintegration of Building 7 at the World Trade Center complex on 9/11 that are not consistent with the available empirical evidence.

Similarly, if one takes a close look at the events at the Pentagon on the morning of September 11<sup>th</sup>, one comes up with a variety of disturbing facts concerning the official account for what allegedly took place at the Pentagon on 9/11. For instance, April Gallop, who had top security clearance at the Pentagon, indicates that she was in the precise place where the official report claimed the commercial jet slammed into the Pentagon. The problem is that she has given testimony indicating that she walked out through the hole in the building caused by ‘the event’ at the Pentagon on 9/11 and although she was in her bare feet, nothing that either her feet or hands touched was hot, that there were no fires, that there was no plane wreckage, no luggage, and no passengers. She also reports that when she was recovering from her injuries in the hospital a group of men came to her and sought to convince her that a plane had slammed into the Pentagon on 9/11.

In addition, Pierre Henri-Bunel, a French explosives expert who served with General Norman Schwarzkopf during the first Gulf War that involved the United States, has done an extensive analysis of the only video footage that has been released in conjunction with the alleged crash at the Pentagon. His conclusion is that the video does not given evidence of a plane crash but, instead, the evidence is consistent



with the possibility that some sort of anti-concrete hollow charge struck the Pentagon on 9/11.

Furthermore, some twenty people, including two Pentagon police officers as well as a person attached to the Naval Annex near the Pentagon, have come forward and testified that the jet plane that went toward the Pentagon approached the building on the north side of the Citgo gas station that is about a mile from the Pentagon, rather than the south side of that gas station. This is significant because the entire *Pentagon Performance Report* is based on the premise that whatever hit the Pentagon approached the building from the south side of the Citgo station, and, among other things, this means that the proposed angle of entry of whatever hit the Pentagon that is advanced by the *Pentagon Performance Report* is not supported by a great deal of evidence.

There are many other factors concerning the events at the Pentagon that are totally inconsistent with what the *Pentagon Performance Report* claims happened on 9/11. These other factors have been reported by a variety of professional people, including an array of both commercial and military pilots who have brought forth a great deal of evidence indicating that important elements – including the alleged telemetry reports from the ‘Black Box’ that supposedly survived the alleged plane crash – in *The Pentagon Performance Report* have been fudged and are inconsistent with the available facts.

None of my concerns about the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 have to do with the ‘who’ of things. They all have to do with questions linked with ‘what’ happened on that day in relation to matters that are entirely empirically and scientifically based.

I reject the official government conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 because its purported explanation of why the Twin Towers and Building 7, as well as its purported explanation of what happened at the Pentagon, are not supported by the facts. In other words, whatever occurred at the World Trade Center and at the Pentagon on 9/11 in relation to material damages, the fact of the matter is that crashing, burning planes cannot account for the observed damage. Therefore, the official government conspiracy theory concerning the events of 9/11 must be re-examined ... and, this time, through a process that is

completely transparent and run by the people, not government officials.

-----

**Question: If 911 were exposed, beyond all doubt, as an inside job, what consequences would that have?**

How one responds to this question really depends on the identity of the people on the inside. If people such as Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld were responsible – and, although for a variety of reasons that are quite independent of 9/11, I feel that Bush and company have betrayed the American people and the people of the world, I am not convinced that they necessarily had anything to do with 9/11 – then there are tens of millions of Americans whose world view concerning their country will be shattered. If – hypothetically speaking -- people like Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld and others were the ‘insiders’ who were responsible for the tragedy of 9/11, then treason would have been committed at the very highest levels of American government, and the fault lines likely would run in every direction with a concomitant capacity to fracture American society in incalculable ways.

If the alleged perpetrators of 9/11 involved a variety of disgruntled military officers, rogue intelligence agents, and self-serving corporate interests, the collateral damage would still be significant. However, it likely would be a social earthquake of several less orders of magnitude than if the hypothetical insiders were people such as Bush, Cheney, and Rumsfeld.

In many ways – and for many different financial, economic, political, cultural, and international reasons – the United States is at a ‘tipping point’. There is a great deal of anger in the United States about many things, and if people were to be presented with incontrovertible evidence that American insiders were involved in, or behind, the events of 9/11, this could be the sort of revelation that might push the United States into political collapse, civil war, chaos, or even a military dictatorship.

I’m not sure many people appreciate just how fragile any society is. The difference between being functional and dysfunctional is a lot less than many people might suppose or wish to be the case. Moreover,

once a country begins the political/cultural slide downhill, it is very difficult to stop or reverse the destructive momentum that has been set in motion.

-----

**Question: Was Israel involved in 911?**

I am aware of the evidence indicating that a group of Israelis were witnessed in North Bergen, New Jersey (which is just across the river from the Twin Towers in Manhattan) celebrating the events at the World Trade Center. I am aware that those individuals were later apprehended, taken into custody, and, eventually, were identified as agents of Mossad. I also am aware that those individuals were released under questionable circumstance and that they later appeared on Israeli television bragging about their experiences on 9/11.

I am aware that there were officials connected with the Israeli government whose travel plans were altered prior to 9/11 and, apparently, this was in direct relation to the impending events of 9/11. However, I also am aware that there were officials within the United States who also were warned not to travel by commercial air on 9/11.

I am also aware that an Israeli instant messaging software company seemed to have prior knowledge concerning the impending events of 9/11. On the other hand, I also am aware that David Schippers – the person who was given the job of being Chief Investigative Counsel in the impeachment of Bill Clinton – has come forth and given testimony that three FBI agents approached him indicating that they knew the day, time, and location of the attacks but were encountering resistance from people in the Counterterrorism unit of the FBI, and, therefore, the Israeli software company might have just picked up on information that, actually, was filling the world's intelligence communities prior to 9/11 and that had been passed on to the United States government by a number of countries – including Israel, Russia, Germany, Egypt, and quite a few other countries.

Because of the behaviors of the Israeli government with respect to Israel's illegally: occupying Palestinian territory, stealing Palestinian territory, building a wall in Palestinian territory, torturing Palestinians, bulldozing the homes of Palestinians, killing innocent

Palestinian children, women, and men, depriving Palestinians of water, and committing any number of war crimes in Lebanon and Gaza, one doesn't have to go searching for excuses to be able to demonstrate Israel's status as an out of control rogue state in the international community. However, whether or not, Israel had anything to do with 9/11 is a very different matter.

Israel certainly had agents in the United States who knew things about 9/11 before it occurred. Whether this knowledge was indicative of their merely having done their homework and, therefore, having become independently aware of some of the forces that were at work on 9/11, or whether their prior knowledge was indicative of something much more sinister, I really don't know.

-----

**Question: In Sweden the media portray anybody who doubts the official story as a lunatic. How about in America?**

There have been a variety of polls taken in the United States concerning the American public's perceptions of, and opinions about, the events of 9/11. The last poll I saw – which was done a few years ago -- indicated that roughly a third of the American people have serious questions about the tenability of the official government conspiracy theory.

Unfortunately, the media bears a considerable responsibility for the state of ignorance of many people concerning the actual facts of 9/11. For many individuals, their ideas about the world are fed to them through the filters, biases, prejudices, and vested interests of the media.

I don't have to invoke any form of conspiracy theory to account for why the media does what it does in conjunction with 9/11. People in the media operate out of individual frameworks that shape their choices.

Like the rest of us, the media is filled with individuals who have fears, anxieties, likes, dislikes, egos, concerns about their career, and who are governed by a great many social expectations arising from those around them that tend to influence how they feel they should behave and believe. I have found very, very few representatives of the

media who have done their homework with respect to the facts of 9/11.

By and large, people in the media – both in the United States and elsewhere -- have accepted the view points of other people – often official, government sources -- concerning 9/11 and have conducted little or no independent investigation into the matter. Moreover, even if they were to have conducted such research, if they tried to present it, they would either lose their jobs and/or be branded as conspiracy nuts and/or find themselves at loggerheads with many other people in their surrounding society.

For the most part, people don't like confrontation, conflict and tension. Consequently, it is easier to let matters like 9/11 go by the wayside rather than have to deal with the unpleasantness that often ensues when one attempts to run counter to the majority social current. The media are no different in this than are most people.

-----

**Question: Let's say 911 was an inside job. But isn't there any real Islamic terrorism? We recently saw the bombing of Ali Hujwiri shrine in Pakistan for example. Who was behind that?**

There are several questions being asked in the foregoing. First, there is no such thing as Islamic terrorism.

Whatever terrorists there are in the Muslim community, they pursue an ideology or theology that cannot be supported by the Qur'an or the teachings of Islam. They do not pursue an extreme or radical version of Islam, but rather they are advocates of a personal philosophy that offers faulty justifications for killing, torturing, maiming, and abusing innocent people – both Muslim and non-Muslim.

These are individuals who have made idols of themselves and who bow down to their own self-serving arguments concerning their alleged 'right' to accuse, judge, and execute whomever disagrees with their personal philosophies. The Muslims in question are counterfeiters who seek to replace real Islam with their bogus spiritual currency.

Are there bad Muslims in the world? Of course, there are, just as there are bad Christians, Hindus, Buddhists, Jews, agnostics, and atheists in the world.

Are some of those bad Muslims involved in terrorist activity? I am sure there are.

However, what Israel is doing in Palestine is also terrorism. Furthermore, what the United States military has been doing in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan is also terrorism.

By definition, terrorism is any act that induces terror in the general public. Israel, and the United States are but two countries among many others that could be mentioned (including many so-called Muslim countries) that, on a regular basis, conduct operations that terrorize the public -- whether through the military, the police, economics, the legal process, religious institutions, politics, the media, or education.

We live in perilous times because, in all too many ways, terrorism is the new religion of the day that, in one form or another, is practiced by many countries, governments, corporations, organizations, educational institutions, and media groups, as well as individuals. The so-called 'War on Terror' is being conducted by individuals who are, themselves, terrorists, and consequently, it has become almost impossible to tell one side from the other.

Consequently, when one cites any particular instance of terrorism – such as the bombing at the Ali Hujwiri shrine in Pakistan – this is like trying to claim that the problem of terrorism comes from only certain kinds of people ... the usual suspects. The unfortunate fact of the matter is that we are all being tossed about in a sea of terrorism in which many: individuals, countries, corporations, and organizations are busily churning up the waters of chaos and destruction for their own personal advantage, hatreds, biases, and greed.

-----

**Question: What is the place of Sufism in Islam?**

Islam is an infinite ocean. Does one drop ask other drops what their place in the ocean is?

Islam refers to a process of struggling toward the realization of one's primordial human potential or fitra. Different people pursue this struggle in different ways and with different degrees of intensity and for different purposes and with different goals in mind.

Some people believe that the purpose of life is to achieve paradise and avoid hell. Others believe that the purpose of life is to be discovered through the realization of the spiritual potential that Divinity has gifted to human beings. Other people believe that one needs to learn how to serve the truth in everything one does, and issues like heaven, hell, states, and stations will look after themselves in accordance with God's wishes.

Who is the Sufi in all of this? So much depends on the purity of both one's *niyat*, or intention, and sincerity. Allah knows best!

Service and worship are not contained in a name but are given expression through actions and understanding that are thoroughly rooted in *taqwa* or piety. The Qur'an indicates that the one who has *taqwa* will be taught discrimination by Allah.

The Qur'an itself distinguishes among: Muslim, Mo'min, and Mohsin. Being a Muslim is not the end of the road, but, rather, being a Muslim merely constitutes the beginning stages of exploring the possibilities inherent in the human condition.

-----

**Questions: Are many Americans attracted to Sufism?**

In al-Hujwiri's *Kashf al-Majub*, one of the oldest, extant expositions of the teachings of the Sufi path, the eleventh century saint quotes an earlier, eighth century proponent of the Sufi path as saying: "Once Sufism was a reality without a name, and now it is a name without a reality."

There are quite a few individuals in the United States today who refer to themselves as Sufi but who do not seem to feel any need to dive into the ocean of Islam and seek to discover the springs from which the Sufi path flows. There are also quite a few individuals in America that refer to themselves as Sufi, but who are unknowingly involved in abusive spiritual relationships with fraudulent shaykhs, and some of these shaykhs are quite well known. There are some individuals in the United States who like to read Sufi literature and like what they read, but this is about as far as the attraction goes. There are some individuals in the United States who have a tendency to label anything that is vaguely spiritual or mystical as being expressions of the Sufi path and, then, proceed to add in whatever ideas and practices

that appeal to them. There are some academics in the United States who teach courses on something they call Sufism but who, themselves, have never had an authentic teacher or actually engaged in the Sufi discipline in any sort of rigorous way. There are some individuals in America that are associated with authentic shaykhs, but the nature of the association varies with the individual and, consequently, it is difficult to know just how attracted such individuals are to the Sufi path.

There is as much misinformation making the rounds in America concerning the Sufi path as there is in relation to Islam, in general. The Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) did warn that there were 73 sects in Islam, and only one of them was correct. What is true in Islam is also true with respect to the Sufi path.

How many people in America are attracted to Islam only to be misled by the people with whom they are unfortunate enough to fall in with and associate? How many people in America are attracted to the mystical dimension of Islam only to be misled by the people with whom they have been unfortunate enough to become associated?

Your question is a good one. And, the answer is rather complex and nuanced, and I do not have any definitive answer for you.

-----

**Question: You wrote a critique of atheist activist Sam Harris called: *Sam Harris and the End of Faith -- A Muslim's Critical Response*. Is there still a future for faith?**

Faith gives expression to the ratio between a given set of knowns and the relationship of that set with another set that is filled with unknowns. Everybody lives in accordance with faith, whether they are atheists, agnostics, or spiritually inclined.

When one eats breakfast in the morning, it is done with a faith that what one is eating is not contaminated or poisoned. When one takes one's car to work, this is done with a faith that the car will not have a serious mechanical failure that will cause an accident, and it is done with a faith that other drivers will obey the rules of the road. When one accepts a job or a job promotion it is done with the faith that it will generate more good than harm. When one marries someone, it is done



with the faith that the relationship will be successful rather than fall apart. When one goes to the doctor or takes medicine, it is done with the faith that the doctor knows what she or he is talking about or that the company that made the medicine is competent in what it does? When one invests in the stock market, one does so with the faith that the company in which one is investing will pay dividends. When one plans a vacation, it is done with the faith that it will be enjoyable and not a catastrophe. When one votes in an election, it is done with the faith that the person one is voting for will actually serve one's interests.

Faith enters into our lives thousands of times a day in relation to virtually every aspect of life. We make choices on the basis of faith every single moment we are alive.

Human beings are not omniscient. Therefore, there are a great many things that we do not know. How we decide to relate what we do know with what we don't know is the character of our faith.

Some people don't like the term "faith". Consequently, they use words like: prediction; probability; inference; projection; implication; extrapolation; model; theory, and the like. In the end, however, these are all really different species of faith.

Therefore, to answer your question, I believe that faith has a bright future in relation to human beings. Whether, or not, such faith will prove to be constructive in relation to helping to realize the essential nature of being human is above my pay grade.

-----

**Question: Do you think it's possible to separate Islam from politics? Can you be an apolitical Muslim?**

Actually, it is not only possible to separate Islam from politics, but the fact of the matter is, that the presence of politics is a very good indicator that Islam is nowhere close at hand.

I do not subscribe to the idea that shari'ah necessarily entails either a legal system or a form of governance. There is no such thing as an Islamic state, although there are many Muslim states.

The term shari'ah appears in the Qur'an precisely once - namely, in Surah 45, ayat 18. "O Prophet, we have put you on the right way

(shari’ah) concerning Deen, so follow it, and do not yield to the desires of ignorant people.”

In Arabic, one of the primary meanings of the word “shari’ah” is to refer to a place where animals come to drink. The related verb “shar’a” refers to the process of taking a drink. There is another word, “shaari” that is derived from the same underlying root and can refer to a way, path, or to the process of determining the nature of such a path or way.

You put all of the foregoing together and shari’ah refers to a process of seeking out a place to drink that which is life-sustaining and to do so in accordance with the nature of the path that determines the relationship among: the drinker, the path to the drinking place, the place to drink, and that which is to be imbibed at the place of drinking. This is the nature of Islam.

There are some people who wish to restrict Islam to just a little more than 500 verses out of a total of more than 6000 verses in the Qur’an and claim that the message of the Qur’an is a legal and political one. I feel that such a perspective does great injustice to a book that nowhere refers to itself as a law book but does refer to itself a means through which all things are explained in detail.

The Qur’an is epistemological and spiritual guidance, not legal guidance. The Qur’an also indicates that there can be no compulsion in the matter of Deen (Surah 2, Verse 256) – that is the process of realizing one’s spiritual potential – and, consequently, I have difficulty understanding how anyone believes that the Qur’an gives them authority to rule over the lives of other people in relation to matters of Deen.

The Qur’an also indicates that: “oppression is worse than slaughter” (Surah 2, Verse 217). And oppression is what takes place when one group of individuals seeks to use political and/or religious forms of compulsion to force other people to comply with the ideological and theological agendas of the former group of individuals.

The problem of regulating the public space is not the purview of religious laws. The problem of regulating the public space is the problem faced by each of us as individuals whenever we interact with that public space and attempt to ensure that such interaction is done through: adab, character, and justice.

Adab, character and justice cannot be imposed on people from the outside in. These qualities must come from within.

One can create an environment that is conducive to the nurturing and growth of such qualities. However, such growth will never take place in an atmosphere of political, legal, or religious compulsion and oppression.

The proof of the foregoing is strewn across the Muslim world. Spirituality tends to die in conditions of compulsion and oppression.

-----

**Question: What is the New World Order that Bush announced on the 11 September 1991?**

It is an expression of the arrogance of power, as well as the delusional fantasy of those who do not know any better.

The shortest distance between two points is the truth. Unfortunately, the people who dreamed up the New World Order are individuals who – to use a mathematical metaphor -- are lost in a complex plane among the convolutions of imaginary numbers without any formula for calculating a reliable metric.

-----



### **10.) Keith, Howard and Cordoba House**

I watched a dialogue between Howard Dean and Keith Olbermann a few days ago concerning the so-called Ground Zero mosque aka The Cordoba House aka Park51 Community Center. Keith was serving as an advocate for the right of Muslims to build the community center at the site of the old Burlington Coat Factory that has been abandoned, more or less, since 9/11 ... abandoned, that is, until the real estate was purchased by SoHo Properties sometime, I believe, within the last several years. Howard Dean was indicating that, perhaps, Muslims should consider the possibility of entering into the true spirit of interfaith relations as well as demonstrate that they are good community neighbors by being willing to sincerely explore the idea of moving the proposed center elsewhere out of consideration for, among others, those who lost loved ones at the World Trade Towers and elsewhere on 9/11.

If nothing else, Howard Dean indicated that by entering into such discussions he felt there might be a teachable moment, or two, that would arise during the ensuing discussion through which either Americans would be able to come to better understand, and possibly even appreciate, the nature of Islam or through which the owners of the property in question might come to better understand and appreciate the perspective of 9/11 families. I believe Howard Dean might be correct about the teachable moment aspect of things. However, I think the nature of the teachable moment might be quite different than he might suppose.

I propose that Imam Rauf and the other stakeholders in the Burlington Coat Factory property should be willing to move the mosque in exchange for a fair, independent, and transparently rigorous investigation into the events of 9/11. Such an investigation has not yet taken place – although many uninformed people suppose that such an investigation already has taken place ... several times.

I am familiar with the *9/11 Commission Report*, the *NIST* reports, the *FEMA Report*, and the *Pentagon Performance Report*, as well as the 9/11 article by *Scientific American* and a book by *Popular Mechanics* that purportedly debunks 9/11 conspiracy myths. The most charitable thing that I can say about all of the foregoing documents is that the people involved seem to know next to nothing about how to properly

do science or research despite their so-called professional credentials ... indeed, they are all guilty of what might be called 'junk' science/research that encompasses a set of activities that give the superficial appearance of real science/research but generate nothing more substantive than junk.

I am not a conspiracy theorist. I have no theory about who was ultimately responsible for the tragedies of 9/11, but I know bad science and research when I see it – and all of the foregoing mentioned documents are permeated with qualitatively poor research and science. Due to the official efforts concerning 9/11 -- which displayed neither good faith nor due diligence -- the American people, if not the world, have been done a great injustice through the aforementioned attempts to frame the discussion concerning 9/11 in a way that does not, and cannot, survive critical analysis.

If the evidence warranted it, I would have no problem accepting the idea that there were 19 or 20 Muslim extremist hijackers who -- with a total lack of understanding of Islam -- decided to inflict great suffering on Americans. I have been a Muslim for nearly forty years, and I have met, read or heard about those within the Muslim community who might be quite capable of such immorality and effrontery to human decency – although, thankfully, the vast majority of Muslims that I have met want nothing more than peace, harmony, happiness, and justice for everyone.

On the other hand, if the evidence warranted it, I would have no problem accepting the idea that were those within the American government, military ranks, intelligence community, and/or corporate world who were quite capable of such immorality and effrontery to human decency. I have been witness to the tragedies all of the foregoing institutions have inflicted on the world over the last sixty years ... and, indeed, I – as have most other Americans and the rest of the world – have been sickened at the way in which governments have lied their way into war for purposes that have nothing to do with the stated aims of such conflicts ... conflicts where thousands of Americans and thousands of non-Americans have been killed or maimed.

One thing that I do know is that none – and I do mean none – of the official reports concerning what happened leading up to, and on, 9/11 can withstand critical scrutiny. In fact, the official story

concerning 9/11 is nothing more than a conspiracy theory and, yet, anyone who finds fault with that officially sanctioned conspiracy theory is, ironically enough, labeled a conspiracy theorist.

Before anyone (on any side of the issue concerning 9/11) points a finger at specific people as the guilty culprits, the facts of the matter need to be established. Once a full data set has been gathered encompassing all relevant evidence, one can begin trying to connect the dots to see who might be implicated in 9/11 and have the facts to back up such identifications.

Four interesting pieces of information concerning the possible premature pointing of fingers concerning 9/11 are as follows: (1) the FBI has publically acknowledged that it has no evidence whatsoever connecting 'Usama bin Laden to 9/11 (although the FBI does have evidence indicating his possible involvement in other issues); (2) the only 'evidence' that the 9/11 Commission has concerning the possible involvement of bin Laden in 9/11 comes from people who have been subjected to extensive water-board torture ... people the 9/11 Commission officials were not even permitted to interview or see – and torture, as most intelligence and military experts indicate, generally leads to confessions but not necessarily to the truth ... people will tell their torturers anything the latter individuals want to hear in the hopes of bringing the suffering to a stop; (3) none of the flight manifests for the hijacked planes carries the names of any of the people who allegedly committed the atrocities on 9/11; (4) the autopsy reports for the passengers on the plane that supposedly struck the Pentagon contain no genetic markers that would demonstrate the presence of Arab individuals on the plane in question.

Another thing I know is that people such as Howard Dean and Keith Olbermann have not done due diligence with respect to their homework on 9/11– that is, they give no evidence of having read all the aforementioned reports or any of the relevant supplementary materials, nor do they seem to have done much critical thinking on the subject ... I know that because they – as is true of almost all other aspects of the media and contributors to the media – continue to spout the official conspiracy theory that 19 Muslims conspired to attack America on 9/11 ... a conspiracy theory that is not supported by the available evidence.

Most Americans do not know that there are hundreds of engineers, scientists, architects, ex-military personnel, pilots, ex-intelligence community officers, and an array of hard-core researchers that have all indicated how the official conspiracy theory being propagated through such documents as *The 9/11 Commission Report* cannot stand close examination. People such as: William Rodriguez, Sibel Edmonds, Mike Feghali, David Frasca, Mike Ruppert, Anthony Shaffer, Indira Singh, David Schippers, April Gallop, Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds, Colleen Rowley, Kevin Ryan, Richard Gage, and Steven Jones – all have pertinent and significant contributions to make with respect to 9/11, but such individuals have been kept from the public view for the most part.

The foregoing claim is not a conspiracy theory. It is a fact, and the proof of the claim is that if one were to ask many Americans about who the foregoing individuals are and what they had to say about the events of 9/11, many, if not most, Americans would probably come up empty because most Americans have not been properly and consistently informed about those individuals by many facets of the media ... and to whatever extent such individuals have been interviewed by mainstream media, those individuals usually have been painted as conspiracy theorists and whack-jobs not worthy of anyone's time -- people who can be, and are, dismissed from polite, 'informed' discussion concerning 9/11.

Apparently, the only acceptable conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 is the one sanctioned by the government and the media. But, of course, that is not a conspiracy theory, it's a ... I don't know ... the right words escape me for describing a conspiracy theory in non-conspiratorial terms.

I find it interesting that many people in the media know – and have known for quite some time -- that the government lied its way into the war in Iraq ... lies that led to tens of thousands of innocent people dying, not to mention the thousands of American casualties, and, yet, many of these same media types seem strangely incurious when it comes to considering the possibility that various Americans might have lied about 9/11 as well. The issues surrounding 9/11 shouldn't rest on dogmatism rooted in blind faith (no matter what



one's ideas on this might be), but, instead, needs to be weighed against the facts ... many of which have not been properly vetted in an objective, independent, public investigation into 9/11.

Recently, Rudy Giuliani waded in on the so-called Ground Zero mosque with the observation that if Imam Rauf were truly a 'healer', he would be willing to move the mosque to another location. On the other hand, the former mayor of New York City also said that if Imam Rauf were not prepared to move the mosque, then he would be disclosing to everyone his 'warrior'-like intentions concerning 9/11 and America.

Giuliani, of course, master politician that he is, sought to frame the discussion by placing Imam Rauf in the kind of untenable position that is intended to force the Imam to heel to the gambit and move in the direction of doing what Rudy Giuliani, Newt Gingrich, Sarah Palin, Charles Krauthammer, and others want of the Imam – which is to change the location of the proposed mosque to another, more acceptable piece of real estate. Seemingly – at least according to Mr. Giuliani – if Imam Rauf is not willing to accede to the wishes of many Americans with respect to the re-locating the mosque issue, then the Imam supposedly reveals himself to be an enemy of the American people ... although being the smart politician that he is, the former Mayor of New York did not state things in quite that way but left such an innuendo circling over the affair like a stealth bomber.

The people who want the proposed mosque moved to a different location out of consideration for the 9/11 families and first-responders who suffered devastating losses on that day nearly nine years ago have a problem that is very similar to the one proposed by Mr. Giuliani. They can accede to the idea that in exchange for the moving of the proposed mosque there needs to be a new, independent, complete, transparent, objective and rigorous investigation into the events surrounding 9/11, or they can show themselves to be those who have absolutely no sensitivity to the actual facts of 9/11 and no sensitivity to those who lost family and friends on 9/11 – despite their protestations to the contrary.

Imam Rauf also has a problem. He can show himself to be a true leader of the Muslim community and exchange a willingness to relocate the proposed mosque for a new inquiry into 9/11 – thereby

—  
—  
serving the interests of both non-Muslims and Muslims – or, he can continue to insist that the mosque will be built on the site of the old Burlington Coat Factory, and in the process reveal that his intentions might be something other than seeking truth, justice, harmony, and understanding on behalf of both non-Muslims and Muslims.

In my book, *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* – which was written a number of years ago – I outline a method for ensuring that any new investigation into 9/11 would be conducted within the legal system of the United States but outside of governmental control. That method is the grand jury system ... something that contributes to democracy nearly every day of the year, and something that would be run by regular, non-governmental people who would enjoy subpoena power.

If the media and the government are not willing to trust the people with an independent investigation of 9/11, then this clearly shows the American people what the media and government think of them. It also clearly demonstrates what the media and government really think of the victims of 9/11 as well as Muslims.

To paraphrase Ecclesiastes somewhat: 'All the rest is vanity'. Too many people on all sides of the so-called Ground Zero mosque issue might be posturing for the sake of ego and not for the sake of truth.

**11.) An Open Letter to Imam Rauf and Daisy Khan**

(With a few minor changes, the following letter is, essentially, the same e-mail that was sent and received by Feisal Rauf and Daisy Khan)

-----

The intention with which I write this letter is as a friend – although I realize that you might not consider me to be a friend. After all, I have been publically critical of Feisal’s book: *What’s Right With Islam*. However, if friends can’t be honest with one another, then I’m not really sure what friendship means.

Moreover, we previously have sat down face-to-face on a number of occasions to break bread and discuss issues of importance. I might not always have said what you liked or stated that with which you agreed, but I have always interacted with you both in a sincere fashion.

I once asked you, Daisy, to look in on a friend and her two children because I was concerned about their physical and spiritual welfare given that they seemed to be inextricably entangled with a fraudulent Sufi teacher. I asked you to do this because, among other reasons, you were relatively proximate to, and a friend of, the family in question while I was living more than ten hours travel-time away from them, and because -- for reasons about which you were cognizant -- a phone call from me might not have been well received.

You expressed mystification about what I believed you could do concerning those three individuals, and I said: “Be a Friend”. In response you said during our phone conversation that you were planning to meet with the mother in the near future, and you indicated to me you would try to gauge what was going on. I assume this was done – I have to assume this since I never heard back from you on the matter.

I also have tried to get in touch with Feisal on several occasions – both by e-mail and phone. On one of these occasions, I spoke with you and asked you to pass on a message to Feisal that I wanted to talk with him about an issue of some importance to me.

Once again, I never heard back. So, I have to assume that neither of you consider me to be a friend despite our past relatively, friendly interactions.

I can't do anything about your side of the situation. All I can try to do is look after my own spiritual condition.

I have never written either of you off. I did not do this despite my disappointment in some of the things you were saying and doing – such as Feisal's support for the fatwa that tried to justify Muslims killing other Muslims in Iraq and Afghanistan ... a fatwa that Feisal sent to the *New York Times* encouraging them to publish it and that was included in Feisal's book (*What's Right With Islam*) – a position that I publically criticized on a number of occasions.

On the other hand, you both have been giving me some fairly clear signals for quite some time that you did not wish to have anything to do with me. Consequently, I consider our relationship to be one of estrangement – that is, something that is, in a sense, still open, in however a tenuous manner, but something that also is fraught with tension of one kind or another and, as a result, might never get resolved.

In any case, despite the turbulent waters that have flowed beneath the existential bridge so elusively connecting us, I am currently writing to both of you as a friend. Moreover, what I have to say now is from nowhere but my heart and soul with a deep concern for your spiritual welfare, as well as the welfare of all Americans and people throughout the world.

You, Feisal, have been criticized by, among others, Newt Gingrich for claiming that the United States was, in a sense, partially responsible for what happened on 9/11. Your position is the 'blowback' theory championed by a variety of people – including Noam Chomsky, Chalmers Johnson, Amy Goodman, and the late Howard Zinn – that through the oppressive and destructive policies conducted by the United States government in relation to many Muslim countries over the last six decades (starting, perhaps, with the CIA's over-throw of the legally elected Mossadegh's government in Iran in 1953), the United States incited various elements in the Muslim world to get revenge against the United States ... revenge that allegedly came home to roost on 9/11.

Your 'blowback' position is in need of revision, for it is inconsistent with the actual facts of 9/11. You should revise your understanding in the light of testimony from, among others: Sibel

Edmonds, Indira Singh, Mike Ruppert, Barry Jennings, David Chandler, William Rodriguez, Richard Grove, Robin Wright, Colleen Rowley, April Gallop, David Schippers, Pierre Henry-Brunel, Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds, Kevin Ryan, A.K. Dewdney, Steven Jones, Anthony Shaffer, Richard Gage, William Lagasse and Chadwick Brooks (both of the latter individuals are Pentagon Police Officers), as well as hundreds of architects, engineers, scientists, pilots (both commercial and military), fire-fighters (including the first responders whose testimony was finally released under a Freedom of Information suit by the New York Times against the City of New York), ex-CIA officers, and workers at both Arlington Cemetery and the Naval Annex who have come forth with evidence that collectively demonstrates that the “official” conspiracy theory concerning 9/11 cannot withstand critical scrutiny – in other words, that what is alleged to have happened, among other places, at the Twin Towers and the Pentagon did not occur in the way that has been claimed in: *The 9/11 Commission Report*; the various NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) reports concerning the Twin Towers and Building 7; or, *The Pentagon Performance Report*.

John Farmer, who headed up one of the 9/11 Commission research teams, has indicated that there were many dynamics taking place behind the scenes of the Commission that ensured Philip Zelikow -- a person with deep ties and conflicts of interest involving the Bush Administration (conflicts of interest about which he remained silent when he was being interviewed for the position of: ‘Director of the 9/11 Commission’) -- had complete control over what did and did not see the light of day during the investigation. Not only is there evidence to indicate that Zelikow had already written a first draft of the Commission’s Report prior to any witnesses being deposed, but there also is overwhelming evidence to indicate that Zelikow actively sought to exclude important testimony from the investigatory and reporting process by preventing many, if not all, of the testimony from the foregoing listed names to be properly considered or openly discussed through the public hearings that took place in conjunction with the work of the 9/11 Commission.

I believe you are honorable people who are seeking to do good as best you currently are able to understand what that might mean and

involve. I believe your Cordoba initiative is done with such an intention.

I do not believe you are willfully holding an opinion concerning the events of 9/11 that is contrary to the facts. Rather, I believe you hold the opinion you do because you are ignorant of the actual facts – because you either have not had the time or taken the time to do due diligence with respect to conducting rigorous research concerning 9/11.

I believe your situation vis-à-vis 9/11 is that of many Americans and even that of many people in the media. I do not believe any of you are part of some vast conspiracy to cover up the truth about 9/11.

I believe you have made the same mistake that many people have committed in this matter. You have let other people provide you with many of your opinions and ideas about 9/11 without bothering to properly verify or vet those sources.

Based solely on your public statements (such as, among other places, your book: *What's Right With Islam*), I know that you have not carefully, if at all, gone through *The 9/11 Commission Report*, The FEMA report, the NIST reports, or *The Pentagon Performance Report*. I know with even more certainty that you have not taken the time to listen to the testimony or read the testimony of most, if not all, of the witnesses who I mentioned earlier.

I know this because if you had done such due diligence you would have come to a much different conclusion than you have concerning the events of 9/11. I know this because you have had a good education and, at one point in your life, were heading toward a career in science and, therefore, you are capable of looking at empirical data or experimental results and, then, you are able to critically analyze such material in order to evaluate its credibility and viability. I know this because I have had discussions with you previously about technical issues.

The problem, however, is that you really have not looked at the actual data and facts concerning 9/11. Indeed, as indicated, your problem is that of many individuals in America – individuals of good will and decency – who have accepted, without much critical investigation of their own, what other people have had to say about

9/11 ... other people who had positions of responsibility concerning the investigation of 9/11 but, unfortunately, betrayed the American people instead.

I don't know what the motives of such people were. I am not interested in speculating about them.

What I do know is that they got pretty much everything wrong in relation to 9/11. They committed egregious errors of both commission and omission during their inquiries into such things as the collapse of the Twin Towers, the collapse of Building 7, the devastation at the Pentagon, and the jet crash in the field in Pennsylvania.

I have no theory about whom or what is responsible for the events of 9/11. I have not formed any conclusions -- one way or the other -- whether the alleged 19-20 hijackers actually had anything to do (whether peripherally, indirectly, or directly) with 9/11.

Individuals who demand an answer to the following question -- namely, if the 19 or 20 Muslims identified by the FBI as being responsible for 9/11 did not commit the terrorist acts that occurred on that tragic day, then who did? -- are, in effect, trying to place the cart before the horse. They are pursuing a mode of logical reasoning that is not likely to get anyone very far if this is to be the point of departure for all ensuing exploratory travel concerning 9/11.

First one needs to establish the facts. Once this has been done, then, one needs to connect the dots to see where they lead with respect to the people who might be implicated by those facts.

No one in the government, academia, or the mainstream media has done any of their so-called fact finding in a way that is capable of plausibly demonstrating that the Twin Towers or Building 7 collapsed in the way alleged. No one in the government, academia, or the mainstream media has done any of the necessary fact finding in a manner that is capable of plausibly accounting for what allegedly occurred at the Pentagon. No one in government, academia, or the mainstream media has done any of the required fact finding in a way that plausibly explains what allegedly went on in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

None of the foregoing is about who is responsible for 9/11. It is entirely about what actually happened – and can be demonstrated – with respect to the physical facts of 9/11.

Why have I bothered to provide the foregoing overview concerning certain facets of 9/11? There are several reasons.

First, I am trying to induce you both to actually take the time to verify whether, or not, your beliefs concerning 9/11 are correct and viable. You cannot do this without going through the physical evidence alluded to before, and, to date, I am certain that you have not done this with much deliberation ... if at all.

Secondly, as long as your opinions concerning 9/11 are critically and factually uninformed, you are not really in any position to make sound judgments concerning the present situation vis-à-vis Cordoba House aka Park51, or the so-called Ground Zero Mosque. Pressure is mounting for you and the other stakeholders of SoHo Properties to acquiesce to the demands of many Americans that you should be willing to move your project to another, less sensitive, less problematic location.

Unfortunately, almost everyone is arguing about the wrong principles with respect to the foregoing controversy. The central issue is not about First Amendment rights, nor is it about the right of Americans to have their sensitivities concerning 9/11 be given proper consideration, nor is it about the rights of 9/11 families to be saved from further insult and injury ... although all of these principles are, in their own context, perfectly understandable and not unreasonable.

The real principle at the heart of the ‘Cordoba House’ controversy is the elephant in the room that no one wants to talk about. The elephant is named “Truth and Justice”, and it is the visibly invisible ghost of 9/11.

Three thousand innocents – both Americans and foreign nationals – were assassinated on 9/11. Then, when there was a rush to judgment by all too many people who should have known better, the tragedy of 9/11 led to the further slaughter of tens of thousands of more innocents in Iraq and Afghanistan, along with tens of thousands more who have been maimed for life – both American and non-American and both Muslim and non-Muslim.



In the process, the families of 9/11 victims have been betrayed. The people of America have been betrayed. The soldiers of America have been betrayed. The people of Iraq and Afghanistan have been betrayed. Truth and justice have been betrayed.

How can you or the other stakeholders of SoHo Properties reach an equitable resolution with respect to the Cordoba House controversy when the whole brouhaha is predicated on misinformation and ignorance concerning the facts of the matter of 9/11? Your present controversy cannot be properly resolved, America's 9/11 wounds cannot be adequately healed, and the tremendous injustices inflicted on Iraq and Afghanistan cannot be adequately addressed until the truth about 9/11 is established.

Mark Twain once said: "The trouble with the world is not that people know too little, it's that they know so many things that aren't so." No truer words have ever been said about people's ideas and opinions concerning 9/11.

If 9/11 families and the people of America want their concerns and sensitivities properly taken into consideration with respect to the Cordoba House project, then, they need to reciprocate and take steps to ensure that what they believe to have happened on 9/11 actually took place in the way that the official story claims. For, if things concerning 9/11 are other than they are officially framed to be, the 9/11 families and the people of America will need to adopt an entirely different set of concerns and sensitivities with respect to 9/11.

If anyone would like to interject at this point that the facts of 9/11 already have been established, then they haven't been paying attention to what was said previously. Anyone who has not gone through: *The 9/11 Commission Report*, the NIST reports, *The Pentagon Performance Report*, as well as listened carefully to the testimony of all of the people I have listed earlier (and many others could be added to that list) and who were prevented (either actively or passively) from testifying before the 9/11 Commission – such a person really has no idea of what might, or might not, have taken place on 9/11.

The understanding of such an individual concerning the physical facts of 9/11 has been provided for them through something other than their own due diligence. Anyone who is honest about this issue will admit as much.

Feisal and Daisy, you, and others at SoHo Properties, have an unprecedented opportunity to do great service to both truth and justice, as well as to the 9/11 families, the rest of America, democracy, and the peoples of Iraq and Afghanistan. Actually, there is no one else on the face of the earth at the present time that has the same chance as you now possess to ensure that the right thing is done with respect to so many principles and people.

This opportunity might never come again. You have a chance to do what no one else has been able to achieve with respect to 9/11 -- namely, seek a new investigation into 9/11 that is objective, rigorous, independent, thorough, and capable of generating results that are actually able to reflect the full set of existing data concerning 9/11 ... something that has not, yet, happened through: the government, the media, academia, or any of the organizations that officially have been linked to the supposed official investigation into 9/11.

As an act of good faith, I feel you should be willing to move your Cordoba House project to another location. However, in exchange for your act of good faith you should require a reciprocal act of good faith -- an agreement to establish (through state and/or federal grand juries) an exhaustive exploration into 9/11.

In fact, since David Patterson, the governor of New York, has graciously offered to help you find a suitable but alternative location for the Cordoba House project, I propose that David Patterson also has the authority to ensure that an appropriately unbiased grand jury of New Yorkers be convened for the purposes of investigating the murders of 9/11 -- just like any other murders that have occurred, or will occur, on New York State soil. The Office of David Patterson would be a natural bridge through which both sides of the offered good faith might meet and reach a just and equitable resolution to the current controversy.

I have confidence in the American people. Moreover, the great work that state and federal grand juries do at least five days a week all across America in helping to protect democracy demonstrates that my faith in the American people is justified.

If a group of average Americans is permitted to investigate 9/11 via a grand jury format and follow the evidence wherever it takes them and subpoena power permits, I believe that the results of such an

investigation will be fair and impartial. I believe that when they consider all the relevant evidence they will arrive at a judicious conclusion concerning 9/11.

However, this challenge must be under the full authority of the people of America, not the government. Let the people fulfill the purposes for which grand juries were originally established as the last bastion of defense against forces of tyranny and injustice that are capable of undermining democracy and freedom.

If you have the foresight to adopt and realize the proposal I am making concerning the exchange of location for a proper investigation into 9/11, the entire world will owe you a debt of gratitude. If you have the courage to adopt and realize the proposal I am making, the whole purpose of Cordoba House would have been fulfilled before it was even built.

I will end with some words from a Tracy Chapman song:

Don't be tempted by the shiny apple;  
Don't you eat of the bitter fruit;  
Hunger only for the taste of justice;  
Hunger only for the word of truth,  
For all you have is your soul.

As a friend, I can think of no better counsel to give you.

Anab Whitehouse

[To date, I have received no response from either Imam Feisal Rauf or Daisy Khan concerning the foregoing communication to them.]



**12.) Explosive Questions for 9/11**

Have you heard about the living-dead who  
Move among us as a corrupted moral  
Essence ... though several commissions have tried  
To mask their presence?

Did you heed the call of ideology  
To stay clear of outrageous theories of  
Conspiracy which were shamelessly spun  
From defective yarns?

Did you know there are engineers whose souls  
Show fault lines that placed humanity at  
Risk by setting evil free to commit  
more atrocities?

I have many questions about that day.  
For instance I would like to hear what they  
Have to say concerning Building Seven.  
Explosive questions that won't go away.

Do you proudly hail members of Congress  
Whose hearts suffer from a malady of  
Conscience that has left them deaf, dumb, and blind  
to September crimes?

Are you informed, now that the media  
Has confused propaganda with facts while  
Urging us to adopt paranoia  
As a way of life?

Did you salute the cool bravery of  
Military leaders who completely  
Shirked their duty toward an enemy both  
Foreign and home-grown?

I have many questions about that day.  
For instance I would like to hear what they  
Have to say concerning Pierre Bunel.  
Explosive questions that won't go away.

Have you been properly enlightened  
By professors who arbitrarily  
Treat duplicity as a quality  
Of truth and justice?  
Do you feel safer from the terrorists  
Who roam freely within halls of justice ...  
Guilty not of failed intelligence but  
failed integrity?

Does your heart not soar on taxed wings of the  
Heirs to nine-eleven – more war, torture,  
Tyranny, and an obscenely healthy  
Defense industry?

I have many questions about that day.  
For instance I would like to hear what they  
Have to say concerning David Schippers.  
Explosive questions that won't go away.

**13.) Letter to So-called Leaders of Today and Tomorrow**

On January 7, 2008, the following letter -- accompanied by a copy of *The Essence of September 11th* -- was sent to: a variety of members of Congress (mostly, but not entirely, from Maine); editors for quite a few commercial and university newspapers; a number of professors at different universities; Scientific American Book Club (which had sold *Debunking 9/11 Myths*, Edited by David Dunbar and Brad Reagan, to its club members), and, as well, some Muslim organizations. I received back one reply. I leave it to the imagination of the reader to work out which of the foregoing categories gave rise to a lone responder.

-----

Hello,

More than six years have passed since the events of 9/11. Based on the results of a May, 2006 poll conducted by Zogby, it is estimated that 70 million voting-age citizens of the United States do not accept the 9/11 Commission's version of what transpired before, during, and after September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. 45% of the Zogby sample felt there should be a new investigation into the events of 9/11. A Scripps Howard/Ohio University poll conducted in August of 2006 asked a different set of questions from the aforementioned Zogby poll in relation to 9/11 but came up with somewhat similar results indicating that approximately 36% of the American people not only reject the findings of *The 9/11 Commission Report* but, as well, harbor deeper anxieties concerning whom they believe might have been responsible, in part or in full, for the tragic events of 9/11.

On the basis of my own experience -- as well as according to the reports of an array of other individuals who have made the effort to exercise due diligence with respect to the matter of 9/11 -- many, if not most, of the people who have accepted the findings of the 9/11 Commission as being definitive (and this includes various facets of the media) have done so in a largely passive manner. That is, many of the supporters of the perspective given expression through the work of the 9/11 Commission have arrived at their position of support by, more or less, uncritically accepting the ideas and data being advanced by the 9/11 Commission while studiously eschewing any kind of rigorous, detailed, critical examination of either *The 9/11 Commission*

*Report* or any of the other attempts (whether by government officials, members of academia, representatives of the media, or people claiming to have studied the matter scientifically) to lend credence to the aforementioned report.

Unfortunately, much of the current discussion revolves around one term: “conspiracy theories”. Irrespective of whether, on the one hand, an individual is a proponent of the 9/11 Commission story in which 19 Arab hijackers conspired together with ‘Usama bin Laden to attack America, or, on the other hand, a person is an advocate of some other kind of conspiracy theory, both sides of this conspiracy theory discussion are caught up in their respective conspiracy paradigms, and, as a result, I believe they are focusing, to varying degrees, on the wrong set of issues. Consequently, such discussions all too frequently seem to be generating conflict-laden confrontations, rather than peaceful reconciliation, in relation to their collective concerns.

Before jumping to conclusions about who the perpetrators for 9/11 might be, perhaps we should consider concentrating on the following question: Do we actually know what happened with respect to 9/11? This might seem like a ludicrous proposal to advance at this stage of things, more than six years after 9/11 and with so much of the media convinced it has done due diligence on this matter despite a demonstrably woeful failure on the part of all too much of the media to judiciously investigate the available data concerning 9/11. However, the reality of the 9/11 situation is that no one (in relation to whatever side of this matter one considers) has come up with a defensible, empirically backed, rigorous understanding of 9/11. Instead, we are confronted with many questions in search of a unified, persuasive explanation.

My ‘proof’ of the foregoing claim is based upon the fact that there are far too many essential questions concerning 9/11 that have been left without satisfactory answers – questions that are outlined, documented, and explored in *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* book accompanying this letter. The questions I have in mind are not the sort of small set of anomalies that often tend to be left over after, say, a good scientific investigation has been brought to a conclusion but that, nonetheless, leaves such residual matters unaddressed because the unanswered questions to which those marginal matters allude do not



appreciably affect the principle conclusions of an investigation that is solidly rooted in evidence existing independently of such anomalous trivialities. Rather, the unanswered questions alluded to above have to do with a multiplicity of critical themes that plague absolutely every facet of the scenario that has been constructed by *The 9/11 Commission Report* (as well as many other treatments of 9/11) – from the Commission’s account of the events taking place before 9/11, to the Commission’s account of the events occurring on 9/11, to the Commission’s account of the events that have transpired since 9/11.

I have always believed in the importance of tackling any issue with a methodical rigor that searches for whatever truths might be unearthed in relation to an issue being explored. I believe in the value of empirical data, and I also believe in the need to subject all such data to a scrupulous, impartial, objective examination that will bring out the strengths, problems, and lacunae inherent in that data.

*The 9/11 Commission Report* has not conducted such an investigation. In fact, in many ways the *9/11 Commission Report* is colored more by what it excludes, as well as the mistakes it makes in relation to what it does include, and both factors give a rather disconcerting hue of empirical and methodological sloppiness to that document.

The final NIST report (National Institute of Standards and Technology, a division of the Department of Commerce) which purports to provide an explanation for why several steel-framed buildings at Ground Zero came down on 9/11 has not conducted such an investigation. This is true in spite of its 10,000 pages of charts, graphs, experimental results, and analysis by an array of government-sponsored engineers and scientists.

Moreover, for nearly two years, NIST has been promising to release a report that supposedly explains how Building 7 at the World Trade complex came down. However, NIST has failed to live up to its promises in this respect.

To be sure, NIST has released some preliminary material concerning its ideas about what they believe might have happened in conjunction with Building 7. Nonetheless, their narrative is little more than a general description of the issue – a description that is almost

totally devoid of any substantive data capable of demonstrating the reasonableness or even plausibility of such an account.

The FEMA report on the destruction of the World Trade Towers has not conducted the sort of investigation into the destruction of World Trade buildings that is conducive to having confidence in its conclusions with respect to such matters. In addition, the FEMA report is largely baffled by the problem of explaining how Building 7 at the World Trade Center complex came down and comes up with an account that, by its own admission, has only a very low probability of being a viable explanation for the collapse of Bldg. 7.

*The Pentagon Building Performance Report* concerning events at the Pentagon on 9/11 has not conducted an investigation capable of convincing anyone other than the ones who participated in the report that it constitutes a reliable and credible study. Indeed, aside from being obscured by a lack of transparency concerning many facets of its research, the report fails to address a number of issues and questions that bear upon the issue of providing a viable account of what took place at the Pentagon.

A *Popular Mechanics* study-- compiled and updated as the book *Debunking 9/11 Myths* -- did not give expression to anything remotely resembling a rigorous investigation. In fact, the finished 'study' by *Popular Mechanics* resembles something more akin to what might be produced through junk science than anything that should inspire confidence in an individual attempting to exercise some modicum of independent, critical reflection.

In contrast with all of the foregoing studies and reports, my book, *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>*, attempts to achieve just one basic goal. More specifically, the accompanying book seeks to demonstrate why there are an abundance of important questions that have not yet been -- and, therefore, still need to be -- satisfactorily answered before the matter of 9/11 (together with the lives that were lost on 9/11 and the families who lost loved ones on 9/11) can be laid to a just resting place.

I don't have a theory about who the guilty parties were on 9/11 (and you might, or might not, be surprised by the fact that if you go to the FBI website you will discover that 'Usama bin Laden is not wanted by the FBI in conjunction with 9/11, although he is wanted for

other events, and that, in a separate context, Robert Mueller, the director of the FBI, has stated there is no paper trail connecting bin Laden to 9/11). Nevertheless, I do believe there needs to be a new, non-partisan (which is quite different concept from bi-partisan), methodical, and rigorous investigation into the events surrounding 9/11. I believe a new publicly-funded inquiry into 9/11 – one with full subpoena power (which unlike the 9/11 Commission is actually exercised) and that is fully transparent to America and the world -- needs to be established in order to accomplish what none of the aforementioned ‘official reports’ were able to do... namely, to find the truth concerning 9/11 ... or, at least, as much of the truth as can be ascertained at this stage of things. I believe such an inquiry must be carried out by people who – unlike all of the reports and studies mentioned previously -- have no conflicts of interest that might interfere with, or be perceived by the public as being capable of interfering with, the ability of such investigators and researchers to carry out a thorough, objective, and exacting inquiry into all facets of 9/11.

*The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* is my contribution toward providing some of the rationale for establishing such a new investigation. This work is not a definitive treatment of everything having to do with 9/11, but the book accompanying this introductory letter does raise an array of questions that I believe need to be addressed by all Americans.

I hope you will read this entire book in a critically reflective manner. I don’t purport to have ‘the’ answers, but I do have a lot of questions ... questions that I feel any member of this democracy ought to be asking and concerning which, hopefully, responsible citizens ought to be seeking defensible, satisfactory resolution.

I am not asking you to take sides with respect to whose – if anyone’s -- conspiracy theory should be championed, and this is true irrespective of whether such theories are promulgated by the government or by those who stand in opposition to the government’s own version of a conspiracy theory concerning 9/11. What I am asking you to do is to be an advocate for establishing truth and justice concerning 9/11 so that the controversies surrounding such conspiracy theories – controversies that are helping to tear this

country apart -- will be brought to a felicitous end. I believe that reading *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* might be as good a place as any through which to begin a healthy, constructive, and just journey to final closure with respect to such a goal.

#### **14.) Constitutional 911: 9/11 and the Constitution**

Many people have criticized both *The 9/11 Commission Report* and the various NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) reports concerning the collapse of three buildings at Ground Zero in New York for lacking qualities such as: thoroughness, rigor, accuracy, and integrity. What I have not seen to date – although someone, somewhere might have said something on this topic – is that the very processes through which the 9/11 Commission and NIST were permitted to produce their reports were unconstitutional.

In other words, neither the 9/11 Commission nor NIST had constitutional authority to do what they did. More specifically, Congress did not have the Constitutional authority to pass legislation to create the 9/11 Commission, and the Department of Commerce -- the parent body of NIST -- did not have constitutional authority to enable NIST to conduct its research and produce its reports in relation to 9/11.

No matter what one's theory concerning 9/11 might be, I believe there is indisputable evidence that the events of 9/11 have been used as a pretext for eviscerating the Constitution – and, actually, some of these issues [for example, torture, extreme rendition, warrantless wiretaps, the Patriot Act, and undeclared wars] already have been explored and analyzed by a variety of people. Yet, many of these same individuals who have been critical of the government in the ways noted previously seem to be of the opinion that although the 9/11 Commission and NIST had the right to do what they did, they just did it badly, and, as a result, such critics seem to have failed to understand that the 9/11 Commission and the NIST reports were part of the Constitutional evisceration process that ensued from 9/11.

Great tragedy occurred on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. Obviously, the nearly 3000 lives that were lost on 9/11 -- along with the many families that, as a result, were adversely affected -- are near the top of the list.

However, the damage that has been done, and is being done, to the Constitution is enabling many more such tragedies to unfold. The patriot Act, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (where hundreds of thousands more people have died), torture, extreme rendition, crimes

against humanity, warrantless wiretapping, hundreds of billions of dollars that have been wasted on war, crippling indebtedness, a failing economy – these are all the bastard children of countless incestuous affairs being illicitly conducted (that is, which are unconstitutional) within, and through, the federal government.

The following discussion outlines the underlying issues. In addition, this essay will explore a few of the ramifications that have arisen through the unconstitutional processes at issue.

-----

The Constitutional basis for my contention concerning the 9/11 Commission and NIST are rooted in four provisions of the Constitution and after listing these roots, I will elaborate upon them in greater detail through much of the remainder of this essay. (1) Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution states that: “The United States shall guarantee every state in the union, a republican form of government.” (2) The Preamble to the Constitution stipulates that the purpose for which the Constitution has been created is: “to establish a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.” (3) The Ninth Amendment indicates that: “The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” (4) The Tenth Amendment stipulates that: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.”

-----

(1) The promise of republican government in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution has nothing to do with the Republican Party. In fact, although I am not a Democrat, nor do I belong to any other political party, nonetheless, one might easily argue – and quite plausibly I believe (and this will be elaborated upon shortly) – that the current Republican Party is the complete antithesis of the actual meaning of “republicanism” being referred to in the Constitution ... although to be fair about the matter, one quite justifiably could say the same thing of the existing Democratic Party – namely, that when its candidates are

elected they usually do not properly observe the fiduciary responsibilities that are entailed by a republican form of government.

The idea of guaranteeing every state in the union, a republican form of government could be read in, at least, two ways. (a) The federal government is guaranteeing that every state will have a republican form of government, and, (b) the federal government is guaranteeing that the federal government will provide a republican form of government in its relations with the various states.

Interpretation (a) is both oppressively tyrannical and runs contrary to the whole revolutionary and constitutional history of America. Therefore, the guarantee of republican government being issued through Article IV, Section 4 is about the quality of government that the central government will offer to each of the states of the union.

Unfortunately, the sad fact of the matter is that almost every administration in the federal government that has taken office since the inception of the United States of America has failed to realize the Constitutional requirements of Article 4, Section 4 – which is not a promise, but a guarantee -- concerning the matter of a republican form of government. Consequently, almost from the very beginning of this country as a constitutionally constructed entity, virtually every federally elected government has conducted its administration in an unconstitutional manner.

When the Constitutional Convention was in progress in Philadelphia, much of the discussion was done through a spirit of republicanism. Indeed, republicanism was part of the ideology of the Enlightenment that influenced the Framers of the Constitution, and, as such, republicanism was: a way of life; a way of thinking; a way of behaving.

Moreover, the theme of republicanism was so close to the hearts of the Framers of the Constitution they held that no one should govern others unless such leaders were completely governed by republican principles. This was so much the case that it was enshrined in the Constitution in Article IV, Section 4, and was probably one of the primary reasons why individuals such as Madison and Monroe initially felt there was no need to create a separate Bill of Rights since the

guarantee of republican government contained in the Constitution should – they believed – satisfactorily accommodate such concerns.

So, what is republicanism? It encompasses a set of core values such as: being benevolent; having integrity; demonstrating character; showing judiciousness; displaying egalitarianism; possessing and giving expression to qualities of virtue; being truly disinterested in personal gain or profit while serving others; having the capacity to be impartial arbiters in all matters and, therefore, never serving as a judge in one's own cause; showing tolerance and modesty in all matters; exhibiting unflinching honesty; manifesting honor and reasonableness in every affair; being willing to sacrifice oneself for the good of others; being unbiased and independent when evaluating and judging any situation; having high-mindedness guide one's thoughts and actions in relation to the public good.

In an ideal republican world, a person in government would not receive a salary or profit for one's labors on behalf of the public. This is one of the reasons why many of the individuals who stayed for the entire Constitutional Convention struggled financially throughout the process, and it is also one of the reasons why others who had assembled for the Constitutional Convention had to leave before the process had been completed – namely, they could no longer afford to survive in Philadelphia and be away from their means of generating income.

Given the foregoing set of republican values, one could understand how people like Monroe and Madison believed that a Bill of Rights was unnecessary. After all, if government officials lived in accordance with the requirements of republican values then all of the protections of human rights that are given a voice through the Bill of Rights could be satisfied by individuals who operated through republican values ... or, so, the theory went.

Fortunately, there were many other individuals in the Colonies who, although they admired and sought to abide by the values inherent in the republican spirit, they, nevertheless, had a less sanguine – or, perhaps, more realistic -- view of human potential. They realized that not all individuals who achieved elected or appointed office in the Federal Government could necessarily be counted on to abide by the requirements of a republican philosophy.



Consequently, these more far-sighted members of the fraternity of Framers had the guarantee of republican government written into the Constitution. In addition, they insisted that unless there was a separate Bill of Rights that would be added to the main body of the Constitution very soon after the ratification process had been completed, then there would be no ratification of the Constitution as written ... the issue was, in a sense, a deal-breaker.

The republican spirit prevailed. A gentleman's agreement on the Constitution had been brokered, and soon after the Constitution was ratified, a process for developing a Bill of Rights was instituted, and the results of that process were subsequently ratified in 1791.

Article VI of the Constitution states:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution."

Among other things, the foregoing excerpt from the Constitution – the beginning portion of which is referred to as 'the Supremacy Clause' – indicates that all laws must be in compliance with the Constitution. This means, among other things, that all laws must be in compliance with the guarantee of republican government.

In short, one of the primary filters through which everything in the Constitution must be understood is encompassed by the "guarantee of republican government". If one wishes to talk about the intent of the Framers, then everything that they did, said and wrote was a function of republican values and principles because that is the philosophy and understanding that essentially shaped their perspective concerning government and social affairs.

Anything that does not satisfy the guarantee of republican government is unconstitutional. Furthermore, all Senators,

Representatives, members of the state legislatures, as well as all executive and judicial officers are bound by the requirements of the guarantee of republican government to acknowledge as much.

Unfortunately, for most of the history of the United States the aforementioned guarantee has not only been unacknowledged, but, as well, it has not been properly enforced with respect to the actions of any of the branches of federal government. Consequently, many of the Congressional laws, executive orders, and judicial decisions that have been generated over the years are unconstitutional for when those laws, executive orders and judicial decisions are critically and rigorously examined, they usually are not capable of passing the litmus test entailed by the guarantee of republican government.

Furthermore, this means that many of the decisions and practices of: Congress, the Executive Office, and the Judiciary that are cited as precedent to support or rationalize their judgments actually often constitute invalid forms of reasoning. This is so because such precedents are frequently the result of processes that could not satisfy the guarantee of republican government that is stipulated in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution and that all governmental officials are required by Constitutional authority to support through affirmation or oath ... as is said in another context, such precedents are the fruit of a poisonous tree (the failure to satisfy the conditions of republican government) and, as such, are, therefore, Constitutionally unacceptable.

To name just a few of the fruits of such a poisonous tree, one might mention: The Federal Reserve Act of 1913. The entire Act was put together in a secret meeting on Jekyll Island, off the coast of Georgia, by a group of seven individuals (Charles, Norton, Paul Warburg, Nelson Aldrich, Benjamin Strong, Abraham Andrew, Henry Davidson, and Frank Vanderlip) who represented a variety of private banking and financial interests and, then the Act was guided through Congress by people (such as Nelson Aldrich, who was the Republican Whip for the Senate) and who knew that the proposed Federal Reserve would not be a Federal institution but a corporation that served the interests of a consortium of private member banks rather than the interests of the vast majority of the people of the United States and that, for the

most part, would be beyond the control of the Federal or State governments.

The foregoing was a clear violation of the guarantee of republican government. This is so not only in relation to the influence that special interests had in constructing the legislation concerning the Federal Reserve (and, there are many, many cases in which private lobbyists and special interest groups write the legislation that is voted on – often unknowingly -- by members of Congress), but the failure to observe the requirements of republican governance also reflects how many people in Congress failed to exercise reasonableness, integrity, honor, impartiality, honesty, judiciousness, impartiality, and benevolence (to anyone but the bankers) during the process of passing the Federal Reserve Act.

In fact, much of the legislation that deregulated the financial industry – e.g., the Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 – and that laid the groundwork for the creation of intentionally complex and mystifying financial instruments, such as derivatives, is unconstitutional. This is because the manner through which many, if not most, of the deregulatory laws came into existence violated the peoples’ right to republican governance ... that is, many individuals who were involved with the passage of such legislation were not people with: honor, integrity, honesty, judiciousness, benevolence, impartiality, egalitarianism, independence, and high-mindedness that was free of all self-interest and private passions concerning such legislation.

Another example of the fruit of the poisonous tree concerns corporations. In today’s world, corporations possess great power, have most of the rights and protections of actual human beings, and, yet rather ironically, often don’t have any of the responsibilities of biological persons.

This current state of affairs has turned the understanding and concerns of colonists and the Framers of the Constitution upside down. In colonial days, corporations were, for the most part, loathed by the colonists – except, of course, for those individuals who stood to gain money and power through their cohabitation with one of the predominant corporations of colonial days – namely, the East India Company.

The Boston Tea Party was an act of rebellion not only against King George, but it was also a statement of protest against the East India Company that had been given an unfair advantage in commerce by being largely exempt from the taxes that were being levied on colonial tea entrepreneurs through the Tea Act of 1773. The East India Company, which had English government office holders and royalty among its stockholders, used the leverage provided to it through the Tea Act to drive smaller tea suppliers out of business by undercutting the prices charged by the latter who had to pay a tax from which the East India Company was largely immune.

The Framers of the Constitution had no intention of, either explicitly or implicitly, delegating rights and powers to corporations. Corporations are not mentioned in the main body of the Constitution nor, for a very good reason, are they mentioned in any of the amendments. Corporations were considered to be malevolent forces intent on denying people the right to have control over their own lives.

However, despite the provisions of the Constitution, corporations have continued to seek ways to undermine democracy and usurp the powers of: the people, states, and the federal government. They have sought to accomplish this through a variety of venues, many of which involved the corporations who owned railroads.

For instance, consider the 1886 Supreme Court decision involving Santa Clara County versus Santa Fe Railroad. Over the years since that decision, corporations have tried to use what they have incorrectly portrayed as the substantive character of that decision as a precedent for treating corporations as persons. However, the attempt of corporations to push for such recognition violates the essential spirit of what is meant by republican governance in several ways.

First, the Santa Clara County decision did not acknowledge or stipulate that corporations were persons. Instead, the impression that such a precedent had been established was created by a court reporter – J.C. Bancroft Davis, a former executive for the railroads, and who, while employed as a court reporter for the Supreme Court, earned money on the side by publishing Supreme Court decision with annotated introductions of his own thoughts. It was those annotated comments of the court reporter – not the actual legal decision -- which

made the claim that the aforementioned decision had stipulated that corporations were persons under the law.

Secondly, the idea that corporations were persons under the law and, therefore, were entitled to the same rights or powers as biological persons would have been rejected by the vast majority of colonists, as well as by the Framers of the Constitution. To try to argue otherwise would require one to rewrite America's revolutionary history, and, as a result, one has no problem in ascertaining the Framers' intent in relation to corporations like The East India Company – such corporations were predatory capitalists and to whatever extent they were permitted to exist, they should not be given any powers or rights that could not be completely controlled or revoked by the people.

Since then, corporations have used money, economic power and collusion with their corporate partners, the banks, to corrupt the political process in America and everywhere else in the world. Consequently, all of the powers and rights that corporations have acquired through the process of government have been gained by ensuring that the guarantee of republican government is ignored and corrupted.

In fact, one can take the issue further. Any attempt to consider corporations as anything other than legal fictions with respect to the very circumscribed category of artificial persons in order to provide civil liability protection with respect to monetary debt or damages in relation to investors of such artificial entities cannot pass the litmus test concerning the Constitutional guarantee of republican government. Moreover, all attempts to claim 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment protection for corporations are also unconstitutional because the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment clearly stipulates that its provisions are specifically for: “all persons born or naturalized in the United States” and corporations are neither born nor naturalized.

Indeed, corporations are not citizens at all – born or naturalized. Thus, when one reads a bit further down in the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment that: “No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States”, this does not prevent laws being made that do abridge any privileges or immunities which corporations might believe themselves to have – and this is so, because corporations are not citizens.

Finally, the last part of Section 1 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment states that no state might: “deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” A corporation is not a person in the sense of a being who has come into this world through biological birth and is a citizen of the United States by either birth or a process of naturalization, and, therefore, corporations are not entitled to equal protection under the law.

The entire history of corporations seeking to be legally identified as actual persons or being recognized by certain jurists as actual persons is predicated on a failure to comply with the requirements of the guarantee of republican government. This is so because all such efforts have been rooted in desires and qualities that are the antithesis of the sort of republican values and principles that are alluded to in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution – in other words those efforts have not exhibited properties of: benevolence, disinterest in personal gain, being unbiased, honesty, virtuousness, having integrity, and not possessing self-interest or private passions.

One could extend the foregoing sort of reasoning to a wide variety of other issues. For instance, passage of the Patriot Act -- along with so many other Congressional Acts – is unconstitutional because most of the members of Congress did not read the Act before passing it. This is a violation of the guarantee of republican government.

One could add other examples of violations of the Constitutional guarantee of republican government. Conflicts involving Vietnam, Panama, Grenada, Nicaragua, Iraq (twice), and Afghanistan were -- and are -- unconstitutional ... irrespective of what Congress, the Executive Office, or the Judiciary claims. All those conflicts involved demonstrable: deceit, dishonesty, injudiciousness, unreasonableness, bias, and, as well, all those conflicts lacked: character, honorableness, integrity, benevolence, and impartiality. Consequently, all of those conflicts have failed to comply with the Constitutional guarantee of republican government that the federal government owes to the states.

The requirement of republican government is the lens through which all issues of national security and interests must be assessed. No war can be declared and no conflict can be fought unless one can

demonstrate that the war and the conflict comply with republican principles and values.

Moreover, if, either after the fact or before the fact, a given war or conflict can be shown to be based, or to have been based, on lies (as say, Vietnam, Iraq – twice -- and Afghanistan have been so exposed), then the perpetrators of such essential breeches of the Constitution need to be impeached, if still in office, convicted, and then, whether, or not they hold elective or appointive office, held accountable for having committed: war crimes, crimes against humanity, and treason in relation to the very principles and purposes for which America came into being.

Or, consider the following. All government treaties and policies involving Native Peoples have been unconstitutional because they all violated, in one way or another, the Constitutional guarantee of republican government to the states and their people.

Nothing that the federal government has done in relation to Native peoples can be characterized as being: honorable, reasonable, impartial, unbiased, honest, tolerant, virtuous, benevolent, or disinterested. Throughout its history, the Federal Government has consistently and continuously violated Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution by failing to provide citizens of the various states with republican governance in relation to a proper treatment of Native Peoples – some of whom provided ideas that helped shape and orient the thinking of the Framers of the Constitution.

Every rider that is added to a Congressional Bill – riders that seek some sort of special entitlement for a given state, district, region, or group as an implicit price for passing the bill in question -- is a violation of Article IV, Section of the Constitution. The very existence of such riders is demonstrated proof that the Bill to which they are attached lacks: integrity, independence, impartiality, honor, character, honesty, judiciousness, and virtuousness.

This might be how Congress operates. However, to the extent that this is the way Congress operates, then all such activities are unconstitutional since they are a violation of the guarantee of republican governance that is owed to the citizens of all the states in America.

Furthermore, many of the laws encompassing: elections, the unfair advantage that the Republican and Democratic Parties have in most jurisdictions, the way in which votes are recorded in many places (e.g., the newer electronic devices that leave no paper trail to verify the integrity of the process), campaign financing, and the use of public airwaves in relation to candidate debates and coverage are in violation of the Constitutional guarantee of republican government for all citizens of the respective states. This means that the elections arising out of such processes are also unconstitutional, for the latter are functionally related to the former activities – activities that lack often lack: integrity, honor, equitability, judiciousness, impartiality, egalitarianism, virtuousness, and character.

How the legislation is worded, or what might be said by various jurists in their decisions concerning this, or that, precedent in any of the foregoing matters, is often irrelevant. This is so because the process through which the legislation has been generated or the judicial decisions that are reached concerning such legislation give expression to numerous violations of the guarantee of republican governance.

Thus, even if one wanted to argue that Congress had constitutional authority to pass a law through which the 9/11 Commission was created (which I do not believe they had and will argue as much shortly), and even if one wished to maintain (which I do not believe can be done in a plausible way ... again, more on this shortly) that the Department of Commerce had constitutional authority to direct NIST to undertake a series of reports concerning the collapse of the three buildings at the World Trade Center (although one might wonder why their alleged mandate did not include the Pentagon as well), there is a wealth of evidence to indicate that neither Congress, nor the 9/11 Commission, nor NIST, nor the Pentagon conducted themselves in accordance with the specifications of Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution which stipulates that the Federal Government is under Constitutional obligation to guarantee republican government for all of the states and their respective peoples in such matters. Indeed, a litany of questions and charges (that I won't reiterate here and might easily be found in a variety of references) have been raised concerning the: honesty, integrity, independence, judiciousness, character, virtuousness, impartiality, reasonableness, and disinterestedness of:



Congress, the 9/11 Commission, NIST, and the Pentagon in relation to their respective investigations into 9/11.

In other words, neither Congress, nor the 9/11 Commission, nor NIST, nor the Pentagon, nor the Office of the President, nor the judiciary have met the litmus test of republican government in relation to 9/11. This is not a matter of officials making promises and, then, not living up to them, but, instead, this is a matter of all branches of the Federal Government having failed to meet the conditions of Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution that guarantees a republican form of government in all matters.

Guarantees are not about giving a good faith effort – and, even this is questionable concerning the way the Federal Government handled the events prior to, on, and following 9/11. Guarantees are about the absolute fiduciary responsibility of all branches of government to ensure that republican values are instituted in everything that is done by any of those branches of government.

There is only one place in the Constitution in which any guarantees are given. This concerns the manner in which all activity – no matter which branch -- of the Federal Government must be conform to the principles, values, and spirit of republican governance.

There are no exceptions to Article IV, Section 4. This is the very heart of the Constitution, and if that provision is disregarded, then, all ensuing governance will be corrupted and become corrupt due to the absence of republican principles and values.

All one has to do is look at the current situation in the United States politically, economically, socially, educationally, financially, militarily, judicially, and internationally and one can see the effects that have ensued as a result of the United States persistent and pervasive disregard in relation to the central importance of republican government to a constitutionally viable democracy. The Framers of the Constitution understood this issue, but most of us have written off the guarantee of republican government as a quaint artifact of ancient history, and, as a result, we are suffering the consequences.

*The 9/11 Commission Report*, the various NIST reports, as well as *The Pentagon Performance Report* were all conceived in, and dedicated to, the proposition that they did not have to comply with the

requirements of Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution. This was a continuation of the acts and policies that the federal government had begun perpetrating before, during, and after the events of 9/11.

As a result, we have been graced with such things as: torture, extreme rendition, militarism, imperialism, enemy combatants, military tribunals, destruction of foreign countries, financial meltdowns, economic exploitation, loss of civil liberties, corporate malevolence, increasingly unmanageable debt; a failing infrastructure, Congressional gridlock, and the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives (including some that were our own). Irrespective of how one might feel about what might, or might not, have occurred on 9/11, the fact of the matter is that the Constitution has been eviscerated by a succession of federal administrations who have failed to keep faith with the Framers' guarantee of republican government for the citizens of all the states in America.

-----

(2), (3) and (4).

All of the Framers of the Constitution, along with most of the colonists, believed that rights were extra-governmental. In other words, rights were inherent in their status as human beings and were not derived from, or gifts bestowed by, government.

The foregoing belief is given unmistakable expression in the second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. Indeed, the idea of democratic government presupposed the existence of human beings who had the sort of naturally endowed rights that would enable them to come together and fashion a form of governance that would protect those rights within a framework that would help advance the common welfare along with all of the other principles mentioned in the Preamble to the Constitution.

Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution stipulates that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representative." The legislative powers that are alluded to in Article I, Section 1 are specified in Section 8 of the same Article.

More specifically, in Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution we find the following enumerated powers to which Congress is entitled.

These powers include the ability to: (a) collect and lay taxes; (b) borrow money; (c) regulate commerce; (d) establish conditions for naturalization and bankruptcy; (e) coin and regulate the value of money; (f) provide for the punishment of counterfeiting; (g) establish post offices; (h) promote science and useful arts through copyright protections; (i) constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; (j) define and punish crimes committed on the high seas; (k) declare war; (l) raise and support armies; (m) provide and maintain an army; (n) make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; (o) provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions; (p) provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; ; (q) exercise exclusive legislation in relation to the District of Columbia and all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the various states for erection of forts; magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings; and (r) make all laws that shall be necessary and proper for the carrying into execution the foregoing powers by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The foregoing powers are not absolute. They are constrained by: the Preamble to the Constitution and the guarantee of republican government.

In other words, powers cannot be executed in just any way Congress wishes. Those powers must be exercised in accordance with republican principles – which are guaranteed – and must be done to further the purposes set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution ... namely, “to form a more perfect union; establish justice; insure domestic tranquility; provide for the common defense; promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.”

Furthermore, the Preamble is not a piece of rhetorical fluff. Without it, the Constitution has no direction or purpose.

Just as the guarantee of republican government gives expression to how government is to conduct itself, so too, the Preamble touches on why pursuing a union of people through government is important and what government is supposed to accomplish.

Unfortunately, there is a great deal that goes on in the three branches of the Federal Government that does not serve the purposes for which the Constitution was created. If one took almost any piece of legislation, executive order, or judicial decision and asked for a rigorous defense be given as to how such legislation, orders, or decisions advanced the causes of the Preamble to the Constitution, much of the former could be shown to be: arbitrary; problematic; inconsistent; unnecessary; ill-conceived; biased; ineffective; and injurious to justice, domestic tranquility, the common defense; the general welfare, and securing liberty for ourselves and posterity.

To the extent that the foregoing claim is true, then all legislation, executive orders, and judicial decisions that cannot be shown to be able to rigorously and demonstrably further the purposes of the Preamble really are unconstitutional. If one's legislation, orders and decisions cannot be shown to serve the purposes for which the Constitution was created, then, such legislation, orders and decisions are really antithetical to why the Constitution was originally created.

For instance, one might ask: How did the Congressional law that formed the 9/11 Commission advance the purposes inherent in the Preamble to the Constitution?

Did the 9/11 Commission help "form a more perfect union"? No, it didn't. The Commission and its executive director were riddled with conflicts of interest, and such conflicts of interest are an anathema to the idea of forming a more perfect union. Furthermore, *The 9/11 Commission Report* is also riddled with errors of many different kinds encompassing problems of both omission and commission, and, once again, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to understand how error is ever going to lead to the formation of a more perfect union.

Did the 9/11 Commission establish justice? No, it didn't because the Commissioners, researchers, and executive director went out of their ways not to establish justice except through statements, arguments, and inferences that were lacking evidential credibility and intent on promoting a conspiracy theory favored by the government. In fact, a terrible injustice was perpetrated on the 9/11 families, the American people, and the rest of the world through the 9/11 Commission and its report.

Did the Commission insure domestic tranquility? No, it didn't, and in fact it had exactly the opposite effect since a number of polls now indicate that well over a hundred and twenty million people (including a number of 9/11 families, as well as an array of professional pilots, architects, engineers, ex-military and intelligence offices, and scientists) in the United States now believe that the 9/11 Commission did not do a credible job in relation to its investigation of 9/11.

Did the Commission provide for the common defense? No, it didn't since it actually undermined the possibility of such a common defense through its many errors of commission (e.g., the Commission intentionally left out the testimony of scores of people who had evidence that ran contrary to the government's conspiracy theory) and, as a result, made certain that many truths about 9/11 would never see the light of day – and, you cannot provide for the common defense by hiding the truth.

Did the Commission promote the general welfare? No, it didn't because the Commission was a body that was engaged in something other than a thorough and rigorous search for the truth -- which is the only thing that could have promoted the general welfare under the circumstances. Instead, America, 9/11 families, and the rest of the world have been fed a steady diet of misinformation, disinformation, and an invented mythology by *The 9/11 Commission Report*.

Did the Commission secure the blessings of liberty for either: ourselves or our posterity? No, it didn't but, instead, the Commission placed our liberties at risk through promoting and propagandizing a conspiracy theory that the government had advanced, without credible evidence, within days following the events of 9/11 – a conspiracy theory that *The 9/11the Commission Report* could not defensibly or plausibly maintain and, yet, a conspiracy theory that has been used by all too many people who should have known better to help rationalize and justify the dismantling of civil liberties in America, Iraq, and Afghanistan.

Since the 9/11 Commission, its researchers, its executive director, and its report were not advancing the principles of the Preamble to the Constitution, then they must have been advancing some other agenda. In other words, whatever was going on with the 9/11 Commission was unconstitutional.

-----

In addition to the constraints imposed on Congressional legislative power by the Preamble to the Constitution and the guarantee of republican government, there are several amendments to the Constitution that are intended to remind everyone – government and citizens alike – that Congress is not entitled to extend its activities beyond the limits that are specified in the Constitution – almost all of which are contained in Section 8 of Article I and that have been outlined earlier. These two amendments are the ninth and tenth amendments.

Colonists, in general, as well as many of the people who were most active in the constitutional and ratification processes, in particular, were concerned that the federal government might try to extend its authority beyond the enumerated powers of Article I, Section 1 in the proposed Constitution. Therefore, they insisted that the Constitution be amended to reflect such a concern -- namely: “The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people,” and this is known as the Ninth Amendment.

This meant that the powers and rights of Congress were fixed and limited by the Constitution. Moreover, whatever those powers were, they could not be extended in such a way as to deny or disparage the rights and powers that people retained beyond the enumerated powers and rights of Congress.

The protections of the Ninth Amendment were further strengthened through the Tenth Amendment. This amendment states that: “The powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states, or to the people.”

The Tenth Amendment accomplished two things. First, it reiterated an important principle, initially introduced through the Ninth Amendment – namely, citizens or the people have constitutional standing quite independently of the federal government or state governments.

If this were not the case, then the Ninth Amendment would have talked about how the enumeration of rights or powers belonging to the federal government should not be understood to either deny or

disparage other rights and powers retained by the states. However, the Ninth Amendment did not mention state rights or powers. The amendment only referred to the rights and powers of the people.

Moreover, the Tenth Amendment affirms that the constitutional standing of people or citizens is independent of the federal governments when it adds the phrase: “or to the people.” If the Framers of the Constitution had wanted to reserve all powers for the states that have not been delegated to the federal government or that have not been prohibited to the state governments, then the Tenth Amendment would have ended with the words: “are reserved for the states,” but this is not what the Tenth Amendment says.

When the issues underlying the Tenth Amendment were being discussed, Roger Sherman from Connecticut suggested that the phrase “or to the people” be added to the wording of the amendment. This suggestion was accepted without objection or debate.

One cannot read the Tenth Amendment as if the phrase: “or to the people,” is just a literary device that offers another way of referring to state governments. Constitutionally speaking, state governments are one thing, and the people are quite another.

There was much suspicion among colonists concerning any kind of government, and this was a direct result of their collective experiences either in Europe and/or through the tyrannical manner in which the British (and their colonialist agents) sought to control things in America. This meant that not only was the idea of a central, federal government to be approached with caution and with respect to which citizens should have protections and relief, but the aforementioned suspicions concerning governance extended to both state and local governments as well.

The Bill of Rights is almost entirely dedicated to protections of people and not of states. The Tenth Amendment does offer protection to states, but, simultaneously, that amendment also extends protection to the people by clearly indicating that: people were to have constitutional standing alongside of states and that citizens had a choice as to whether they wished those powers that were not delegated to the federal government or prohibited to the states to fall within the purview of the people or the purview of state governments that, theoretically, represented citizens.

The people insisted on a Bill of Rights because they did not trust government – any government. The people insisted on the Ninth and Tenth Amendments because those amendments gave the people a constitutional standing that neither the federal government nor the state governments should deny or disparage.

Unfortunately, states historically have continuously sought to usurp the rights and powers of people that were granted to people under the Ninth and Tenth Amendments. States, in this respect, have tried to do to the people what the federal government has attempted to do in relation to the states and the people – that is, to extend the sphere power, influence, and control of the central government.

For example, let's return to the list of enumerated powers that are listed in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution and that have been stated earlier. Nowhere in that list of powers is there anything indicating that Congress has the right and power to create legislation concerning a 9/11-kind of investigation.

The closest that the enumerated list comes to such a possibility is in relation to the power of tribunals. The primary root meaning of the idea of a tribunal is in the form of a court or forum of justice.

In fact, Article I, Section 8 indicates that the power at issue involves the capacity “to constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.” This infuses the notion of tribunal with a thoroughly judicial flavor.

The 9/11 Commission did possess the power of subpoenas, and this is similar to what happens in relation to tribunals. Moreover, most witnesses had to swear an oath under possible penalty of perjury, and, again, this is somewhat similar to what occurs within tribunals.

Nonetheless, despite the foregoing surface similarities between the investigation of the 9/11 Commission and the idea of tribunal, the 9/11 Commission does not really satisfy most of the criteria that might justify calling such a process a tribunal. For instance: (1) the Commission was not constituted with a judicial purpose in mind but, from the beginning, was treated as an investigation; (2) there was no special prosecutor appointed; (3) there were no defendants; (4) there was no attempt to observe the laws of evidence or follow normal court procedure; (5) the entire process of research was kept hidden and was



not subject to rules of disclosure or cross-examination; (6) there were witnesses (e.g. George W. Bush and Richard Cheney) who did not have to swear an oath before giving testimony; (7) no judge or judges were assigned to the investigation; (8) although there were witnesses who gave false testimony, no one was held accountable; (9) although the power of subpoena was available to the Commission, it was almost never used, and as a result, even if justice were the point of the exercise – which it wasn't – justice could never had been served by Commissioners who were, for whatever reason, unwilling to exercise the subpoena power in anything but a perfunctory and very limited manner; (10) there were no sanctions associated with the findings of the commission; (11) the findings of the 9/11 Commission were not subject to review by the Supreme Court that is clearly a requirement entailed by the Congressional power to be able to constitute tribunals that are “inferior to the Supreme Court”.

One cannot try to claim that something is a tribunal when it ignores, or tramples upon, most of what a tribunal requires. Furthermore, even if one were to concede the idea that 9/11 Commission was a tribunal (which the foregoing points indicate is not the case), then, at the very best, such an individual is faced with the prospect that the 9/11 Commission was unconstitutional in the manner in which it violated the principles inherent in the Preamble to the Constitution, as well as unconstitutional in the way in which it violated the guarantee of republican government set forth in Article IV, Section of the Constitution.

The fact of the matter is, the 9/11 Commission was not a tribunal in: intent; name, form, principle, process, or results. Therefore, in passing legislation that created the 9/11 Commission, Congress exceeded its constitutional authority.

None of the powers that are enumerated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution entitle Congress to form a 9/11-style investigation. Congress could have created a tribunal that would have been required to pursue the issues surrounding 9/11 in a very different way than the 9/11 Commission did, but Congress didn't do this, and, therefore, the 9/11 Commission as constituted and realized was in violation of the Constitution.

According to the 9<sup>th</sup> Amendment, “the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people”, and, yet, this is exactly what Congress did through the formation of the 9/11 Commission – deny and disparage rights that are retained by the people. According to the 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment, “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people,” and, yet, by passing legislation for the 9/11 Commission, Congress transgressed into areas that are clearly the preserve of, and reserved for, the states or the people.

By passing legislature to form the 9/11 Commission, Congress not only violated the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights of the people as pointed out in the foregoing comments, but, as well, Congress violated the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights of people. Among other things, the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment introduces the idea of a “grand jury”.

Normally speaking, grand juries are formed when a district attorney or attorney general wants to prosecute someone whom he or she believes has committed a crime. During the grand jury proceeding, the prosecutor puts forth an array of evidence that she or he believes strongly indicates that a given individual has committed a certain crime.

The members of the grand jury are free to ask whatever questions they like concerning such evidence. They also are free to ask for additional evidence and witnesses to be presented.

Once all the witnesses and evidence have been presented, the prosecutor leaves the room where the grand jury has been convened. The jurors then discuss and explore the issues among themselves as to whether, or not, they believe sufficient evidence has been presented to underwrite an indictment of the accused individual.

The understanding of many people – including that of some lawyers and prosecutors – concerning the idea of a grand jury tends to end at this point. In other words, once the grand jury reaches a decision concerning whether, or not, to indict someone, then supposedly the work of the grand jury is complete.

However, a grand jury does not serve the state or its legal officials. The grand jury serves the people, and the reason that the idea of a

grand jury has been enshrined in the 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment is to preserve the civil liberties of citizens.

Consequently, on the one hand, grand juries are the last outpost of protection for citizens against arbitrary and unwarranted prosecution by the government. However, on the other hand, grand juries also are a constitutionally authorized forum to ensure that the government is not undermining the civil liberties of citizens in ways that might extend beyond the interests of any given district attorney, attorney general, or other legal representative of the government.

Once the immediate reasons for which some level of government has convened a grand jury have been served, a grand jury is free to pursue any other issue that is of interest to the members of that jury that carry implications for the civil liberties and rights of citizens. Many district attorneys and attorney generals who actually know about this dimension of the power of grand juries are often not inclined to share such knowledge with the members of a grand jury and, thereby, help those members understand the full potential of their power under the Constitution.

The powers of grand juries are entailed by the guarantee of a republican form of government for the states. The powers of grand juries are entailed by the rights inherent in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments – rights that belong to the people and not to the central government. The powers of grand juries are entailed by the principles given expression through the Preamble to the Constitution. The powers of grand juries are entailed by the priority that people have over governments through the natural, inborn rights of human beings and from which governments derive whatever authority they have.

By passing legislation that created the 9/11 Commission, Congress usurped the rights and powers of grand juries to make determinations and judgments in such matters. By passing legislation concerning 9/11, Congress attempted -- in contravention of the amended Constitution -- to deny and disparage the rights and powers of the people ... rights and powers that could be exercised through venues like, but not restricted to, a grand jury.

Furthermore, by participating in a commission that was without constitutional authority, each of the Commissioners, as well as the executive director of the Commission, and all of the Commission

researchers did also effectively deprive the American people of the latter's 5<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights. I do not call what the various participants did a conspiracy, but, rather, each person acted individually and, probably without any real understanding of the nature of their unconstitutional behavior. However, whether done unknowingly or knowingly, all those individuals were, nonetheless, still denying and depriving American citizens of their Constitutionally established rights by working with and on the 9/11 Commission.

Article II, Section 2 of the Constitution indicates that the President shall: "appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, and counsels, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and that shall be established by law." In conjunction with the 9/11 Commission, the President did appoint, first, Henry Kissinger, and, then, Thomas Kean to serve as Chairman of the 9/11 Commission.

However, the 9/11 Commission was created through Congressional legislation. It was not a Presidential body.

Thomas Kean was assigned to the Commission as the President's representative on a legislatively created body. As such, Thomas Kean had no special authority apart from what Congress had enabled (unconstitutionally) the Commission to have in the first place.

By appointing the chairman for the 9/11 Commission, the President violated the 5<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights of the people because he was co-operating with a body – namely, the Congress – that had exceeded its Constitutional authority in relation to the powers that it had, and had not, been granted. Consequently, in the process, the President also exceeded his authority even though under other circumstances the President does have the Constitutional authority, as noted earlier, to appoint various individuals as ambassadors, Supreme Court judges, counsels, or officers of the United States.

In addition to Congress and the President, there is another facet of government that also violated the 5<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment rights of the people. The facet of government to which allusion is being directed here concerns the Department of Commerce that authorized NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) to conduct an investigation into the building collapses at the World Trade Center.

NIST came into being in 1901 and is under the auspices of the Department of Commerce. It is a non-regulatory agency whose stated mission is: “to promote U.S. innovation and industrial competitiveness by advancing measurement science, standards, and technology in ways that enhance economic security and improve the quality of life.”

Whatever technical facility NIST might have, neither the Department of Commerce nor NIST had Constitutional authority to investigate the World Trade Center building collapses. The investigation of those collapses was not about, on the one hand, regulating commerce, nor, on the other hand, was such an investigation a matter of promoting innovation and industrial competitiveness, or advancing: measurement science, standards, and/or technology.

Even if one were to concede that the Department of Commerce and, therefore, NIST had Constitutional authority to conduct the investigation it did with respect to the World Trade Center (which I do not concede and that they cannot justify under the Constitution), overwhelming evidence exists through the work of people such as: Richard Gage, Steven Jones, Judy Wood, Kevin Ryan, and many, many others that NIST did not conduct itself in accordance with its Constitutionally mandated obligation to go about its activities in compliance with republican principles of: honesty; integrity; honor; impartiality; judiciousness; character; independence; or reasonableness.

Moreover, it seems rather odd that NIST was given authority to investigate the collapse of the World Trade buildings, rather than, say, the National Transportation Safety Board or the FBI. Of course, in many ways, neither the NTSB nor the FBI is really equipped with the resources and expertise to examine the collapse of three buildings at the World Trade Center except in very restricted ways.

Unfortunately, almost from the very beginning, the FBI failed to treat the World Trade Center as a crime scene. The FBI permitted evidence to be taken away without consideration for the possibility that its theory concerning the nature of events on 9/11 might be incorrect or incomplete, and, consequently, as an agency of the central government, the FBI violated the Constitutional guarantee of a republican form of government for the states – a possibility that

assumes more ironic proportions given that the FBI has, since, publically stated they have absolutely no credible evidence capable of tying 'Usama bin Laden to the events of 9/11.

One might also add that the FBI has acted unconstitutionally in the manner in which it has handled potential evidence about 9/11 involving, among others, Sibel Edmonds, Indira Singh, Robert Wright, and David Schippers. In the first three cases, the FBI has put a gag order on the people in question and, as a result, has prevented those individuals from sharing what they know with the American people.

The provisions of Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution are quite clear. The federal government (including all of its agencies) is under an absolute guarantee to provide a republican form of government to the states of the union, and, yet, based on what has been said by Edmonds, Singh, Wright, and Schippers, the FBI has not acted with: impartiality; honesty; honor; integrity; judiciousness; character; or reasonableness in relation to 9/11.

The cry of 'National Security' does not trump a constitutional guarantee of republican government. This is especially so when there is prima facie evidence provided by, at least, four individuals, acting independently of one another, that the FBI has not conducted itself in accordance with the Constitutional requirement of republican government with respect to the events of 9/11.

In addition, the mantra of "National Security" also does not justify the use of torture water-boarding, extreme rendition, the invention of categories such as "unlawful enemy combatant", or maintaining captives without due process. The military and all intelligence agencies are under the auspices of the federal government, and, therefore, they are subject to the requirements of Article IV, Section 4 concerning the guarantee of republican government to all states – and this remains true whether, or not, the country is at war or engaged in some military conflict.

If the federal government in any of its manifestations does not comply with the Constitutional guarantee of republican government, then national security has been violated because there is nothing more vital to the national security of America than the requirements of republican government. There is nothing more important or essential to Constitutional stability and viability than the requirement that all

federal employees (whether members of Congress, members of the military, members of the so-called intelligence community, members of the judiciary, or members of any department or office within the federal government) act with: integrity, character, honesty, impartiality, judiciousness, benevolence, independence, honor, self-sacrifice (not the sacrifice of others), and virtue. Moreover, if federal employees cannot act in the foregoing manner, then everything they do is unconstitutional.

-----

Currently, despite whatever successes and good features might be present, the United States is a failed state. It is a failed state because it gives expression to all the characteristics of a failed state.

More specifically:

(1) Failed States do not honor the provisions and guarantees of their constitutional documents – and the foregoing discussion has shown that the United States federal government has done this again and again.

(2) Failed states are unwilling or unable to protect their citizens – e.g., 9/11; Katrina; the BP/Deep Water Horizon catastrophe (along with many other environmental disasters); the financial meltdowns involving derivatives; the banking industry; endless wars for contrived reasons.

(3) Failed states tend to regard themselves as beyond the reach of domestic and international law – e.g., America’s opting out of the World Court, as well as its undermining the United Nations by continuing to support Israel’s illegal occupation and confiscation of Palestinian property, as well as Israel’s illegal wall, settlements and violation of Palestinian human rights.

(4) Failed states feel free, if not entitled, to carry out aggression and violence against other countries and peoples – e.g., the United States’ acts of unprovoked aggression against Iran, Guatemala, Cuba, Vietnam, Lebanon, Nicaragua, Chile, Grenada, Panama, Haiti, Iraq (twice), Afghanistan, Pakistan, and the Palestinian people.

(5) Failed states suffer from a deficit of democratic institutions – e.g., America’s legal system is broken and disadvantages the poor in all too many ways; congress is deadlocked and almost completely under

the influence and control of lobbyists and special interests; the military is used as a tool for imperialistic and corporate agendas; the electoral process is deeply dysfunctional; the executive office often behaves as if it is a monarchical, imperial presidency that does not have to serve anything but its own agenda.

(6) Failed states usually have no, or little control, over their central banks or actively collude with such banks to the disadvantage of the vast majority of their citizens so that the latter are enslaved by the banking system rather than empowered by it – e.g., the Federal Reserve system is a consortium of private banking interests that was unconstitutionally legislated into existence and has never once been able to avert any of the crises (such as the Great Depression or the current near-Depression and the recent meltdown in the financial markets) for which it, allegedly, was created.

(7) Failed states are characterized by a media whose behavior and potential for objectivity and integrity have, in many ways, been co-opted -- e.g., if the American media had been objective and acted with integrity in relation to the events of 9/11 – which they did not—then America’s present situation might not be so dire.

(8) Failed states terrorize their own citizens and the citizens of other countries – e.g., the persistent evisceration of the American Constitution that has been perpetrated by all three branches of the federal government over the last several hundred years is nothing less than a series of terrorist attacks upon successive generations of American citizens, and such terrorist attacks have permitted other terrorist activities by the federal government to spill over into America’s treatment of many other countries and peoples around the world.

In view of the foregoing, I believe that there are roughly five choices facing the American people:

(a) Acknowledge that the 9/11 Commission was an unconstitutional usurpation of the rights of citizens under the 5<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments of the Constitution, as well as a violation of both the Preamble to the Constitution and Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution that guarantees republican government to all of the states of the union, and, as a result, permit American citizens – not the government – to pursue a new investigation into the events: leading



up to, occurring on, and ensuing from 9/11. This could be a first and very necessary step that permits Americans to reclaim and reassert their right to a constitutional democracy that has integrity and other qualities of republican governance.

(b) Convene a new Constitutional convention in which the American people have an opportunity to correct all the things that currently help make the United States a failed nation.

(c) Permit states to secede and make their own arrangements – alone or in concert ... and I might point out that although I consider much of the recent discussions concerning secession by various states (e.g., Texas) to be of a frivolous and ill-conceived nature, states do have the right to secede from the Union if the federal government breaks the Constitutional contract that binds states together. In fact, secession is one of the rights and powers that are entailed by the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments, and, therefore, Lincoln was wrong when he sought to force states to remain in the Union. However poorly conceived a move to secede might be, it is neither necessarily an act of insurrection, nor is it an act of sedition or treason, and, therefore, the federal government has no power to prevent it. When the federal government, or any of its agents, no longer complies with the requirements of republican government, then the federal government has lent justification to the desire that people or states might carry with respect to the issue of secession.

(d) Enter into a series of bloody, chaotic rebellions, insurgencies, and insurrections through which multiple parties all vie to control other human beings and deprive the latter of their natural, inherent rights as human beings.

(e) Go with the status quo and be sucked down by the whirlpool in the toilet of an increasingly failed state.

The first option noted above – that is, holding a new, rigorous, independent investigation into the events surrounding 9/11-- is the easiest and least problematic choice facing the American people. Moreover, pursuing that choice might be the best chance America has of pulling back from the precipice of destruction on which the country is teetering.

The second option – that is, convening a new constitutional convention – might serve as a very constructive complement to the foregoing option. Although there is a great deal about America that is right, there also is far too much about America that is dysfunctional and destructive (with respect to ourselves and others), and, therefore, there is a deep need to revitalize and rededicate our democracy through establishing methods and principles that might permit America to be better than it has been over the last several hundred years.

Although the last three options noted above are actual possibilities that are staring us in the face, I don't see any of them as being able to constructively solve the problems with which Americans are currently confronted even as I see different groups within the general population who seem to be increasingly advocating some form of secession, insurrection, or rebellion. Moreover, I feel that those individuals who believe that America will somehow stumble through the current Constitutional crisis without being required to change, in any essential way, the nature of governance or without having to change what is currently going on within government, are suffering from a form of thinking that is seriously delusional in nature.

We can choose to rid ourselves of our current failed state status, and I believe the first step in this process involves either: initiating a new, citizen-controlled but constitutionally authorized investigation into 9/11, and/or convening a new Constitutional convention. The alternative to the foregoing is that we can choose to become an increasingly failed state through secession, insurrection, rebellion, or maintaining the status quo.

America is at a tipping point. The fracture lines are running in all directions, and although just as no one can predict when a major earthquake will occur, all the indices are present to point to a coming cataclysmic social and political event or series of such events in our collective futures.

Time is running out. Important choices need to be made now, or very soon the capacity to choose might be ripped from our hands by social, political, and economic events that could inundate us in an irreversible fashion.





### **15.) Unscientific America: 9/11, Harris, and Chomsky**

Approximately, eight years ago, Chris Mooney and Sheril Kirshenbaum wrote: *Unscientific America: How Scientific Illiteracy Threatens Our Future*. Mr. Mooney is a best-selling author of non-fictional works exploring different aspects of science, while Ms. Kirshenbaum – after earning several masters degrees in marine biology and marine policy from the University of Maine (which is not too far away from where I currently live) – serves as the director for the non-partisan, nonprofit organization known as *Science Debate* that seeks to “restore science to its rightful place in politics”.

*Library Journal* considered *Unscientific America* to be among the best Science-Tech books to appear in 2009. Moreover, the science advisor for President Obama – namely, John Holdren – highly recommended the foregoing book.

I purchased the foregoing title not too long after it came out when I was a member of a book club that featured material exploring different facets of science. However, as is often the case with me, a fair amount of time passed before I actually got around to reading that work.

During a section entitled: *From a Scientist and a Writer* – which amounts to a foreword for their publication – Mooney and Kirshenbaum describe an initiative known as ScienceDebate 2008 in which a physicist, philosopher, screen writer, and lawyer were brought together for the purpose of trying to induce members of the scientific community to contact politicians who were running for office and seek to persuade the latter individuals to begin taking seriously – by addressing – an array of policy issues involving science.

The two authors indicate that the aforementioned project exceeded everyone’s expectations. More specifically, within a few months of organizing that event, more than 38,000 people were supporting their efforts, including many Nobel laureates, as well as scores of university presidents, numerous well-known scientists, and a variety of scientific organizations.

Nonetheless, despite the number of successful outcomes that ensued from the ScienceDebate 2008 initiative, the central thrust of that program appeared to be largely thwarted. More specifically,

notwithstanding the fact that many scientists, educators, and scientific institutions had been sufficiently influenced by the foregoing project to begin actively reaching out to various politicians, unfortunately, candidates from both political parties – as well as the media – largely ignored the overtures of individuals from the scientific community and, as a result, failed to feature – or even include – various issues of science policy in their political campaigns.

Mooney and Kirshenbaum refer to scientists as a “reality-based community”. For reasons that will be explored later in this chapter, such a moniker might be somewhat presumptuous ... at least in some cases.

In the meantime, one might keep in mind that not all science necessarily reflects reality (and as my book: *Evolution Unredacted*, documents, the theory of evolution tends to lend support to the foregoing claim). Moreover, there are many scientists who appear to be less interested – and, frequently, will admit as much – in discovering the nature of reality than they are in solving certain kinds of quantitative and physical problems and have found science to be a good means through which to bring their interests to operational fruition.

During the first part of Chapter One – entitled: ‘Why Pluto Matters’ -- the authors of *Unscientific America* comment on the existence of a dangerous fault line that they believe runs through much of American life in which competing theories of reality, like so many conceptual tectonic plates, push up against one another, creating complex dynamics that could release a great deal of destructive potential at any given time. The foregoing pressures stem from, on the one hand, the fact that for more than half a century, hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent on establishing and operationally funding an assortment of government-based and academic-oriented laboratories (and this doesn’t take into account the trillions of dollars that have been spent on the research and development of military weapons that seek to exploit the findings of science), and, yet, on the other hand, Mooney and Kirshenbaum decry the fact that a disturbingly high number of Americans – at least from the perspective of the authors – continue to resist, if not reject, a variety of fundamental scientific principles ... such as “the scientifically undisputed explanation of the

origin of our species and the diversity of life on Earth” (page 3) known as the theory of evolution.

As has been noted previously (both in this book and elsewhere in my writings), one could acknowledge that the theory of evolution is “the scientifically undisputed explanation” for the origins of all species, but this might be more of a reflection on the problematic state of science when it comes to the theory of evolution than it is an admission that what is considered to be a scientifically undisputed explanation necessarily gives expression to either truth or reality. Moreover, one might challenge the claim that the theory of evolution is the “scientifically undisputed explanation” for the origins of all species because there are scientists – such as Michael Behe, a biochemist at Lehigh University – who do dispute the scientific viability of the explanation to which the theory of evolution gives expression.

To be sure, for a variety of proffered reasons, scientists (e.g., Kenneth Miller – a cell biologist at Brown University) do criticize and reject the position of Professor Behe vis-à-vis the theory of evolution (whether, or not, those proffered reasons are actually viable is another matter). Nonetheless, the very fact that there are scientists – whether they are right or wrong in what they have to say – who do dispute that the theory of evolution is an adequate explanation for the origins of all species tends to belie the foregoing contention of Mooney and Kirshenbaum that the theory of evolution is a “scientifically undisputed explanation.”

Of course, if one is so inclined, one can restrict use of terms such as: “Scientist,” “science,” and “scientific” to situations in which only those individuals and understandings with which one agrees will be considered to be deserving of such descriptions. However, doing so would tend to prejudicially distort the nature of science since many theoretical positions, ideas, and hypotheses often are advanced when various aspects of the material world are explored, yet determining where the truth lies in any given case is not always easy and clear-cut even if – often for either arbitrary reasons or for reasons that later turn out to be problematic – the consensus of scientific opinion might be, at least for a time, oriented around one conceptual position rather than another.

For example, many physicists, for relatively arbitrary reasons,

accepted Bohr's Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics. The reasons being alluded to in the previous statement are arbitrary because Bohr never actually proved that his understanding of things was correct. Instead, he was merely able to point out problems with a number of proposals that had been put forth at various Solvay gatherings by Einstein ... proposals that were expressed in the form of thought experiments that were intended to challenge the viability of the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics.

In addition to various comments concerning the sad status of the attitudes of large segments of the population in America toward the theory of evolution, the authors of *Unscientific America* also proceed to run through a litany of related problems that science and scientists face in America. For instance, they indicate that a study conducted by the *Project for Excellence in Journalism* discovered that during any given five hour period of cable news, one was not likely to encounter more than a minute, or so, of science coverage while being exposed to: 26 minutes of crime, 12 minutes of news items involving disasters and accidents of one kind or another, and 10 minutes worth of entertainment and celebrity news.

Research also has revealed that during the sixteen-year period between 1989 and 2005, the number of newspapers that contained a section on science were reduced from 95 to 34, a nearly two-thirds reduction in featured coverage. The *Boston Globe* joined the foregoing exodus in 2009 when they discontinued their highly respected section on science.

Furthermore, the National Science Foundation gathered data indicating that approximately only 15% of the American public is committed to pursuing various issues concerning science or news about science. Most of the rest of the American public seems to be steeped in one form, or another, of scientific illiteracy.

Thus, despite the fact that science and scientists possessed a great deal of cultural authority following World War II, nonetheless, for a variety of reasons, such prestige has steadily been eroded over the last 70 years. Some of the reasons underlying the loss of cultural authority that once had been enjoyed by scientists are a function of the previously noted changes in the nature of media coverage – or lack thereof.



The aforementioned decline in prestige among scientists also has to do with the way in which science is taught in grammar and high schools (especially when such “teaching” is conducted by individuals who lack true competency in science and, therefore, probably should not be conducting classes in science to begin with). Finally, still other reasons for the decline in prestige of the scientific community that was noted earlier have to do with the way in which many scientists have permitted themselves to become entangled in various kinds of conflicts of interest in which they have preferred their own financial and political interests to the possible best interests of the general public.

During his celebrated 1959 talk concerning two cultures – namely, science and humanism -- C.P. Snow explored several dimensions of the foregoing sort of disjointed and, frequently, contentious relationship. Among other things, he indicated that the foregoing two communities seemed to have little understanding of one another and, in addition, often were contemptuous toward whichever of the two cultures they did not consider to be their own.

The authors of *Unscientific America* believe that at least part of the solution for addressing the issue of scientific illiteracy among Americans rests with working to enhance the quality of the communication that takes place between the community of scientists and the rest of society. Among other things, the two authors felt that as a result of such factors as over-specialization within science, the processes, properties, principles, problems and potential of science were not being properly communicated to the rest of society, and, therefore, over time, science and scientists suffered a loss of relevance, significance, and influence in the minds of the American public.

However, there might be another reason why scientists have lost much of their cultural authority among Americans. More specifically, for a variety of reasons, many Americans no longer trust scientists to serve as objective, honest brokers of truth concerning the nature of reality.

To be an objective, honest broker of truth does not necessarily mean that one’s understanding of some facet of reality is correct or true. Being an objective, honest broker of the truth requires that a person’s efforts to acquire insight into the nature of some aspect of

existence be rooted in a rigorous process that is transparent, open, not intended to evade difficult problems, or mislead and distort (through commission or omission) with respect to relevant issues, as well as be critically and fairly responsive to evidence.

Mooney and Kirshenbaum do indicate that they consider scientists such as Richard Dawkins and Sam Harris to be zealots who might be more interested in using science as a means for promoting their New Atheism than they are committed to uncovering the truth. Moreover, the authors of *Unscientific America* also indicate that such ideological extremists tend to undermine efforts to find common conceptual ground because the aforementioned sorts of individuals seem to be more interested in discovering reasons for continuing to be combative rather than engaging in discussions that are sincerely dedicated to seeking the nature of truth no matter where this might lead.

On the other hand, Mooney and Kirshenbaum claim there are many individuals who reject bedrock scientific discoveries such as the theory of evolution because the latter individuals "... wrongly consider such knowledge incompatible with faith." (Page 9) Unfortunately, the two authors of *Unscientific America* never explain in just what way the kind of knowledge to which they are alluding is, supposedly, compatible with faith, nor do they explain how so many people seem to have arrived at such an incorrect understanding concerning the theory of evolution.

Whatever one might think about the truth of either some form of evolution or creationism, there appears to be a fundamental difference between, on the one hand, worldviews which maintain that everything (in physics, chemistry, and biology) is, at some point, a function of random events, and, on the other hand, conceptual frameworks that contend that events occur in accordance with determinate principles of Divine governance. To be sure, there are some scientists -- such as Kenneth Miller -- who believe in both God as well as the theory of evolution, and, in the process, seem to suppose that the universe -- and, therefore, God -- operates in accordance with, among other things, the principle of quantum indeterminacy, and as a result, seek to portray God and random events as being mutually compatible with one another, but the foregoing efforts seem more like a process of trying to square the circle rather than constituting a viable scientific point of

view.

Consequently, one wonders to what extent Mooney and Kirshenbaum can be trusted as honest brokers of the truth – that is, why should they be believed -- when they try to claim that those who believe in God are wrong when the latter individuals consider the theory of evolution – as currently understood with the science community -- to be incompatible with faith. In other words, the two authors of *Unscientific America* don't appear to be serving as honest brokers concerning the search for truth when considering the nature of the relationship between the theory of evolution and the existence of God because they seem to distort the actual nature of that relationship in order to present science – at least as it is understood and practiced by the vast majority of scientists -- in a less antagonistic, more moderate, and “reasonable” light.

Unfortunately, there is a much more problematic dimension associated with various facets of science and so-called scientists than whether, or not, science and faith can be reconciled. This problematic dimension has to do with the way in which all too many scientists go about pursuing science – or failing to do so – in contexts that entail threatening possibilities for their careers, reputations, financial interests, and/or physical safety.

The events of 9/11 constitute such a context. Those events give expression to a challenge for anyone – whether scientists or non-scientist – who wishes to claim that he, she, or they are interested in seeking the truth of things.

Throughout the book by Mooney and Kirshenbaum, issues such as the theory of evolution and global warming are mentioned again and again as being pertinent to the task and challenge of trying to rehabilitate the sense of significance, relevance and influence that is associated with science in the minds of the American public. Yet, a rigorous discussion concerning the scientific issues surrounding 9/11 is completely absent from the contents of the foregoing book, and one can't help but wonder if the “reasons” why that sort of discussion is absent from the pages of *Unscientific America* might play more of a role in inducing Americans to be scientifically illiterate than does anything that Mooney and Kirshenbaum might have to say concerning why they believe such illiteracy exists and how that problem could be resolved

... indeed, the absence of the 9/11 issue in *Unscientific America* would seem to be one more indicator that there are individuals within the scientific community who cannot necessarily be trusted to be honest brokers of the truth concerning certain facets of reality ... that is, the efforts of such people to acquire insight into the nature of some aspect of existence is not necessarily rooted in a rigorous process that is transparent, open, unintended to evade difficult problems, or mislead and distort (through commission or omission) with respect to relevant issues, as well as be critically and fairly responsive to evidence.

The process of becoming, or being, an honest broker in matters of truth is often filled with a variety of difficulties. For instance, individuals often have to struggle in order to overcome blind spots in their understanding of things so that they might serve as an honest broker of events – scientific and otherwise.

However, some individuals seem unwilling, or incapable, of making the sorts of conceptual, methodological, epistemological and/or moral adjustments that are necessary to be able to engage issues in an objective, rigorous, and critically reflective manner. The discussion that begins on page 15 involves an inquiry into three individuals and their respective manners of engagement of issues involving 9/11.

One of the individuals being alluded to in the foregoing paragraph – namely, Peter Michael Ketchum -- was able to make the kinds of conceptual and emotional adjustments that enabled him to recover certain aspects of his ability to be able to try to serve as an honest broker of truth within the scientific community in matters involving 9/11. Unfortunately, the other two individuals that are discussed in the material that follows – namely Sam Harris and Noam Chomsky – do not appear to have been able to make the same kinds of adjustments as were navigated by Mr. Ketchum, and, as a result, they do not, yet, appear to have been able to rediscover and re-capture the qualities that are necessary to be able to serve as honest brokers of truth in the matter of 9/11 ... and, perhaps, in relation to other issues as well.

Consequently, Sam Harris and Noam Chomsky seem to have become deeply entangled in the problems associated with the ramifications of what being truly “unscientific” in America entail. In

other words, Dr. Harris and Professor Chomsky tend to behave like individuals who, in any given case – such as 9/11 -- are unwilling, or incapable of, objectively searching for evidence, judiciously analyzing the significance of that evidence, and accurately identifying whatever truth such evidence reveals.

[[**Note:** There is a relatively small amount of repetition that occurs during the ensuing discussion. This is due, in part, to the fact that Sam Harris and Noam Chomsky often make the same, or similar, mistakes when engaging the issues of 9/11, and, therefore, because I believe it is important not to leave unaddressed various problematic claims and assertions that have been made by Dr. Harris or Professor Chomsky concerning 9/11, I have tried to take the time that seemed to be necessary to be able to exercise due diligence with respect to a variety of issues that are commented on by Sam Harris and Noam Chomsky, and, as a result, from time to time, there is a certain repetition of material that emerges during the process of critically reflecting on their respective positions since, at certain points, their perspectives tend to overlap.

However, irrespective of whatever irritation a reader might feel as a result of the small amount of repetition that does occur in the following material, this should be measured against the mental anguish and turmoil that have been experienced by millions of innocent people in Iraq, Afghanistan, Libya, Yemen, Lebanon, and Syria whose lives have been lost, abused, tortured, wounded, displaced, mutilated and destroyed due to the fact, in part, that people such as Sam Harris and Noam Chomsky have failed to fulfill their responsibility and duty as intellectuals when it comes to the issue of 9/11 – namely, (1) “to insist upon the truth”, and (2) “to see events in their historical perspective”, and (3) to not disengage or detach themselves from events in a way that helps facilitate the very problems and tragedies that they claim to oppose. I’m sure that the individuals who have been most adversely affected by the events of 9/11 won’t mind whatever relatively small amount of repetition occurs in the following pages because, unfortunately, such points need to be made again and again in order for those ideas and facts to have a chance of penetrating the shield of willful blindness that appears to

engulf people such as Sam Harris and Noam Chomsky in the matter of 9/11.

Willful blindness is rooted in a legal principle – which actually has relevance to many non-legal contexts ... including matters of science and research. This principle refers to instances in which a person can be held accountable for their actions if that individual could have known something or should have known something that substantively affects a given situation, but, instead, the person chooses not to act on, or take into account, what could have and should have been grasped so that appropriate actions might have been taken (for a more in depth exploration of the notion of willful blindness read Margaret Heffernan's book: *Willful Blindness: Why We Ignore the Obvious at Our Peril*). ]]

### **Peter Michael Ketchum and NIST**

Consider the example of Peter Michael Ketchum. For much of his professional life, he was deeply ensconced in the world of high performance systems and scientific computation.

In 1997, he began working at NIST (The National Institute of Standards and Technology) that operates out of the Department of Commerce. From its inception, NIST has been tasked with engaging the processes through which industry sets standards and coordinating those activities with policies of the federal government.

Among other things, NIST attempts to help industry clarify the process of setting standards. In addition, NIST lends support to the foregoing process through a variety of activities, including research.

After a few years at NIST, Mr. Ketchum was assigned to the mathematical and computational sciences division of NIST. He also served as the chairperson for that division's seminar series in applied mathematics.

When, on August 21, 2002, NIST was placed in charge of investigating the cause of the complete destruction of three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11, Mr. Ketchum was not involved in either the research for, or writing of, various reports that were generated by NIST in conjunction with the foregoing investigation. However, he was aware that those activities were taking place.

For many years, Mr. Ketchum accepted the findings that had been recorded in a series of reports released by NIST that purported to account for the demise of the Twin Towers as well as the collapse of Building 7 on 9/11 that had been part of the World Trade Center in Manhattan. However, he had accepted the foregoing findings without really examining, or reflecting on, the contents of those reports because, during that period, he was of the general opinion that the work performed at NIST was of the highest caliber and that, as a general rule, its members conducted themselves with integrity when engaged in research.

In July of 2016, a friend mentioned to him that a certain amount of evidence was accumulating which seemed to suggest that the official position concerning 9/11 might not be the slam-dunk that the media and government had been claiming. The "official" position of the

government consisted primarily of: (1) *The 9/11 Report: The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon The United States*; (2) a series of reports released by NIST concerning the demise of buildings on 9/11 that occurred at the World Trade Center in New York, and (3) The Pentagon Performance Report that was issued in conjunction with the damage that was inflicted on the Pentagon on 9/11]

For approximately a month, Mr. Ketchum didn't follow up on the foregoing information. Eventually, he began to rigorously inquire into a variety of issues concerning 9/11, especially in relation to NIST's research efforts involving the destruction of buildings at the World Trade Center.

Within a relatively short period of time after initiating his own review of the NIST findings, Mr. Ketchum realized that NIST's account of what transpired on 9/11 at the World Trade Center was, to use his words on the matter, "not a sincere and genuine study." As a result, he became quite upset ... first, with himself, since, for sixteen years he really hadn't paid sufficiently close attention to an array of issues concerning 9/11, and, then, he became upset with NIST for the lack of integrity that characterized its reports concerning 9/11.

Once he was able to examine material concerning NIST's handling of its 9/11 investigation, Mr. Ketchum felt evidence overwhelmingly indicated that Buildings 1, 2 and 7 of the World Trade Center were brought down by controlled demolition rather than being due to a variety of structural damage that, supposedly had been caused by either crashing commercial jets and/or office fires that were initiated by spilled jet fuel or – in the case of Building 7 -- through just fires. Irrespective of the extent to which the aforementioned controlled demolition thesis might, or might not, be correct, Mr. Ketchum came to the conclusion that the NIST findings were not done in a competent manner and, therefore, were unacceptable.

-----

Before moving on to explore some of the aspects of Mr. Ketchum's conceptual transformation concerning the events of 9/11, one might be prudent to consider some cautionary qualifications concerning the issue of controlled demolition in conjunction with the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building 7 at the World Trade Center on 9/11. More specifically, while there is ample evidence (some of which is presented



in the present work) to indicate that multiple explosions occurred in different parts of the World Trade Center on 9/11, and while there is considerable evidence that can be cited (e.g., see the chapter: 'Rebel with a Cause' elsewhere in *The Framing of 9/11, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*) in support of the claim that nano-thermite was present in dust samples from the World Trade Center, nevertheless, there are a number of facts that suggest something more exotic – but still not definitively identified -- also was taking place at the World Trade Center on 9/11 than just the use of explosives and nano-thermite with respect to the destruction of the World Trade Center on 9/11.

Thermite, thermate, and nano-thermite are not explosives. They are chemical compounds that, when ignited, are capable of burning their way through, among other things, metal objects (e.g., steel columns in a building), and, when properly orchestrated with explosives, form a system that is capable of sequentially removing sections of designated steel columns to bring about a controlled collapse of a building.

As indicated earlier, I do not dispute that both explosives and nano-thermite were present in, and utilized at, the World Trade Center in conjunction with the destruction of the two Twin Towers and Building 7 on 9/11. What I do dispute is that explosions and nano-thermite are not capable of accounting for certain phenomena that occurred in relation to the events at the World Trade Center on 9/11.

For example, If two 110 storey, 500, 000-ton buildings collapsed to the ground (whether through controlled demolition or through some sort of a conventional, progressive collapse that involved a pancaking of floors one on top of another), one would expect to find 220 stories of material on the ground. Yet, photographs of Ground Zero on the morning of 9/11 (one can see the not-yet destroyed Building 7 in the background) show that after the two towers had disappeared, there was not much more than piles, here and there, of 12 to 14 stories worth of steel on the ground.

Some people have argued that the reason why there is so little debris above ground at Ground Zero is because the weight of the “collapse” drove all that material down into the sub-basements. However, Dr. Wood has found “official” photographs demonstrating that the tunnels, rails, and cars for the Path Train that ran under the

WTC showed only minor damage. Moreover, there was no debris from the towers down in the Path Train tunnels.

In addition, many of the stores in the concourse beneath the Twin Towers were not damaged. One of Dr. Wood's favorite photographs in this respect is a picture of a store in the concourse with a window full of famous Warner Brothers dolls – such as Bugs Bunny, Foghorn Leghorn, and the Road Runner – yet, the store (and this was true of many other stores) was not damaged.

Even more significantly, the World Trade Center was built over a section of concrete foundation that was poured over bedrock. The poured concrete is referred to as the 'bathtub' and it is intended to protect Lower Manhattan from being flooded by the Hudson River.

The bathtub-structure is, in some respects, fairly fragile. This was problematically demonstrated when some of the earth-moving equipment that had been brought in to help with the clean up process at Ground Zero were responsible for cracking the bathtub structure in a number of places.

Yet, one is led to believe that the collapse of 2, 110 storey, 500,000-ton buildings did not put even a scratch in that bathtub structure. Cranes weighing only a fraction of what the Twin Towers weighed could crack the bathtub structure, but the mammoth Twin Towers could not accomplish this. Surely, this is an anomaly that begs for critical reflection.

There is another problem surrounding the attempt to explain the destruction of the World Trade Towers either through a conventional progressive collapse due to fires or due to controlled explosions. More specifically, the seismic signal associated with the demise of the two towers was significantly less than one would expect to be associated with the 'collapse' of two such weighty buildings.

This was especially evident in the demise of the 47-storey Building 7. The destruction of this building had a seismic signal of .6 and was barely distinguishable from normal background noise for an average workday in Manhattan.

The seismic signal associated with the destruction of Building 1 was 2.3. The seismic signal for the demise of Building 2 was 2.1.

Those readings are comparable to the seismic reading associated with the Seattle Kingdom when it was brought down through controlled demolition. The difficulty here, however, is that the height and weight of the Twin Towers should have given expression – but did not -- to a potential energy that was some thirty times greater than the potential energy possessed by the Kingdome when the latter energy was released upon destruction.

There is an additional problem surrounding the length of the seismic signal according to Dr. Wood. For example, the length of the seismic signal for the South Tower's demise was about 8 seconds.

Most proponents of the controlled demolition idea with respect to the Twin Towers (and Building 7) often mention that all three buildings came down at close to free fall speeds. A conventional, progressive collapse (e.g., as in the pancake theory in which upper floors come crashing down on lower floors in a sequential manner) cannot be reconciled with such near free-fall speeds and would require much more time to crumble to the ground due to the resistance that each floor puts up before succumbing to the forces being exerted on those individual floors by the collapsing upper floors ... this is the principle of the conservation of momentum in action.

However, the idea of controlled demolition cannot account for why, say, the South Tower was destroyed at a rate that is faster than free fall. Yet, the roughly eight- second seismic signal associated with the destruction of the South and North Towers indicates that those events took less time than would have been the case if one dropped a bowling ball from the roof of the 110-storey structure unimpeded by air-resistance (approximately 9.5 seconds ... and factoring in air-resistance would slightly lengthen the duration of free fall for such an object).

Instances of controlled demolition approach near free fall velocities because buildings are rigged with cutter charges in such a way that the support columns are knocked out in a sequence that removes any resistance to the falling floors. Consequently, in such cases, the time it takes for a designated building to come down is like dropping an object to the ground from the top of whatever building is being demolished through such controlled demolition.

For a building's destruction to register a seismic signal whose length indicates a time that is shorter than free-fall speeds suggests something is going on in that process of destruction other than controlled demolition. A seismic signal of such short duration might indicate that the building is not just falling freely through space (notwithstanding air-resistance) but is being propelled downward by some force.

On the other hand, a seismic signal of such short duration also might indicate that some kind of force had destroyed the building in such a way that eight, or so, seconds was all it took to register what was left of the building plus its contents with respect to impacting the ground. For example, if – for the sake of conversation – one were to hypothesize that some sort of force reduced a large number of floors to nothing more than dust and that such dust dispersed in a cloud over a large area, then the length of the seismic signal for such an event would be like dropping an object off a much shorter building, and, therefore, the time of free-fall would be much less than one would expect for a taller building.

During the press conference that marked the release of its initial, final report on Building 7, NIST indicated that the destruction of Building 7 was “whisper quiet”. NIST – through its spokesperson, Shyam Sunder – used that description in conjunction with the demise of Building 7 in order to respond to a question about the possible use of explosives (in the form of controlled demolition) with respect to the destruction of Building 7.

Some might wish to argue that by saying what he did that Sunder was merely lying in order to try to hide evidence pointing to the presence of explosives and controlled demolition. However, by saying what he did about the fall of Building 7 being “whisper quiet”, Sunder actually was undermining the position of NIST.

NIST claimed that Building 7 came down as a result of a progressive collapse that had been initiated through the way fire caused girders to expand and, in the process, generate torque forces on a key core beam and, thereby, led the beam to buckle. However, if Building 7 came down due to a progressive, pancake collapse, then, there should have been a lot of noise associated with such a collapse as

one floor slammed into the next and, in addition, successive core beams and floor assemblies buckled and came apart.

However, if the demise of Building 7 was “whisper quiet”, one is not talking about a conventional progressive collapse of the kind to which NIST subscribed. No noise, no conventional, progressive collapse.

By saying what he did in the press conference, Sunder is not only ruling out controlled demolition and explosions, he also is ruling out his own theory. So, if Building 7 came down “whisper quiet”, then, one needs to find some other explanation for how that building came down.

In support of Sunder’s “whisper quiet” comment, Dr. Wood indicates that some people were doing a video with Building 7 as a relatively distant backdrop. The building was coming down so silently that none of the participants realized what was going on until the building was already part way down.

A second point to consider in relation to the possible role of explosives or controlled demolition in bringing down three buildings at the World Trade Center revolves around the following anomaly. On five different occasions the Earth’s magnetic field shifted during 9/11.

The times of these abrupt shifts in the magnetic field correspond very closely with five events at the World Trade Center. The first shift in Earth’s magnetic field occurred precisely at the time when whatever struck the North Tower created a hole in that building. A second shift in the magnetic field took place at the exact time when the South Tower was impacted by something ... most people believe a commercial jet was implicated with respect to the holes in the Twin Towers. Three further shifts in the magnetic field happened at the precise time that Building 1, Building 2, and Building 7 came down.

Controlled demolitions could not have caused such shifts in the Earth’s magnetic field. Conventional progressive collapses cannot account for such abrupt shifts either.

The shifts in the Earth’s magnetic field were recorded through the magnetometer site in Alaska. The site consists of a number of different stations, and the shift recordings were drawn from six of those stations.

In each of the foregoing cases, the magnetometer indicated that for a period of time the magnetic field signal started going down prior to a given event at the World Trade Center (i.e., being struck by something or coming down). When the five aforementioned events took place, the magnetic field signal began to rise again.

Of course, one might wish to argue that the correlation between the two sets of data – one set in Alaska involving magnetic field readings and one set in New York involving three, steel-framed, high-rise buildings – was purely coincidental. And, if such a correlation occurred with respect to just one of the five events in New York, but not in the other four, a person might be inclined to accept such a possibility, but when the abrupt shifts in the magnetic field occur on five different occasions and are tied to specific times at which events in New York transpired, then one might be wise to start looking for some other explanation.

There are a number of other anomalous phenomena associated with the events of 9/11 that occurred at the World Trade Center that tend to indicate that something more than explosives and nano-thermite were involved in the destruction of the World Trade Center buildings on 9/11. One can learn more about those additional phenomena by reading Dr. Wood's book *Where Did The Towers Go?*, but the foregoing several pages of commentary should be enough to help engender a certain amount of caution in the reader with respect to keeping an open mind about what might have transpired at the World Trade Center on 9/11 ... we now return you to our regularly scheduled program concerning Peter Michael Ketchum.

-----

One of the many factors that bothered Mr. Ketchum about the NIST reports was that they failed to exhibit due diligence with respect to determining whether, or not, there was any evidence that explosives of one kind or another might have been present at the World Trade Center on 9/11. For instance in a public statement (carried on C-Span) Dr. Shyam Sunder (Director of the NIST Building and Fire Research Laboratory) announced that before stating what NIST had found to be the cause for the collapse of Building 7, he wanted to state what NIST had not discovered in its investigations ... which was that NIST had not found any evidence indicating that explosives of any kind had been

involved in the collapse of Building 7.

Dr. Sunder stated that the size of the blast necessary to bring down Building 7 would have had a very loud sound associated with it yet none of the video examined by the researchers concerning Building 7 provided evidence that such a blast had taken place. Furthermore, NIST had not discovered any witnesses who reported hearing such a blast.

Nevertheless, Barry Jennings -- who was serving as the Deputy Director of the Emergency Services Department for the New York City Housing Authority on 9/11 -- had given public statements (independently corroborated, at least in part, by Michael Hess) indicating that as Mr. Jennings and Mr. Hess were descending the stairs of Building 7 (because the elevators were not working), the structure was rocked by an explosion from below (which occurred prior to the demise of Buildings 1 and 2) that took out the 6<sup>th</sup> floor landing near which he had been standing, and, as a result, he and Mr. Hess were forced to retreat back up the stairwell and seek an alternative exit from the building.

Furthermore, when the two individuals were finally rescued and led down to the lobby area of Building 7, Mr. Jennings described the entire ground floor as being in total ruins. Earlier, on his way to the Emergency Command Center located on the 23<sup>rd</sup> floor of Building 7, he had gone through that same lobby area and it had been in pristine, undamaged condition.

In addition, William Rodriguez, Kenny Johannemann, Jose Sanchez, Salvatore Giambanco, Anthony Satalamacchia (all of whom worked at the Twin Towers), along with Felipe David (an employee of a company that serviced the candy machines in the Twin Towers) and, perhaps, sixteen other individuals, all experienced massive explosions that took place in the basement complex of the North tower of the World Trade Center prior to anything striking the building above. Moreover, John Schroeder, a New York City fire fighter, also reported being bounced around on 9/11 as if he were in a pinball machine when a series of explosions rocked the North tower he was in -- explosions that occurred prior to the demise of the South Tower -- and as he evacuated the former building, he discovered that the lobby area -- including 2-3 inch glass windows and marble-covered surfaces -- had

been completely destroyed by one, or more, explosions.

Yet, NIST did not bother to interview any of the individuals mentioned in the last paragraph, nor did they talk with the aforementioned Barry Jennings, in relation to the possibility that explosions had occurring at the World Trade Center on 9/11. Therefore, notwithstanding the claims of Shyam Sunder to the contrary, apparently, NIST did not look very hard to uncover evidence concerning possible explosions that might be related to the demise of Buildings 1, 2, or 7 on 9/11 ... and, indeed, when one does not look for evidence of explosions, then declaring that no such evidence has been found becomes quite easy.

NIST proclaimed – through the voice of Dr. Sunder – that researchers had: “... identified thermal expansion as a new phenomenon that can cause the collapse of a structure. For the first time we have shown that fire can induce a progressive collapse.”

However, when Peter Ketchum, a former NIST employee, critically examined the evidence that NIST put forward in support of the foregoing claim, Mr. Ketchum stated: “The explanation that is given by NIST for the collapse of Building 7 sounds like a Rube Goldberg Device” in which an overly complex, fantastic, and irrelevant explanation is used to try to account for something that can be explained in a much simpler manner.

According to Dr. Sunder, NIST had identified column 79 as the weak link that was the first column to buckle and, in turn, led to the successive failures of other columns. Yet, as Mr. Ketchum has indicated in a public statement concerning the foregoing matter, the position of the column (located off-center) that allegedly buckled and supposedly initiated the collapse of Building 7 should have led to an asymmetrical collapse of the building, but, instead, the building came straight down in a symmetrical fashion, collapsing into its own footprint rather than asymmetrically tipping over in some fashion and, as a result, spilling over into adjoining areas on the ground below.

Consequently, Mr. Ketchum referred to NIST’s account of the collapse as being “just fantasy land,” He added that: “Asymmetric damage does not lead to symmetric collapse,” and, furthermore: “It’s very difficult to get a building to collapse symmetrically.”



Moreover, Mr. Ketchum notes that when one takes the computer model NIST constructed in an attempt to demonstrate the nature of the alleged collapse process and compares that model with actual video footage of the demise of Building 7, the two do not resemble one another. In fact, the NIST computer model of Building 7 never actually takes one through the entire collapse process, but, instead, stops with the buckling of column 79 and, then, assumes that everything else that follows took place in a way that is depicted by actual video footage of events on 9/11.

Shyam Sunder claims that – with absolutely no evidence to back up his assertion – NIST’s structural model of the collapse “...matches quite well with a video of the event.” Apparently, he believes that as long as one asserts something with sufficient confidence, then this will be enough to make whatever one says true even if such a statement is at odds with an array of facts.

Peter Ketchum mentions that he remembers seeing a statement from NIST indicating that the researchers were having difficulty trying to figure out why Building 7 collapsed. In fact, earlier during its investigation, NIST researchers proposed a theory concerning the collapse of Building 7 that subsequently had to be discarded as untenable.

Eventually, they resolved their difficulty by fabricating a fictional, fantastical account concerning the collapse of Building 7. Even, then, they were forced to amend that second theory and acknowledge the validity of the arguments of David Chandler, a high school physics teacher in New York, which demonstrated that Building 7 was in free fall for at least three seconds ... a fact that is entirely at odds with the notion of a progressive collapse in which floors successively slam into the floors below them and, therefore, at no point do those floors have an opportunity to exhibit free-fall behavior.

The NIST computer models of the progressive collapse that, supposedly, enveloped Building 1 (North) and Building 2 (South) of the World Trade Center commits the same error as NIST did in conjunction with its model of the Building 7 collapse. In other words, in the case of each of the foregoing three buildings, the NIST models only take things up to the point at which collapses supposedly were initiated and does not provide any of the details concerning how such

a collapse, once it was initiated, would proceed in a way that is capable of being verified by what had been recorded with video on 9/11.

When Dr. John Gross – at the time, a senior researcher for NIST -- was asked about whether NIST had been tasked with the responsibility for determining the cause of the collapses of World Trade Center buildings on 9/11, Dr. Gross responded by saying:

“We found ... what happened I think ... we’ve scientifically demonstrated what was required to initiate the collapse. Once the collapse initiated, the video evidence was rather clear ... it was not stopped by the floors below, so, there was no calculation that we did to determine that ... what was clear on the video.”

Notwithstanding Dr. Gross’s foregoing comments, neither he nor NIST have scientifically demonstrated that the collapse scenario they advanced could account for the properties of the collapses that were captured by video, and, in fact, Dr. Gross admits as much when he acknowledges that NIST did not perform any calculations to demonstrate that their model would be compatible with the video evidence, and, instead, merely assumed their conclusions by claiming - without evidence – that the video evidence confirmed their model.

Peter Ketchum – the former NIST employee who belatedly became aware of the incredibly shoddy work perpetrated by NIST in relation to its investigation into the collapse of three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11 – also has commented on the properties of the rubble that remained following the collapse of the two 110-storey towers plus the 47-storey Building 7. He indicates that there was virtually nothing left to the buildings ... that almost everything had been reduced to a powdered state.

Joe Casaliggi, a New York City fire fighter, recalls going through the rubble at Ground Zero following 9/11. He notes:

“You have two 110 storey office buildings. You don’t find a desk. You don’t find a chair ... you don’t find a telephone ... a computer ... the biggest part of a telephone that I found was half of the key pad ... and it was about this big [spreading his thumb and forefinger apart a few

inches]. The building collapsed in dust.”

Dr. Steven Levin, an environmental medical doctor working at Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York, went through a list of some of the destruction that transpired at the World Trade Center. He said:

“We’re talking here of 43,600 windows, 600,000 square feet of glass [Note: Much of which is several inches thick], 200,000 tons of structural steel, 5 million square feet of gypsum, 6 acres of marble, and 425,000 cubic yards of concrete turned, in good part, to a cloud. ... I was astonished at the degree to which solid materials were turned into pulverized dust as a consequence of that building collapse.”

However, as Mr. Ketchum was alluding to earlier, the foregoing degree of destruction is inconsistent with the idea of a progressive collapse of buildings at the World Trade Center. Indeed, Dr. Judy Wood, a former professor of engineering mechanics, indicates that if there had been three progressive collapses that took place at the World Trade Center on 9/11, then, one would expect to find roughly 267-stories worth of materials at Ground Zero, and, instead, one finds only three piles of rubble, none of which is more than 12-14 stories high ... a problem that is captured in the title of her 2010 book: *Where Did The Towers Go?*

Mr. Ketchum also notes another inconsistency in the NIST theory of a progressive collapse involving Buildings 1 and 2 on 9/11. More specifically, a progressive collapse is driven by gravity, and, therefore, the force of a gravitational collapse is directed downward. Yet, on 9/11, video evidence reveals that there were multi-ton sections of steel perimeter columns that were being projected hundreds of feet in a horizontal direction.

The force of gravity cannot explain such lateral movement. Gravity operates in a downward vertical direction, not horizontally, and consequently, NIST failed to identify the source of the force that was propelling multi-ton steel beams in a sideways direction.

Another set of facts that is inconsistent with the notion that the three buildings at the World Trade Center underwent a progressive

collapse as a result of damage from commercial jet crashes and/or office fires has to do with the temperatures that, for months, were recorded at Ground Zero following 9/11 despite the fact that the piles of rubble had been sprayed with thousands of gallons of water. NIST reported that the maximum temperatures reached within the World Trade Center buildings were approximately 480 degrees Fahrenheit or 250 degrees Celsius.

For instance, despite the fact that substantial rain fell at Ground Zero on the 14<sup>th</sup> of September, thermographic imaging directed at the base of the three destroyed buildings at the World Trade Center detected some hot spots associated with those buildings that registered temperatures in excess of 1,300 degrees Fahrenheit, while several additional hot spots exhibited temperatures of over a thousand degrees Fahrenheit.

The U.S. Department of Labor stated on its “A Dangerous Workplace” web page that:

“Underground fires burned at temperatures up to 2,000 degrees (Fahrenheit).”

Furthermore, the October 2012 issue of *Professional Safety* – the journal of the American Society of Safety Engineers – contained the following words concerning the issue of temperatures at Ground Zero following 9/11:

“Thermal measurements taken by helicopter each day showed underground temperatures ranging from 400 degrees Fahrenheit to more than 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit.”

A December 2001 History Channel program called “Rise and fall of the Towers” indicated that: “As recently as the end of November, it was still 1,100 degrees down underneath the rubble.” During December, ice would form on the rubble pile early in the day, but beneath the surface, the ground was still smoldering and one person working on the pile observed that the ground wasn’t frozen but “kind

of bubbled underneath your feet.”

The observable fires that were present in the underground areas of the World Trade Center were finally extinguished on December 19, 2001, more than three months after 9/11. Yet, the burning question of what was the source of those fires has not been successfully extinguished.

Some people theorized that the source of the fuel for the fires came from the gasoline in the cars that were parked beneath the World Trade Center. The American Society of Safety Engineers stated in its aforementioned journal that nearly 2,000 cars were located that had been parked on three underground floors of the Center, and although some of those vehicles had exploded and were completely burned, many other cars were in drivable condition – neither crushed nor burned. Moreover, the journal article indicated that “... gasoline in a car either explodes or it remains inside the tank ... it does not leak out and go looking for fires to be fueled.”

The Society of Safety Engineers also indicated that a tank containing 72,000 gallons of fuel that was stored in the basement of the World Trade Center had been discovered. Although the tank was slightly damaged, no leaks were detected in the tank, and the fuel in the tank was removed.

Most of the office equipment in the buildings had – somehow – been transformed into dust on 9/11, and, therefore, could not serve as a source of fuel, and, moreover, there were many stores in the underground shopping complex that were still intact and their contents never burned. So, if 2,000 parked cars, a huge fuel storage tank, office equipment, and subterranean stores were not fueling the high temperatures at Ground Zero that continued for months on end, what was responsible for that phenomenon?

The television program “Relics from the Ruins” that aired on the History Channel featured an eight ton I-beam taken from Ground Zero that was six inches thick and bent in the shape of a horseshoe. A worker commented on the I-beam and said:

“I found it hard to believe that it actually bent because of the size of it and how there’s no cracks in the iron. It bent without almost a

single crack in it. It takes thousands of degrees to bend steel like this,”

--Note: Steel melts at 2,800 degrees Fahrenheit – 1,500 degrees Celsius – and softens at 1,100 degrees Fahrenheit 593 degrees Celsius ... for steel to melt or bend in the foregoing manner usually requires that the temperature to which steel is exposed be sustained for a period of time -- and yet, as previously noted, NIST insisted that the maximum temperature attained by fires at the World Trade Center was about 480 degrees Fahrenheit.

Some people have maintained that traces of a substance were discovered at Ground Zero and that, upon analysis, the material was identified to be the incendiary/explosive known as nano-thermite. When nano-thermite is ignited it burns at around 4,800 degrees Fahrenheit and since its chemical composition provides it with its own source of oxygen, it is capable of burning in conditions that are devoid of oxygen (such as underwater).

Whether nano-thermite was the fuel that maintained the high-temperature at Ground Zero going for months or was responsible for bending an eight ton Steel I-beam into a horseshoe shape is unknown ... and for those who wish to claim that nano-thermite might have been the fuel that subsidized the more than three months worth of high-temperatures that were recorded at the World Trade Center following 9/11, then, as a homework assignment, you might try to calculate how much nano-thermite would be necessary to sustain such a persistent set of high temperatures for that length of period of time. In any event, what is clear is that there is no known way through which military grade nano-thermite could form naturally in the dust at Ground Zero, and, therefore, its presence there needs to be explained.

NIST refused to look – at least in any manner that can be called scientific – for evidence that explosives had been present at the World Trade Center on 9/11, and it did not choose to investigate whether, or not, the high temperatures that, for months, had been discovered to be present at Ground Zero following the events of 9/11 might have had anything to do with the collapse of three steel-structure buildings on 9/11. In fact, as Peter Ketchum noted in his public statement concerning the matter, NIST seemed to do everything it could to avoid looking for evidence that might indicate the presence of explosives at

Ground Zero on 9/11.

According to Dr. Sunder, “We conducted the study without bias, without interference from anyone, and dedicated ourselves to do the very best job we could. And, in fact, I would suggest that the public should ... at this point recognize that science is really behind what we say.” Actual facts belie the foregoing assertion.

The only kind of science that is behind the NIST reports concerning 9/11 is the sort of research that cannot but induce Americans to distance themselves from such so-called scientific activity and become “unscientific” in the best sense of the latter term. In other words, the sort of research conducted by NIST in conjunction with 9/11 is the kind of process that forces one to conclude that such “scientists” can no longer be considered to be honest brokers of truth, and if the NIST manner of research – as exemplified in relation to 9/11 -- is “scientific”, then, one needs to become “unscientific” so that evidence, objectivity, rigor, love of the truth, and integrity once again matter.

Peter Ketchum – a scientist – did not investigate the events of 9/11 for nearly sixteen years. He merely accepted the word of others ... until a friend’s casual remark induced him to look into the matter more carefully.

As far as the issue of 9/11 is concerned, Mr. Ketchum didn’t really begin to become an honest broker of the truth concerning those events until he actually begin to look at relevant evidence some 16 years after the events of 9/11 had taken place. He became an objective, honest broker of the truth in relation to 9/11 when he made the requisite efforts to acquire insight into the nature of 9/11 in a manner that was rooted in a rigorous process that was transparent, open, not intended to evade difficult problems, or mislead and distort (through commission or omission) with respect to relevant issues, as well as be critically and fairly responsive to actual evidence rather than be ruled by propaganda, indoctrination, and forces of undue influence in relation to the issue of 9/11.

Having done the foregoing does not mean that his conclusions concerning 9/11 are necessarily correct or true. Nonetheless, he has done, and is doing, what any objective and honest broker of the truth must do in order to try to gain insight into the nature of truth with

respect to some given issue ... in this case 9/11.

Unfortunately, there are many other scientists who continue to fail to examine the actual evidence concerning 9/11 and, as a result, remain in ignorance or in denial concerning the nature of the events of 9/11. Sam Harris is one such scientist.

-----



### **Sam Harris and 9/11**

Dr. Harris is a neuroscientist. Or, perhaps, more to the point as far as the present discussion is concerned, he was trained in sciences exploring the brain, and, therefore, is familiar with the methods and processes of science.

Yet, interestingly enough, I have not come across any statements in his books (and I've read three of those works), nor have I encountered any statements in several podcasts and interviews he has given, that touch on the subject of 9/11 that provide any indication that he actually has looked at evidence concerning 9/11. Instead, almost everything he has to say on the subject is in response to various conspiratorial claims that certain people have made about whom they believe is responsible for 9/11 and with whom Dr. Harris wishes to take issue.

In what follows, I will provide the text for a number of lengthy statements that have been made by Dr. Harris concerning 9/11. As I believe will soon become fairly evident, those statements encompass a litany of problems that seem to be devoid of any quality of scientific or even rational analysis.

For instance, during a recorded conversation between Steven Wright and Sam Harris that appeared on SamHarris.org and that tried to respond to various issues concerning 9/11, Dr. Harris states:

“When you follow each one of these anomalies to some alternative conclusion ... it's never the same conclusion. There's no unified view of what would explain everything that happened here. There's dozens or hundreds or more different things all of which are mutually incompatible but all of which are different from the prevailing story that Al-Qaeda did it. But, there is no unified view that makes it the perfect work of evil genius to have George Bush sitting reading 'My Pet Goat' when this thing goes off. Now, what evil genius decided to do it that way?

“I mean there's larger phenomenon of conspiracy thinking that again, once you connect it to the fake news phenomenon that we're living through now, it becomes hugely consequential. It's like I've always thought of conspiracy thinking as a kind of pornography of

doubt. There's an itch that people are scratching here. People who, for the most part, feel disempowered and imagine that people in power are always doing something malicious and that whenever you can explain something based on incompetence, it's never really incompetence. The irony here is that they are attributing a super human level of competence to people where there's never any evidence of this kind of competence.

“Bill Clinton couldn't stop a semen-stained dress from appearing on the evening news. Presidents can't do these sorts of things, and, yet, we are asked to imagine that thousands upon thousands of psychopathic collaborators killed some of the most productive people in our society in downtown Manhattan ... just for what? The pleasure of sending us to war in the Middle East ... not to Saudi Arabia where the hijackers came from ... but to Iraq when we could easily have found a pretext to go to war anyway and what a great war that was, and, yet, they did this without a single leak ... there's not one person with a guilty conscience who got on 60 minutes and spilled the beans ... and, yet, generally speaking, you can't even keep the next iPhone from being left on the bar before it gets released. It's an amazing double-standard of reasonableness that gives us this kind of thinking.”

Although Dr. Harris mentions the issue of 9/11 anomalies toward the beginning of his foregoing statement, he never specifies what sorts of anomalies he has in mind. Consequently, one has no concrete context upon which to reflect in order to determine whether what he is saying is true or not.

Furthermore, when he speaks about following each one of the foregoing sorts of anomalies – whatever they might be -- to some alternative conclusion, once again, his statement lacks specificity. We don't know which alternative conclusions he is alluding to or what he, or anyone else, considers the nature of the relationship to be, if any, between various anomalies and various conclusions.

All we have is his declarative statement that is embedded in a context of vagueness. He proceeds to complain that “there's no unified view of what would explain everything that happened here,” but he doesn't offer any concrete evidence to substantiate what he claims ... all he offers is unsubstantiated assertion.

Dr. Harris maintains there is “no unified view of what would explain everything that happened here.” However, given that the so-called “prevailing view that al-Qaeda did it” also fails to explain everything that happened on 9/11 – in fact fails to explain in a factual manner nearly all the events of 9/11 -- Dr. Harris never explains why there should be an alternative, unified view that is capable of explaining everything among those who do not accept the “prevailing story that al-Qaeda did it” since the so-called prevailing view is, itself, unable to provide such a unified account.

Be this as it might, nonetheless, contrary to the foregoing claim of Dr. Harris, the one thing on which all those who reject the “prevailing story” agree – a point which Dr. Harris entirely ignores – is that the “prevailing story that al-Qaeda did it” suffers from a variety of problems. Moreover, those many problems begin with the fact that at least 6-7 of the alleged 9/11 hijackers – all of whom, supposedly, perished in the four plane crashes that occurred on 9/11 -- were confirmed as still being alive by a post-9/11 BBC news item.

Did some people jump to conclusions concerning 9/11 or about who might have been responsible for perpetrating that tragedy before they carefully examined all of the evidence? Yes, they did, and Sam Harris is one of those individuals?

In his foregoing statement, Dr. Harris contends that in relation to various claims concerning the nature of 9/11: “There’s dozens or hundreds, or more, different things all of which are mutually incompatible but all of which are different from the prevailing story that Al-Qaeda did it.” However, since Dr. Harris doesn’t specify what the nature of the alleged incompatibilities are, we have no evidential basis for determining whether, or not, his assertion is correct or whether, or not, such alleged incompatibilities might, through one means or another, be capable of being reconciled in some fashion.

In the previously quoted excerpt, Dr. Harris mentions the idea of a prevailing story – namely, that al-Qaeda is responsible for the events of 9/11 – but what is that story based on? As I believe has been demonstrated in my own books (namely, *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* as well as the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> editions of *Framing 9/11*), and as Judy Wood has pointed out -- with considerable detail -- in her book: *Where Did The Towers Go?*, and as David Ray Griffin argued in

books such as *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*, and as Webster Tarpley expounded in his book: *9/11: Synthetic Terror*, and as Rebekah Roth has established in her “*Methodical*” trilogy, the “prevailing story that al-Qaeda did it” is untenable at nearly every – if not every – juncture.

As has been demonstrated in the foregoing books, there are substantial problems with *The 9/11 Commission Report*, *The Pentagon Performance Report*, various NIST reports, and a variety of reports from the FBI. So, why should anyone accept the prevailing story that al-Qaeda did it as being the indisputable, definitive treatment of 9/11?

The whole “prevailing story” notion seems to give expression to little more than an argument from authority in which one is supposed to accept such a story just because individuals in authority have told it. Unfortunately, despite being filled with lots of information (much of it amounting to little more than misinformation and disinformation), the “prevailing story” is almost entirely devoid of any relevant facts concerning the events of 9/11.

What evidence is there that is capable of proving – independently of the government’s framing of the story -- that al-Qaeda carried out the attacks on 9/11. In point of fact, there is absolutely zero reliable evidence indicating that al-Qaeda carried out – or was capable of carrying out – the events of 9/11.

The FBI, itself (both through its website as well as through it’s, then, director, Robert Mueller) admitted there was no evidence tying ‘Usama bin Laden to the events of 9/11. Furthermore, the confessions of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed that implicated bin Laden, Mohammed Atta and others – and were obtained thorough nearly 200 rounds of water-boarding -- have never been confirmed by independent sources (and the similar confessions of other individuals that were induced through torture do not constitute independent confirmation), nor have those “confessions” ever been subjected to rigorous cross examination (indeed, the CIA prevented the members of the 9/11 Commission from having any contact with those who were ‘confessing’ to the crimes of 9/11).

Moreover, contrary to the aforementioned contentions of Dr. Harris, why should one assume that George Bush’s reading of ‘My Pet Goat’ had anything to do with the plan for 9/11 or that such a reading

was put in play by some evil genius? In order to determine whether, or not, George Bush was culpable in relation to 9/11, a proper investigation of those events must be permitted. [And, by “proper”, I mean an investigation that is: Independent – i.e., not run by the government; fully funded (rather than being substantially underfunded as the 9/11 Commission had been); provided with subpoena power, and requiring sworn testimony -- unlike the 9/11 Commission testimony of Bush, Cheney and others - - with penalties of perjury or worse for knowingly offering false statements].

Sam Harris’s foregoing, extended statement is indulging in a form of argument in which he gets to supply all of the premises against which he wishes to argue. Yet, the premises of his argument have nothing to do with a central issue – namely, whether, or not, the “prevailing story” that Dr. Harris is unjustifiably treating as the default perspective concerning 9/11 is capable of successfully being defended when it is rigorously examined ... something that Dr. Harris has provided no indication of having done (either with respect to defending or examining).

The words “a kind of pornography of doubt” that Dr. Harris advances in conjunction with his criticism of conspiracy theories constitutes a nice turn of phrase, but, what does it actually mean and how relevant is it? On any given day, in numerous courtrooms, in virtually every state in America, as well as in a variety of Federal courts, there are numerous conspiracies that have proven to be true.

Consequently, Dr. Harris needs to clarify what he means by the phrase “a kind of pornography of doubt” in conjunction with conspiracy theories that have been proven to be true on a regular basis in the courtrooms of America. As it stands, the phrase “a kind of pornography of doubt” seems to be little more than an attempt to cast aspersions upon anyone who has the temerity to question or harbor doubts concerning the viability of the “official” story concerning 9/11.

Dr. Harris refers, in a pejorative fashion, to the itch that people supposedly are scratching with respect to 9/11 (i.e., and such an itch is described by Dr. Harris as being nothing more than a matter of individuals feeling disempowered and who “imagine that people in power are always doing something malicious”). However, he

apparently fails to consider the possibility that the underlying motivation of the individuals to whom he is alluding might have to do, instead, with not being satisfied with the “prevailing story” concerning 9/11.

Maybe such individuals are “merely” trying to seek truth and justice in relation to the events of 9/11, as well as attempting to save the country from the ruinous ramifications of the government-sponsored and media-sponsored malignancy that has enveloped the issue of 9/11. In other words, perhaps the individuals that Dr. Harris wishes to malign are not necessarily motivated by an ideology of false imagination or a thirst for conspiracy as he claims is the case.

Doesn't this kind of search for truth, justice, and a way to protect the country describe what is going on – at least to some extent -- in a courtroom when a prosecutor charges someone with conspiracy to commit various crimes? Moreover, couldn't those who do not accept the “official” story concerning 9/11 be motivated by similar goals?

Furthermore, what is one to make of the conspiracy thinking that is at the heart of the “prevailing story” – i.e., that al-Qaeda perpetrated 9/11? The mother of all conspiracy theories is that 19 Arab hijackers conspired with a guy in a cave in Afghanistan – namely, 'Usama bin Laden -- to perpetrate 9/11, and, therefore, if Harris's foregoing turn of phrase – i.e., “a kind of pornography of doubt” -- is to have substantive value, then, presumably, the “pornography of doubt” that Dr. Harris believes stains conspiracy thinking must also be applicable to his own conspiracy theory – namely, the one that is at the heart of the “prevailing story” ... that 20 Arabs conspired to attack America on 9/11?

In his foregoing extended statement, Dr Harris tries to suggest that the itch being scratched in conjunction with 9/11 is nothing more than a matter of: “People who, for the most part, feel disempowered and imagine that people in power are always doing something malicious and that whenever you can explain something based on incompetence, it's never really incompetence” Where is (or what is) the proof that justifies such an assertion?

At best, Dr. Harris offers vague sorts of anecdotal references in support of his position. At no point, however, does he engage in a serious analysis of actual evidence concerning 9/11.

He always operates at a meta-level. In other words, he only addresses conspiracy theories concerning the events of 9/11, and, as a result, he never actually explores real evidence concerning the events of that day.

In addition, Dr. Harris tries to give the impression that the events of 9/11 can be adequately explained by the issue of “incompetence” rather than having to refer to any kind of conspiracy, but what is the nature of the evidence that the events of 9/11 can all be explained by the notion of “incompetence”? What are the specific facts and arguments that demonstrate that everything that went on prior to, during, and following 9/11 were all a function of incompetence?

Dr. Harris says there is never any evidence of the kind of competence to which he claims that conspiracy thinking is alluding. However, since he is entirely vague at this juncture concerning what, specifically, he means by such statements, one has nothing on which to base an assessment of whether he is right, or not, concerning his claims in this regard.

Moreover, notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Harris seems to believe that Bill Clinton’s inability to prevent the release of evidence concerning a semen-stained dress indicates that presidents are powerless to prevent leaks from occurring that will expose their high crimes and misdemeanors, nevertheless, his Clinton example actually undermines Dr. Harris’s perspective concerning the issue of leaks rather than substantiates that point of view. More specifically, Robert Wright, Jr., Sibel Edmonds, Colonel Anthony Schafer, and Coleen Rowley all attempted to leak information to the public about various governmental anomalies concerning 9/11 but were either ignored, censored, or placed under a gag order, and, as a result, Dr. Harris’s use of the Bill Clinton example tends to disprove the point that Dr. Harris seems to be trying to make rather than demonstrate it.

Dr. Harris also overlooks – or is ignorant about – what happened to an FAA employee – James P. Hopkins -- who discovered information (which ran counter to the “official” story) that he considered to be relevant to the investigation of 9/11 and tried to forward the information up the chain of command. He was fired for his efforts in that regard.

That individual fought to get his job back. Eventually, he won his case, but, subsequently, was killed during a car accident in Washington, D.C.

Dr. Harris also ignores – or is ignorant of – articles that appeared on May 7, 2004 in both the *New York Times* and *Chicago Sun-Times* that referred to a meeting of 16 air traffic controllers that took place before noon on the morning of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 at the New York Air Route Traffic Control Center in Ronkonkoma, New York. The air traffic controllers met in a conference room in the basement -- known as the “Bat Cave” -- and passed around a microphone so that each of the individuals could share, in a recorded fashion, his, her, or their recollections and impressions concerning the events of 9/11.

Several months later those tapes were destroyed by a quality assurance manager at the aforementioned Ronkonkoma center. The destruction took place despite the fact that three days after the events of 9/11, the FAA had sent out an order to all departments – including the one for which the foregoing quality assurance manager worked -- indicating that personnel were to “retain and secure until further notice ALL Administrative/Operational data and records” concerning the events of 9/11.

When asked why he destroyed the tapes, the quality assurance manager stipulated that he felt the flight controllers were not in a state of mind that would have enabled them to have voluntarily consented to making such statements. However, he provided no evidence to back up the foregoing claim, nor was he qualified to make such a determination, and, most importantly of all, he was in violation of the aforementioned directive that had been issued by the FAA several months before he destroyed the tapes.

When the quality assurance manager destroyed the recording that had been made by the 16 flight controllers, he is reported to have crushed the tapes in his hand and, then, cut the tape into little pieces, and, finally, deposited the cut up tape in various trash receptacles that were located in different parts of the building. Given the lengths to which the aforementioned quality assurance manager went in order to destroy the testimony of 16 air traffic controllers concerning the events of 9/11, one can't help but wonder about the nature of the contents of those recordings.



At this point, one might also re-introduce, the aforementioned public statement given by Barry Jennings, the Deputy Director of the Emergency Services Department for the New York City Housing Authority on 9/11, concerning his experience in Building 7 in relation to the occurrence of explosions on 9/11 at the World Trade Center. His account -- along with evidence from many members of the New York City fire and police departments -- was also ignored by the 9/11 Commission.

Or consider the case of David Schippers -- who might best be known to some people as the lead investigative and prosecuting counsel for the House of Representative's impeachment proceedings against William Jefferson Clinton. In an October 13, 2001 story run by the *Indianapolis Star* one discovers that nearly a month and a half prior to 9/11, he [Mr. Schippers] had spoken with several FBI agents who were hoping for some legal advice.

The article describes how the two agents disclosed that they had reliable information specifying how lower Manhattan was to be a target in a terrorist attack that would involve the use of hijacked airplanes as weapons. The information they had included targets, dates, and funding pathways.

The reason for their speaking with Mr. Schippers is that they both had been removed from the investigation and had been threatened with being prosecuted under the National Security Act if they spoke out about what they knew. According to the two FBI agents, the threats and obstruction apparently came from FBI headquarters in Washington.

During the interview, Mr. Schippers claimed that some six weeks or so prior to 9/11, he had tried without success on a number of occasions, to get in touch with Attorney General Ashcroft in order to pass on the information that Mr. Schippers had learned through the two FBI agents. The Attorney General did not return any of Mr. Schippers' calls to the former's office.

Finally, one of the friends of the Attorney General who had been contacted by Mr. Schippers in relation to FBI information got back in touch with the Chicago lawyer (i.e., David Schippers). The friend of the Attorney General said that John Ashcroft had received the information and would call Mr. Schippers the next day.

The next day Mr. Schippers did receive a call but not from the Attorney General. According to Mr. Schippers, someone else, calling on behalf of the

Attorney General, said that the matter would be investigated, and following that investigation, Mr. Schippers would be informed of what had been discovered and/or done.

Mr. Schippers passed on his information to the Attorney General approximately a month before the events of 9/11. Nonetheless, as of the October 2001 interview date, Mr. Schippers had not been contacted by the Attorney General with respect to the very detailed information concerning the September 11, 2001 attacks.

Finally, one shouldn't forget – as appears to be the case with Dr. Harris (or, perhaps, he never knew) -- that more than twelve individuals (a number of them worked for the Pentagon, some as members of the Pentagon police) came forward after 9/11 and indicated that just prior to the explosions that occurred at that complex on the morning of September 11, 2001, the only plane they saw approach the Pentagon flew on the north side of the Citgo gas station that was located approximately a mile, or so, from the Pentagon. This is a crucial issue because *The Pentagon Performance Report* indicates that the plane that supposedly struck the Pentagon had a flight path that proceeded along a line to the south of that Citgo station and that, among other things, took the craft over a Virginia Department of Transportation communication antenna.

If the testimony of the foregoing 12 individuals is correct, then, the findings of *The Pentagon Performance Report* are brought into serious question because the only plane that was near to the Pentagon at the time of the explosions would have struck (if it struck) the Pentagon at an angle that is entirely at odds with the “official story.” Moreover, many commercial and military pilots have indicated that the south-side flight line that is promoted by the official story would have involved unmanageable g-forces (as well as a substantial destabilizing “ground effect”) in order for American Airlines Flight 77 to be able to avoid the aforementioned Virginia Department of Transportation antenna and still be able to skim over the grass on the Pentagon lawn and, then, enter the Pentagon on the level of the ground floor as indicated by the “official story”.

Consequently, Dr. Harris is factually incorrect when he tries to claim that there were no leaks concerning 9/11. Rather, there were all kinds of leaks, but those leaks also were accompanied by an array of

efforts on the part of the government and the mainstream media to contain and suppress the foregoing sorts of information.

Furthermore, even if one were to concede Dr. Harris's point that there were no leaks concerning the events of 9/11, nonetheless, if – as Dr. Harris states in the extended statement that was quoted at the beginning of this section of the present chapter – conspiracy thinking claims that psychopathic individuals collaborated in the killing of people in Manhattan on 9/11, then, none of those psychopaths will have the requisite guilty conscience that is likely to lead them to make the sort of public confessions on 60 Minutes that would constitute the kind of leak that Dr. Harris seems to have in mind. Thus, even if it had been the case that there were no leaks concerning the events of 9/11 – which is factually untrue – if psychopaths really were in charge of the 9/11 operations, then, one would have no reason to expect that any leaks would be forthcoming since, by definition, psychopaths are individuals who do things without remorse for the harm they cause to others, and therefore, they do not experience guilty consciences in relation to the things they do or don't do.

One also should keep in mind some rather sobering revelations that appear in research concerning psychopaths (such as: *Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of The Psychopaths Among Us* by Robert D. Hare; *Snakes In Suits* by Paul Babiak and Robert Hare; *The Sociopath Next Door* by Martha Stout, and *The Psychopath* by James Blair, Derek Mitchell, and Karina Blair). For instance, a conservative estimate of the number of psychopaths that live among us is between 10 and 13,000,000 million individuals, and those individuals occupy all strata of society including: Government, the military, science, law enforcement, the media, the judiciary, banking, education, and the corporate world.

The power structure is infested with such individuals. If some aspect of that power structure were interested in perpetrating a crime like 9/11, it would have little trouble recruiting people from within its own ranks that possessed the right sort of psychopathic tendencies to be able to plan, implement, and cover-up something like 9/11, and there are millions of other individuals who, if necessary, could be psychologically manipulated into becoming ideological psychopaths who could play the role of “useful idiots” on behalf of such

psychopathic “leadership” (Ideological psychopaths are individuals who are so entangled in, and committed to, their system of beliefs that they are willing to adopt psychopathic-like traits – such as a relative absence of compassion and conscience – in order to impose their beliefs on other human beings).

In his earlier, extended statement, Dr. Harris alludes to the ideas of some individuals who argue that the motivation for 9/11 was to create a pretext that would be able to justify going to war in Iraq in order to afford the United States an opportunity to take control of Iraq’s oil. Dr. Harris questions the logic underlying such thinking by citing the fact that none of the hijackers came from Iraq and, therefore, if the motivation for 9/11 had been to provide justification for attacking Iraq, then, surely, a better scenario could have been arranged than getting non-Iraqis to hijack airplanes and crash them into various targets in the United States

Dr. Harris should be less arbitrary and selective (in a self-serving manner) with respect to the possible motivations concerning the perpetration of 9/11 that he considers. However, by framing the issue in the way he has – namely, that some people believe that 9/11 was used as a pretext for invading Iraq – he is able to ignore a litany of other possibilities concerning the kinds of motivations that might have been behind 9/11.

For example, on – and/or prior to -- 9/11, hundreds of billions of dollars worth of gold were removed from the vaults of the Bank of Nova Scotia beneath Building 4 of the World Trade Center. In addition, billions of dollars worth of insurance fraud, bond market manipulations involving Brady bonds, and problematic stock market transactions (in relation to American and United Airlines, as well as in relation to a variety of companies that were located in the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center) also were committed in conjunction with 9/11.

Moreover, the Office of Naval Investigation and the Army Audit Office had been given the task of investigating the 2.1 trillion dollars that were reported as having gone MIA by Donald Rumsfeld the day before 9/11. The offices where the two foregoing investigatory units were located happened to be among the ones that were destroyed at the Pentagon on 9/11.

Furthermore, Building 7 of the World Trade Center contained considerable evidence concerning the multi-million dollar scams of, among others, Enron, World Com, and Global Crossing. All of that evidence was destroyed on September 11, 2001.

9/11 was also used as a pretext for rushing to pass The Patriot Act that already had been written prior to 9/11 and for which its proponents were merely awaiting the right opportunity to be able to introduce it into Congress. Moreover, 9/11 served as the motivating pretext for the creation of Homeland Security, which became a cash cow worth billions of dollars as well as a means of gaining increased control over the citizens of America.

Furthermore, the first war to be declared after 9/11 was not in Iraq, but in Afghanistan, and that war was tied directly to 9/11 – despite a lack of proof – as a result of charging the Taliban with harboring the person who was considered by the U.S. government to be the master-mind of 9/11 – namely, ‘Usama bin Laden – again, despite the official admission of the FBI that there was no evidence tying bin Laden to 9/11. Moreover, notwithstanding that to which Dr. Harris alludes in relation to his previously given extended statement, there would have been no reason to attack Saudi Arabia because although many of the alleged 19 hijackers supposedly were from Saudi Arabia, nevertheless, those individuals were characterized as a bunch of disaffected individuals who had broken ranks with the Saudi government because the latter had permitted infidels to set up bases on holy land during the first Gulf War, and, therefore, presumably, Saudi Arabia was not responsible for what those disaffected individuals did and, as a result, could not be considered to be a state sponsor of terrorism.

In addition, contrary to what Dr. Harris claims, Cheney, Bush, and others did come up with a variety of other pretexts in addition to September 11<sup>th</sup>, for going to war with Iraq. Aside from the fact that Cheney insisted that there had been contact between al-Qaeda and Saddam Hussein that took place in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania or some such place, Bush, Powell, and Blair invented the idea that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq despite the fact that the UN indicated that there were no weapons of mass destruction remaining in Iraq (Hans Blix was head of the United Nations

Monitoring, Verification, and Inspection Commission from January 2000 to June 2003 and American Scott Ritter, Jr. was a weapons inspector for the United Nations from 1991 to 1998, and both of the foregoing individuals stated prior to the 2003 invasion of Iraq that, up to that point in time, no significant cache of weapons of mass destruction were being stockpiled in Iraq).

Finally, in his previous quoted extended statement, Dr. Harris takes a fictitious example – i.e., the next iPhone being left at a bar before it is released – and tries to claim (without evidence) that such a contrafactual example is relevant to what took place in relation to 9/11 by creating the impression that if 9/11 had been the result of the actions of individuals other than bin-Laden and 19 Arab hijackers, then there would have been leaks of one kind or another ... but, according to Dr. Harris, no such leaks have occurred. The fact of the matter is that quite independently of the already mentioned instances of government officials such as Sibel Edmonds, Robert Wright, Jr., Colonel Anthony Schaefer, Coleen Rowley, Barry Jennings, David Schippers and many others who tried to get their testimony included in the public record concerning 9/11, there also were other leaks concerning 9/11. For example, one might consider the notice released prior to the events of 9/11 by Odigo (an Israeli instant messaging service) warning roughly 4,000 people to stay away from the World Trade Center on 9/11, or, perhaps more importantly, there is the sworn testimony of April Gallop – who was at Ground Zero in the Pentagon at the time that explosions occurred – which stipulated that she saw no evidence indicating that a plane had hit the Pentagon on 9/11 and also testified that several people who did not identify themselves came to the hospital where she and her baby were being treated for injuries due to events taking place on 9/11, and those individuals tried to intimidate her into silence with respect to what she had seen and experienced at the Pentagon on 9/11.

When it comes to 9/11, clearly, Sam Harris seems to know almost nothing – if not nothing – about the events of that day. The thinking that is problematic concerning 9/11 is entirely his, and Dr. Harris is the source for some of the very fake news phenomenon that he purports to be critically opposed to in his foregoing comments.

Nonetheless, Sam Harris is quite correct. When one connects the issue of fake news with Dr. Harris's sort of conspiracy thinking (his thinking is conspiratorial not only in relation to what the critics of 9/11 are all about, but, as well, his belief that al-Qaeda is responsible for 9/11 is also conspiratorial), then, the results are "hugely consequential" because his brand of fake news might, very well, have helped facilitate the deaths of millions of Muslims and other individuals in the Middle East, as well as might have helped enable the displacement, abuse, mutilation, and destruction of millions of Iraqi and Afghani lives by the United States government and others.

-----

The following excerpts are from another podcast in which Sam Harris participated that pertains to the issues of 9/11. I'll begin with an extended quote from this second podcast that features some of the views of Sam Harris concerning 9/11, followed by some critical reflection on what he says, and, then, move on to address other excerpts from that same, second podcast.

"If you ask someone who really believes in the 9/11 truth conspiracy theory, right, that Bush brought down the World Trade Center, and you ask them to have a conversation about it, and they give you all the rigmarole about the melting point of steel and building 7 and people rigged the buildings to explode, and you ask them how they got all that thermite into the buildings, and they did it in the dead of night, and how many conspirators were involved, and there's an endless energy to talk about these things, and in that case these really are propositional claims about what happened when no one was looking, and I think the people who believe this stuff really do believe it, and this is very much analogous to what happens in religions ... this is analogous to a Christian saying: "No, No, you don't understand. I really think that Jesus was resurrected. I think he was nailed up on the cross, he was a human being. The tomb was empty, and he ascended ... and what do you think ascension is? Well, I think it's actually going up against gravity physically, and when the rapture happens, I'm going to be pulled up there, and if you're in a 747 at that moment, you're going to see me up in the stratosphere. Whether they are that explicit, if you

get people talking, they believe something concrete ... they're not metaphorical moves."

Why is Dr. Harris's litmus-test for 9/11 a matter of whether, or not, someone believes that Bush is responsible for what went on that day? Why doesn't Dr. Harris – or the conversation he claims to want to have with someone who engages 9/11 in a way that is different from him – start with the fact that the official story does not hold together and, therefore, whatever happened on that day is other than what the official story – or Dr. Harris -- is trying to suggest?

How does one have a conversation with someone – such as Dr. Harris -- who refers to the issue of facts as "rigmarole"? The use of that term seems to provide evidence that Dr. Harris is a person who already has made up his mind about the issue of 9/11, and, as a result, uses a pejorative term to sum up what he believes concerning matters that appear to be closed for him as far as further inquiry of a sincere, objective nature is concerned.

In a real conversation – that is, a dialogue – two, or more, individuals mutually explore possibilities in order to try to discover the nature of truth involving some matter, but all Dr. Harris seems to want to do is to ask questions in an incorrect order and in an obstructionist manner. For instance, instead of asking – as Dr. Harris does -- how people got thermite into the Trade Towers, (and thermite is a mixture of powdered iron oxide and aluminum capable of generating very high temperatures when ignited), why not ask why traces of military grade nano-thermite have been found in dust samples from Ground Zero (and nano-thermite consists of a metal and metal oxide whose particles are combined in powders that are 100 nanometers in size), or why not ask Dr. Harris to defend the official story concerning the events of 9/11?

Instead, Dr. Harris asks questions for which he knows there are logistical problems and for which there is, at best, only marginal and rather speculative "evidence." Doing things in this manner offers him a way to frame the conversation in a way that serves his interests ... in other words, the foregoing approach gives expression to an underlying strategy in which certain kinds of questions are asked or raised in



order to obscure, or detract attention away from, more pertinent and fundamental kinds of questions.

For instance, the theory that Bush brought down the World Trade Center might be a theory that is advanced by some individuals, but such an idea doesn't necessarily have anything to do with the fact that three World Trade Buildings came down at near free fall speed on 9/11 and that this latter set of facts is completely inconsistent with the "official" explanation that planes and fires caused three buildings at the World Trade Center to collapse. In other words, one should separate the issue of who is responsible for 9/11 from the issue of the physical evidence that exists in conjunction with the events at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Before trying to decide who perpetrated the events of 9/11, perhaps, the first order of business should be to determine the nature of the events that transpired on that day. For example, before claiming that 19 Arabs were the ones who attacked America on 9/11, maybe one should try to determine what the evidence is concerning whether, or not, 19 Arabs actually hijacked four planes, or whether, or not, those individuals could have flown commercial jets in the way indicated by the "official story", or whether, or not, cell phones could have been used to make calls from airplanes at heights above 1,500 feet, or whether, or not, planes and/or fires would have been able to cause three steel-framed buildings to collapse in the way indicated by the official story, or whether, or not, a plane hit the Pentagon, or whether, or not, a plane actually crashed in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

In the previously quoted, extended excerpt from one of his podcasts, Dr. Harris notes that the people who harbor all kinds of beliefs concerning the events of 9/11 are making propositional claims about what happened when no one was looking. Furthermore, Dr. Harris claims that this is very similar to what takes place in conjunction with religious claims when people give expression to various beliefs about, for instance, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus or what happens during the phenomenon of "rapture" despite the fact that those individuals have no access to hard evidence concerning those sorts of matters.

While it might be true that some people make statements about 9/11 that are divorced from, or contradicted by, actual facts

concerning the events of that day, nonetheless -- and notwithstanding Dr. Harris's propositional claims to the contrary -- the issues of 9/11 are not at all like the religious issues that Dr. Harris mentions. There is a considerable amount of factual evidence that exists in relation to the events of 9/11 that are, for the most part, absent from an array of religious issues.

For instance, commercial jets could not have flown at the speeds indicated by the official story concerning 9/11. Such speeds exceeded -- by hundreds of miles per hour -- the VMO, or the maximum permitted operating speeds for such aircrafts and would have led to substantial structural damage to aircraft flying at those speeds. Or, contrary to the claims of NIST, Underwriters Laboratories empirically demonstrated that the floor assembly units for the Twin Tower buildings would not have failed in the way in which NIST claimed they did on 9/11, and, therefore, the failure of those assemblies could not have been a cause of the progressive collapse of the two towers as stated by NIST with respect to the events of 9/11.

Kevin Ryan, a chemist, was fired from his job at Underwriters Laboratories for disclosing the foregoing information. This is, yet, another fact that discredits the view of Dr. Harris that there were no leaks that occurred in conjunction with the events of 9/11.

Furthermore, independently of the logistical problems raised by Dr. Harris concerning how people (or how many people were required to) get thermite into the Twin Towers, or when this was done, and quite independently of whether, at this point, those questions can be determinately answered, one is confronted with the fact that Mark Basile, a chemical engineer, along with a number of other scientists (e.g., Steven Jones, a physicist, Kevin Ryan, a chemist, and Niels Harrit, a chemist), have found evidence that military grade nano-thermite was present in different dust samples that were taken from Ground Zero. This fact needs to be explained because there is no good reason for nano-thermite to be present in those dust samples ... in other words, military grade nano-thermite is not something that will naturally form in dust without a great deal of highly technical assistance.

In addition, quite apart from Dr. Harris's dismissal of such allegedly rigmarole issues as the melting point of steel, many scientifically and technically oriented observers have commented that

fires and heat cannot account for the total pulverization of nearly a million tons of: Steel beams, concrete, acres of marble surfacing, numerous multi-ton electrical transformers, as well as office furniture that took place at the World Trade Towers on 9/11. The phenomenon of progressive collapse -- which is put forth by NIST as the reason why three steel-framed structures collapsed on 9/11 -- is not capable of generating the level of force that could cause the foregoing kind of destruction.

Progressive collapses are a function of the force of gravity. Yet, whatever caused the pulverization of more than one million tons of materials on 9/11 at the World Trade Center involved a force or forces that is, or are, far in excess of what gravity can deliver through a progressive collapse.

Another empirical fact that is present with respect to 9/11 is that air-phones could not have been used to make phone calls, as claimed in the official story, on some of the planes supposedly hijacked on 9/11 -- namely, American Airlines Flights 11 and 77. Air phones had been deactivated on all American Airline flights as of January 31, 2001, nearly nine months prior to 9/11.

Consequently, Barbara Olson -- who, supposedly, was a passenger on Flight 77 -- could not have used an air-phone on 9/11 to call her husband, Ted Olson, the Solicitor General for the United States. As noted above, all such phones had been deactivated by American Airlines and, therefore, were not available on Flight 77.

Furthermore, contrary to the claims of the official story, Barbara Olson could not have used a cell phone to make a collect call to her husband. This is because not only do cell phones not operate in such a fashion, but, as well, because cell phones in 2001 were not capable of working in planes flying at altitude that is when the calls from Barbara Olson to Ted Olson supposedly were made.

Finally -- although many other facts could be cited here -- according to the official story, no plane parts were found at the alleged 9/11 crash sites in New York City, Virginia (the Pentagon), or Shanksville, Pennsylvania. Yet, 80,000 pieces of the Columbia shuttle were retrieved despite the fact that the shuttle was traveling at 17,000 miles per hour when it disintegrated while the hijacked planes of 9/11 were

only flying at 4-500 miles an hour when they supposedly disintegrated.

Airplanes don't disintegrate when they impact the ground or a building. And, yet, according to the official story concerning 9/11, we are being asked to believe – despite a total lack of any evidence or proof – that for the first time in aviation history, four commercial jets all disintegrated on impact on the same day and left nothing behind except a couple of paper passports (one on the streets of New York and the other in a field in Shanksville) that, quite by chance, happened to belong to several of the alleged hijackers.

In short, Dr. Harris contends that claims made in relation to 9/11 are like claims made in a religious context because – according to Dr. Harris – in both instances propositional statements are being made about events that are devoid of the sort of facts that are needed to support the propositional statements that are being made. Although there could be specific instances in which the foregoing contention might be substantiated with respect to the claims that some individuals make in conjunction with 9/11, nonetheless, as a general statement concerning 9/11, his contention is ludicrous because – as has been noted throughout this chapter -- there are many facts that can be consulted in relation to 9/11 that one cannot access in various religious issues.

Following up on the previously quoted extended excerpt from a second podcast concerning 9/11, Sam Harris goes on to say:

“There's no question that people sometimes conspire, right, so I already have a room in this unexplored mansion ... it's completely rational for me to open that door. I'm not forsaking any principle of rationality to say: This might be among the conspiracies that I haven't heard about. It only becomes irrational – like in the case of 9/11 truth – for me when I see that (1) the incentives are not aligned the way they should be; (2) the number of conspirators are so vast as to make any effective secrecy implausible; (3) the kind of reasoning that I notice people doing in order to defend the anomalies there become ... it's so obviously post hoc and based on confirmation bias, and a host of cognitive errors that the defenses are not plausible, but if you change all of that, and you give me an allegation, about an egregious

conspiracy that is more well-behaved ... where you don't require 5,000 conspirators, and it is not all pieced together after the fact, and the incentives make some sense, then I have a category for that which is, yes, sometimes there really are mustache-twirling conspirators who have access to information that we don't have and they operate in darkness, and we find out 30 years later, and, yes, it's true that for me to spend any time entertaining that in a condition where it is not yet plausible or not popular ... yeah, that is kind of a faith-based use of my time ... I'm saying, well, is this worth doing ... am I going to look crazy to my peers?"

In the foregoing comments, Dr. Harris contends that -- depending on circumstances -- although the idea of conspiracy is not necessarily irrational, nevertheless, he considers 9/11 claims to be irrational. He proceeds to cite three rules of reasoning [involving (1) proper alignment of incentives, (2) the number of conspirators, and (3) the kind of reasoning employed] that, supposedly, help lead him to the conclusion that 9/11 claims are irrational in nature.

Why should one accept Dr. Harris's foregoing conditions of rationality, or why should one accept his way of applying those conditions to the issue of 9/11? There is nothing in the contents of that podcast from which the foregoing excerpt is drawn that provides anything of a persuasive nature that might induce one to adopt his proposed rules for reasoning about 9/11.

He only addresses -- in a very oblique manner -- a few possibilities in his remarks, and, then, appears to conclude that because some ideas concerning 9/11 might be irrational, then, all ideas concerning 9/11 must be irrational. In other words, Dr. Harris seems to be classifying all 9/11 ideas that differ from the prevailing story (the "official" view) as being irrational.

However, he fails to demonstrate that his position is tenable. Among other things, in this regard, Dr. Harris doesn't tackle any central or fundamental issue concerning 9/11 ... not the least of which is that there is absolutely nothing about the prevailing/official view, story or theory concerning 9/11 that is tenable, and, therefore, by necessity, one is forced to search for some other way to account for the events of 9/11.

One also might point out that in conjunction with his aforementioned first rule of reasoning concerning 9/11 Dr. Harris doesn't specify what the nature of the incentives are that should be aligned in a certain way, nor does he specify the nature of the criteria that are to be used in determining what constitutes a proper alignment of incentives, nor does he justify the use of those unspecified criteria for establishing a proper alignment of incentives. In short, Dr. Harris first rule or principle of reasoning concerning 9/11 is devoid of specific content or any sort of rationale for why it should be used to identify what is rational when it comes to the issue of 9/11.

As far as the second rule or principle of reasoning that is employed by Dr. Harris to make judgments about the rationality of any given perspective concerning 9/11 – namely, the matter of how many conspirators are required to pull off 9/11 – one wonders how many conspirators are required to make something implausible, and what is the basis for making such a claim? The second rule or principle of reasoning cited by Dr. Harris seems both arbitrary and subjective.

What he considers implausible might not actually be so. Among other things, he has no idea – or, at least, his foregoing comments contain no evidence in this respect -- about what secrets might have been kept successfully by the government or about how many people might have been involved in keeping those secrets.

After all, there were a reported 125,000 people involved in the Manhattan Project during its peak period of hiring (and this does not take into account the total, cumulative number of people who were hired, for one reason or another, for just short periods of time at some point during the project). Yet, nonetheless, that secret appeared to be kept fairly well while it was taking place.

At a subsequent juncture in his foregoing comments, Dr. Harris mentions that 5,000 people constitute a conspiracy that is not well-behaved. This seems to be a rather arbitrary figure (and claim) and, therefore, stands in need of being justified ... something that Dr. Harris does not do.

In addition, there could be a lot fewer people needed to keep a significant secret hidden than Dr. Harris appears to suppose is necessary. For example, a great deal of information might be capable of being controlled by a few individuals and, then, altered as necessary

in order to provide different people with various cover stories concerning what is taking place, and, as a result, many individuals whose understanding of what is transpiring might be manipulated by the kind of information they are being fed and, therefore, they could be participating in a set of events such as 9/11 without understanding the actual significance of their participation or how that participation serves a secret purpose or project that might be orchestrated through the control of information concerning those events.

During his foregoing extended comments, Dr. Harris also alludes to individuals who supposedly reason about 9/11 in, allegedly, an ad hoc fashion or individuals who base their understanding on confirmation bias, or individuals who commit other kinds of cognitive errors. However, he provides no specific examples of what he means.

Therefore, one has no way of knowing whether what he claims he has noticed in conjunction with such 9/11 thinking is really the case or whether what he saying in this regard merely gives expression to his own set of cognitive errors. In fact, to proceed in the vague, non-specific way that he does in the context of 9/11 is to commit a cognitive error, because, without specificity, what he says is devoid of substantive value.

Dr. Harris also advances the idea in his foregoing, extended comments about the allegedly problematic way in which conspiracy thinkers are “defending” various views concerning 9/11 anomalies. However, Dr. Harris doesn’t specify what sorts of anomalies he has in mind at this point, nor does he stipulate what the nature of the defense is concerning those anomalies or why such defenses are problematic.

Before trying to analyze whether, or not, certain ways of defending various anomalies are viable, one, first, should become clear about the nature of the anomalies one is talking about in order to determine whether, or not, some ways of defending a perspective concerning various anomalies might be better than others. For instance, one might critically reflect on the manner in which the prevailing/official view, story or theory seeks to explain away (or dismiss) various anomalies -- such as the issue of bombs going off at the World Trade Center or the free-fall speed exhibited during the demise of the three building at that complex, or, the alleged crash of planes at the Trade Towers – by, for the most part, largely ignoring all

manner of evidence concerning the foregoing matters that is inconsistent with the story the government and the mainstream media wish to promulgate.

At a certain point in the previously quoted extended comment, Dr, Harris talks, in a pejorative fashion, about piecing things together after the fact. Just what does he mean?

Most understanding and knowledge is pieced together after the fact. This is a common process in both science and everyday life in which we try to make sense of the data or information that is available to us but tend to do so after the fact, rather, than prior to the fact. Is Dr. Harris suggesting that people should generate their understanding before the fact of events?

At a certain point in his extended comments, Dr. Harris speaks about waiting until an idea is plausible or popular before deciding whether, or not, to invest time in such an issue. He also notes, in passing, that he does not wish to look crazy in the eyes of his peers.

The truth is not necessarily about people's conception of what is, or is not, plausible nor is it a matter of popularity. Furthermore, searching for the truth should not be a function of one's concern with what others think about what one is doing because this merely means that one is permitting other people to set the agenda for the pursuit of truth, and, consequently, one becomes susceptible to a process of self-censorship in which one shies away from tackling certain issues because of the opinions that other individuals have concerning those matters.

Of course, when investigating any given issue, one should take into consideration what other people – especially one's peers – believe. Nonetheless, one needs to independently reflect on those beliefs in order to determine whether, or not, the beliefs of one's peers should be taken seriously and considered to be reliable.

In many cases one only can determine the "worth" of doing something after the fact of having done it. This is one of the reasons why people conduct experiments or why they explore different aspects of existence in order to find out what worth, if any, is entailed by such activities ... and, often times, discovering problems can have as



much worth – and, sometimes has more worth – than discovering certain kinds of truths.

In his foregoing, extended comments, despite citing three rules or principles of reasoning concerning 9/11, Dr. Harris fails to specify what it is about the issue of 9/11 that is irrational, or implausible, or not worth the effort to try to discover what the truth concerning 9/11 actually is. Dr. Harris refers to alternative approaches to 9/11 as being inherently implausible, and, yet, rather than examine, in concrete terms, the actual evidence concerning such matters, he restricts himself to talking only in vague generalities about allegedly problematic, conspiratorial approaches to 9/11, and, lo and behold, he finds that alternative ideas about 9/11 are, ipso facto, implausible ... as computer programmers might say: Garbage in and, therefore, garbage out.

-----

In addition to two podcasts (discussed above) that contain material on Dr. Harris's ideas about 9/11, Sam Harris also was a guest on "The Joe Rogan Experience" where he discussed such issues. "The Joe Rogan Experience is an Internet program that explores – through interviews and commentary -- a variety of issues.

During the foregoing program, Dr. Harris states:

"The problem with any conspiracy of that sort, and especially a bigger one, like 9/11 truth stuff conspiracy is that it just takes so much perfect collaboration to bring it off, and we know that people are so bad at that ... we know that interests don't align so perfectly ... we know that there's always somebody who just wants to sell their story to a tabloid, or feels guilty about the part they played ... or, they're getting divorced and they just can't stop talking ... and Bill Clinton couldn't keep a semen-stained dress off of the news. You know that's like the simplest thing. He is like the President of the United States with a terrified intern, and this is going to wreck his presidency, and he still couldn't keep the dress a secret."

To begin with, Dr. Harris offers no evidence or proof in the foregoing statement (or later in the program) demonstrating that

conspiracies require “perfect collaboration” in order for them to be perpetrated. Furthermore, the term: “perfect collaboration” frames his perspective gives expression to an arbitrary standard that he claims is necessary for a conspiracy to be perpetrated, and, consequently, that standard is something that he needs to justify ... which he does not do during the aforementioned program..

In addition, the foregoing excerpt from his interview with Joe Rogan seems to provide fairly clear evidence that Dr. Harris wishes to use many, if not all, of his comments concerning 9/11 by playing them off against various ‘conspiracy theories’. Yet, not all things 9/11 are necessarily about conspiracies.

Unfortunately, however, Dr. Harris doesn’t appear to want to talk about the actual issues, problems and evidence that pertain to 9/11. Indeed, during the course of nearly 70 minutes of recorded material (involving two podcasts and the Joe Rogan interview), Sam Harris fails to offer even one fact about the actual events of 9/11 ... everything he says in the aforementioned recorded material is based on generalized, unsupported statements concerning purported conspiracy theories.

Furthermore, Dr. Harris not only limits his remarks concerning 9/11 to the topic of conspiracy theory, but he also seems to want to talk only about certain kinds of conspiracies ... ones that don’t make sense or that involve problems of one kind or another. Apparently, he is trying to distance himself (and everyone else) from the real issues of 9/11, and if this is not what he is trying to accomplish, then, nevertheless, this is the inevitable result of the manner in which he seems to approach issues involving 9/11.

Dr. Harris continuously places the cart before the horse when it comes to 9/11. For example, rather than taking the time to sift through the evidence concerning the prevailing or official view/story and its attendant problems, he chooses to address the issue of collaboration and how it needs to be so perfect in order to be pulled off.

Who is responsible for 9/11 – irrespective of whether, or not, the perpetration of such a crime is done with perfect collaboration -- is not the first order of business in any investigation of 9/11. To properly initiate an investigation into 9/11, one needs to try to establish what happened on that day.

Once the foregoing has been accomplished, then, one could proceed to critically entertain different theories about possible responsibility. In other words, once a person has established some basic facts, then, an individual might be in a position to determine whether, or not, any of those kinds of theories are defensible, or indefensible, ways to account for the facts that have been established.

According to Dr. Harris's earlier quoted statement on the Joe Rogan program, "we" allegedly know all kinds of things about conspiracies. For example, supposedly, we know that people are bad at keeping conspiracies secret and, supposedly, we know "there's always somebody who wants to sell their story to a tabloid", and so on.

Apparently, we know all kinds of things that aren't necessarily so. For instance, we might know that some people are bad at keeping secrets, but we have no way of knowing if everybody is bad at doing so.

Conceivably, there are people who are really good at keeping secrets and/or at collaborating with one another to maintain secrecy. Presumably, such people would be very hard to identify and, therefore, might stand a good chance of being able to elude detection.

Moreover, contrary to the foregoing contention of Dr. Harris, we don't necessarily know that there always will be somebody who wants to talk about a conspiracy or that there always will be someone who has a guilty conscience concerning things in which they were involved. To be sure, we might know there are some people who are willing to talk or who have a guilty conscience because we have come across such cases in our own lives or through the news or on television or in books.

Nevertheless, we are not necessarily likely to know about cases in which the people involved with a given event were unwilling to talk about what went on, or unwilling to sell their story, or did not have a guilty conscience concerning such matters. By purporting that we know all the things he claims we know with respect to the issue of conspiracies, Dr. Harris is putting forth a theory that requires something more than his assertions about such matters.

In addition, as was the case with respect to one of the podcasts involving Dr. Harris was discussed previously in this chapter, he, once

again, refers to the Bill Clinton example concerning a semen-stained dress, and Dr. Harris appears to believe that just one example – the one he keeps repeating – is capable of proving his point about the difficulty involved with suppressing evidence. However, all his example demonstrates is that there are some things that have not been kept a secret.

The Bill Clinton case is part of an inductive argument. Dr. Harris is trying to argue from the particulars of the Bill Clinton issue to conspiracy theories in general by arguing that as Bill Clinton goes, so go all attempts to keep things secret, but he needs something more than one anecdotal case to give credence to the point he is trying to make.

In other words, the form of Dr. Harris's argument at this point is that conspiracies are highly unlikely to be successful because all one has to do verify such a contention is to look at the Bill Clinton case involving Monika Lewinsky and the semen-stained dress. Yet, Dr. Harris does not offer any relevant evidence concerning how many conspiracies are successful and remain hidden as measured against how many conspiracies are not successful or do not remain hidden ... a statistic that might serve to support his view that the Bill Clinton case is fairly typical of what happens when people try to keep things secret or quiet.

Consequently, what Bill Clinton could, or could not, do with respect to the suppression of evidence doesn't necessarily have anything to do with the issues of 9/11. One needs to ask, among other things, whether, or not, the official theory concerning 9/11 is tenable, and, if it is not – which I do not believe it is, and this is a belief rooted in considerable evidence (some of which has been indicated previously in this chapter and much more of which can be found in several books on the subject that I have written) -- then, one must go in search of some alternative account to explain the events of 9/11.

Plausibility concerning the nature of the events that transpired on 9/11 must come from the evidence entailed by 9/11. Plausibility will not be found – as Dr. Harris seems wont to do -- through the processing of irrelevant information – such as the activities of Bill Clinton in the Oval Office – or by speculating, in a general manner, about conspiracies of one kind or another.

To reiterate a point made earlier, first, one must ask if the prevailing/official view is capable of being defended, and irrespective – at this point – of how such a set of events might have been pulled off or how unlikely such a process might have been, if the “official” view, theory, or story is not tenable, then one is left with the realization that although somebody did pull something off on 9/11 because the evidence supports such a claim, but, nonetheless, the somebody who did pull something off did not necessarily include the 19 hijackers from Saudi Arabia and a few other Middle Eastern countries who were identified by the FBI as having perpetrated 9/11 because according to the BBC and various other sources, at least ten of those individuals are still alive, and none of the names of any of the alleged hijackers appeared on the passenger manifest lists for Flights 11, 175, 77, or 93.

-----

Dr. Harris continues on in the Joe Rogan interview with the following comments:

“There’s an adage on this subject – never ascribe to conspiracy what can be explained by incompetence, or something like that, and it’s just so obvious the incompetence factor in many of these situations is so high and so obvious ... and with September 11<sup>th</sup>, it’s just a crushing variable ... we were just not ... we’re not prepared to deal with that kind of problem, and anyone who thinks this was a conspiracy thinks that at least hundreds, probably thousands of people woke up one day – perfectly normal people ... people in the FAA, people in the military, people in government ... woke up perfect psychopaths willing with a clear conscience to murder 3,000 of their innocent neighbors and not ... this wasn’t Tuskegee ...this wasn’t the poor and disenfranchised of a race that you’re not so fond of ... these are some of the most powerful people in our society just blown up one day and all of this was perfectly attuned to leave the person at the top of the conspiracy -- presumably George Bush -- sitting reading *My Pet Goat* when the whole thing kicked off I mean it’s just ... it’s ridiculous ... it’s like ... and, then, as a pretext to go into Iraq ... first of all, it would have been so much easier to think of a pretext to go into Iraq, but why make it look like we got bombed or attacked by Saudis, and Yemenis and Egyptians that, in fact, is what it looks like?

... If your thinking about the sort of false flag operation thesis ... that we wanted to go into Iraq and steal their oil ... but, then, we're perfectly evil and perfectly Machiavellian and could bring this whole thing off without any leaks to this day... ten years hence, no one has come forward and said this is the part I played in it, and I feel terrible about it, and, yet, we botched it in these huge ways where we had to go to Afghanistan, before Iraq, and we really didn't want to go to Afghanistan ... no one suggests we actually wanted to actually wanted to be running around Tora Bora fighting the Taliban."

Can incompetence – as Dr. Harris claims -- really explain 9/11? For example, can one attribute the fact that three Trade Towers fell that day at roughly freefall speeds into their own footprint as being due to incompetence? Was the fact that most of the Twin Towers and Building 7 had been transformed into dust on 9/11 – something that could not be accomplished by airplane crashes, fires, and collapses – due to incompetence? Was the fact that none of the phone calls from the allegedly hijacked airplanes that day – most of which were cellular in nature – could not possibly have been made from those planes when they were in the air due to incompetence? Was the fact that there was no airplane wreckage found at the Pentagon due to incompetence? Was the fact that at least ten of the alleged hijackers – including (according to his parents) Mohammed Atta -- were still alive after 9/11 due to incompetence? Was the fact that professional commercial and military pilots have indicated that they could not have hit those buildings that day in the manner indicated in the official story due to incompetence? Is the fact that no steel-structured building prior to, or since 9/11, ever collapsed due to fires despite having burned for up to 20 times as long as the Trade Towers due to incompetence? Is the fact that none of the pilots or flight attendants in the four, allegedly hijacked airplanes followed FAA protocol that day due to incompetence? Is the fact that William Rodriguez and others heard and experienced bombs going off in the Twin Towers before planes supposedly struck those buildings due to incompetence? Is the fact that none of the alleged hijackers ever flew anything more than a single-engine airplane and were considered to be poor or terrible pilots by their instructors, and, yet, somehow on 9/11 were able to fly

commercial jets better than pilots with many years experience were able to do, due to incompetence? Is the fact that for months after 9/11 temperatures in excess of 1,000 degrees Fahrenheit were recorded at Ground Zero despite the fact there was no identifiable source of fuel to sustain such temperatures for that length of time due to incompetence? Does the fact that April Gallop – who was at the Pentagon when things blew up on 9/11 – was willing to testify in a sworn statement that there were no plane wreckage, engines, luggage, bodies or fires in the space where the incident happened due to incompetence? Was the fact that 12 witnesses – including members of the Pentagon police – have given public statements that the plane that approached the Pentagon on 9/11 flew on the North side of the Citgo gas station about a mile from the Pentagon and not on the South side of that station as required by the Official story due to incompetence?

In addition, Dr. Harris appears to be proposing something quite remarkable in his previous comments when he appears to suggest that the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> are entirely explicable as a function of incompetence. More specifically, according to Dr. Harris, 20 Arabs (consisting of 19 alleged hijackers and a guy in a cave in Afghanistan) were able to collaborate with sufficient competence to pull off 9/11, but, for whatever reason, such collaborative competence seems to be beyond the ability of Americans because, as Dr. Harris confidently states, everybody “knows” how bad at conspiracies and keeping secrets that people in government are.

Furthermore, in the previous extended statement that has been quoted, Dr. Harris advances a theory – based on a fictitious conspiracy scenario -- concerning the alleged cognitive states of the people who might have committed 9/11. More specifically, according to Dr. Harris, first, those who were responsible for 9/11 were perfectly normal, and, then, they became psychopaths.

However, the argument is entirely constructed from suppositions that are not tied to any actual analysis of the people who were responsible for 9/11 ... whoever they might be. He has no idea – and, certainly, no evidence to substantiate such an idea -- whether, or not, the perpetrators were normal individuals, or whether there was some transformation in them through which they became psychopaths ... this is all contra-factual thinking ... on the part of both Dr. Harris as

well as on the part of any conspiracy theory that might be making such claims.

At this point in the previously quoted excerpt from the Joe Rogan Experience interview, Dr. Harris launches into a soliloquy against those who believe that the attacks of 9/11 were a pretext for invading Iraq despite the fact that the alleged hijackers were, supposedly, from Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Egypt. As he does so, he attempts to downplay the fact that the first war to be declared after 9/11 involved Afghanistan by trying to claim that no one wanted to go into Afghanistan. However, if this is the case, then, why did the United States reject, out of hand, the Taliban offer to be willing to hand over 'Usama bin Laden on the presentation of proof by the United States that he was, indeed, responsible for 9/11?

NATO's rules of engagement with respect to Afghanistan also required the foregoing sort of proof. However, just as the United States government never provided that proof to the Taliban government, the American government also never produced such proof for NATO, and, therefore, NATO's participation in the Afghan war constitutes a violation of that alliance's charter.

Furthermore, if, as Dr. Harris claims, the United States government was not interested in going into Afghanistan, then, why did the American government indicate that its reason for war with Afghanistan had to do with the fact that the Taliban had been giving safe harbor to 'Usama bin Laden and other members of al-Qaeda, and since those individuals were responsible for 9/11, then, Afghan must be taught a lesson concerning its support of such terrorists and criminals? This reason for war was given despite the fact - previously noted -- that the FBI indicated on its web site that bin Laden was not wanted for 9/11, and, as well, Robert Mueller - the, then, Director of the FBI -- also indicated, when asked, that the FBI had no evidence that tied bin Laden to the events of 9/11?

To try to argue - as Dr. Harris does -- that the U.S. government did not want to go into Afghanistan is to engage in revisionist history. Dr. Harris fails to consider a variety of possibilities for going into Afghanistan that not only had to do with 9/11 but also had to do with, among other things, that country's potential for serving as a strategic location for building a gas pipe line.



For example, the events of 9/11 could have been a pretext for, among other things, invading Afghanistan, and, thereby, getting the war on terror started. The events of 9/11 could have been a pretext for: Passing of The Patriot Act, and/or for establishing Homeland Security, and/or for enabling various intelligence agencies to conduct ever more rigorous forms of illegal surveillance on the American people, and/or for justifying programs of rendition and torture ... all of which were in place prior to the invasion of Iraq.

The events of 9/11 might also have been a pretext for justifying the elimination of the Taliban's interference with the heroin drug trade. In addition, the events of 9/11 could have been a pretext for generating huge spending increases in the military budget and, therefore, increasing profits for the military-industrial complex.

The events of 9/11 might have been a pretext for undermining criticism of, and opposition to, the idea of further wars in the Middle East. Consequently, the events of 9/11 could have helped grease the skids for sliding into the invasion of Iraq.

Harris focuses on the fact that citing 9/11 as a pretext for invading Iraq makes no sense. However, he fails to consider all of the things that the events of 9/11 enabled the federal government to do quite independently of Iraq and for which 9/11 could have served as a pretext for initiating.

-----

Dr. Harris continues on during the Joe Rogan interview with the following comment:

"We go to Iraq ... that worked out well ... the idea that that was the easiest way to get their oil is crazy. It would have been far cheaper to buy it.

Dr. Harris's foregoing analysis is quite off the mark. Saddam Hussein was interested in accepting, and had begun transitioning into, a program of receiving, Euros in payment for oil rather than U.S. dollars. This threatened the American petro-dollar.

If the petro dollar fell by the way side, then, this would have been the beginning of the end for the United States economy. Therefore, contrary to what Dr. Harris claims, purchasing Iraqi oil would not, ultimately, have been cheaper than seizing that resource if the United States were forced to purchase Euros with money that was not just printed into existence through quantitative easing in order to be able to pay for its oil.

In a relatively short period of time, the price of oil would have become prohibitively expensive for the U.S. government and American companies. This is because the monetary exchange markets could no longer be manipulated by the United States through pumping U.S. dollars into the world's economy in order to continue financing America's consumption of world goods ... including oil.

The only thing crazy here is Harris's analysis of the Iraq situation. The reason for invading Iraq was not just about oil but, even more fundamentally, was about controlling the cost - and, therefore, affordability -- of oil in America.

-----

During the Joe Rogan interview, Dr. Harris stated that:

"If we just wanted to go into Iraq to create ... let's buy the idea that people conspire and that, actually, certain people in our government are willing to run a false flag operation so that we can go into Iraq. What would you have done? You would have shot down one of our planes over Iraq ... we wouldn't even have needed that because Saddam was shooting at our planes ... we had a no-fly zone in force for ten years ... the war wasn't over as far as he was concerned ... he kept shooting at planes ... he didn't hit any, but let him hit one, and, then, we would go in, but ..."

Actually, contrary to the foregoing contrafactual thinking of Dr. Harris, the American government actually did run a number of false flags against Iraq. Those false flags went by the name of "weapons of mass destruction" and "Yellow cake" uranium from Niger, and the intelligence asset "Curve Ball", and alleged 'high-level intelligence

meetings between Hussein and al-Qaeda in Czechoslovakia', and the notion of Iraq being a primary source for "state-sponsored terrorism".

-----

Dr. Harris adds on to his previous comment by claiming, in response to the idea that 9/11 might have been an 'Inside Job', that:

"... killing 3,000 people in downtown Manhattan ... people who were well connected and send the world-economy into a tailspin, it just doesn't have the right shape of it."

To reiterate some points that were made earlier, Dr. Harris's foregoing statement conveniently ignores a variety of possibilities for why some morally challenged individuals might not have thought twice about the prospect of killing 3,000, or more, of their fellow citizens, many of whom played productive roles in the world economy. For example, Dr. Harris seems to ignore the fact that the evidence that had been gathered involving the Enron, World Com, and Global Crossing scandals, together with various other market scandals, and were being stored in Building 7 of the World Trade Center, were all destroyed on September 11, 200. This could have served as a powerful motive for someone's being indifferent to any loss of life that might be associated with the destruction of such evidence.

Alternatively, one might wish to consider the multi-billion dollar insurance frauds that came about as a result of the destruction of the World Trade Center as an enticing motivation -- at least from the perspective of some twisted individuals -- for the killing of 3,000, or so, of the "little" people. One might also mention the profits that were generated by the theft of hundreds of billions of dollars worth of gold from the vaults of the Bank of Nova Scotia that were housed in the basement of Building 4, or the money that would be made from rebuilding the World Trade Center, as well as the money that would be generated through the military-industrial complex due to the destruction of the World Trade Center and using that destruction as justification for going to war, or the money that would be made by re-establishing the heroin trade routes out of the poppy fields of Afghanistan, or the money that might be made by mercenaries for the

parts they would play in, first, Afghanistan, and, then, later on, Iraq. All the foregoing possibilities might have been far more pertinent to generating motivations for perpetrating 9/11 than either Iraq or whatever temporary blips to the world economy that might have ensued from the deaths of 3,000 people, irrespective of what the role of such individuals might have been in the world economy.

For some people, September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 was a tragedy. For other individuals, 9/11 was the mother of all financial, economic, military, political and/or career opportunities.

Toward the end of his interview with Joe Rogan, a question is raised about why the United States seemed so eager to invade Iraq, Dr. Harris states:

“To some degree, I’m talking out of my depth here because I’m not really like a policy guy ...

Nor, apparently, -- at least based on the foregoing three Internet programs -- is Dr. Harris “really like” a: History guy, or a “fact” guy, or a 9/11 guy, or a financial/economic guy, or a political analysis guy, or an “insight” guy. Furthermore, despite having received a doctorate in cognitive neuroscience, Dr. Harris does not appear to be much of a science guy either since he seems to be unconcerned with discovering actual empirical evidence concerning 9/11 and appears to prefer, instead, to become immersed in contrafactual meta-thinking with respect to various conspiracy theories that might have arisen in the minds of some people in conjunction with 9/11 but tend to be far removed from the essential issues of 9/11.

Many scientists who have abdicated their scientific responsibilities in relation to 9/11 might be like the previously discussed case of Peter Michael Ketchum, the former employee of NIST, who, unfortunately, up to a certain point in time, never really exercised due diligence in the matter of 9/11 because he had trusted – mistakenly – that the so-called scientists who actually were involved in the investigation of the World Trade Center destruction or the damage at the Pentagon were honest brokers of the truth concerning 9/11 ... which they were not. However, although Mr. Ketchum needed 14 years, or so, to reactivate his status as an honest, objective broker of

the truth in the matter of 9/11, nonetheless, he finally did become a scientist once again in that respect and started looking at actual evidence in conjunction with 9/11, and, then, proceeded on to analyze and weigh the value and significance of that data.

However, although Dr. Harris provides a certain amount of evidence to suggest that, to some extent, he has thought a little – very, very little -- about the events of 9/11, nonetheless, he has not done so as a scientist because the scientific method is entirely absent from the way he tends to engage the topic of 9/11. In other words, his perspective concerning 9/11 is not only almost entirely devoid of empirical content, but, in addition, the quality of his thinking concerning the issue of 9/11 lacks rigor, insight, rationality, and diligence.

As such, Dr. Harris does not seem worthy to be considered as an honest and objective broker of truth with respect to matters pertaining to 9/11. In other words he appears to have failed to make the requisite efforts to acquire insight into the nature of 9/11 in a manner that is rooted in a rigorous process that is transparent, open, not intended to evade difficult problems, or mislead and distort (through commission or omission) with respect to relevant issues, as well as be critically and fairly responsive to actual evidence

Like so many other scientists in America, Dr. Harris appears to have abdicated his fiduciary responsibilities to the truth in matters pertaining to, among other things, 9/11. In the process of having exhibited signs of willful blindness (see page 14) concerning the issues of 9/11, he has become part of the realm of “Unscientific America” that Chris Mooney and Sheril Kirshenbaum never talk about in their book of the same name ... namely, the realm of so-called scientists who have abdicated their responsibilities to the truth in the matter of, among other things, 9/11.

Perhaps, the reason why Mooney and Kirshenbaum never explore the foregoing sorts of issues in their aforementioned book is because they, themselves, suffer from the same malady as Dr. Harris does. In other words, they all seem blind to the fact that each of them, in her or his own way, is helping to bring about an “unscientific America” because of their unwillingness to be honest, objective brokers of the truth when it comes to issues such as 9/11.

The topic of 9/11 should have a central role in both scientific and non-scientific facets of the curriculum in every American high school and university. The fact that this is not the case constitutes an important reason why America is becoming increasingly “unscientific” because – as the issue of 9/11 demonstrates in the case of individuals such as Sam Harris -- all too many individuals who consider themselves to be scientists – or teachers of science -- have abdicated responsibility when it comes to fulfilling the most fundamental role of a scientist – namely, to serve as an honest broker of truth in all matters of investigation ... including the issue of 9/11.

-----

### **Noam Chomsky and 9/11**

Sometimes, because of his research in linguistics and theories of mind, Noam Chomsky is referred to as a cognitive scientist. Moreover, he has an office in, and teaches (or taught) courses at, an institution – M.I.T. – that is home to many colleagues who often are referred to as scientists or engineers and who have been helping to train succeeding generations of scientists and engineers for many decades.

In October of 2001, four or five weeks after the events of 9/11, Professor Chomsky released a book of essays called *9-11* that ran a little over 100 pages in length. The book consisted of a half dozen, or so, essays that were drawn from interviews he had done following 9/11.

Approximately ten years later he updated the foregoing work by adding an essay about a variety of issues that arose in conjunction with the Navy Seal Six operation that allegedly terminated the life of ‘Usama bin Laden in Pakistan on May 2, 2011. The title of the latter book was *9-11: Was There An Alternative?*

With respect to the latter publication, I won’t go into the details of the eyewitness accounts in Pakistan – not covered by Western media outlets – indicating that the American government’s version of events in relation to the foregoing operation are not corroborated by individuals from Pakistan who actually observed Operation Neptune Spear take place at Abbottabad, nor will I do anything more than state that many years earlier (in 2002 or 2003) bin Laden had been reported, by a variety of foreign media outlets, to have died of various physical ailments, and, consequently, whatever took place on May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011 was something other than it was portrayed to be.

What remains the same, however, both with respect to the 2001 edition of *9-11* and its updated, 2011 edition, is that in both cases, Professor Chomsky tends to fail to carefully examine, analyze, and critically reflect on a great deal of relevant information concerning the events of 9/11 and the life of ‘Usama bin Laden. Professor Chomsky claims to be putting things in an appropriate historical context in his two books (more accurately, two editions of one book), but all he actually does is construct a narrative that gives expression to his political and philosophical ideology.

Both of the foregoing works – without citing any evidence whatsoever -- take as a starting point the “official” government story that 19 Arab hijackers, working in conjunction with ‘Usama bin Laden, planned and executed the events of 9/11. He, then, proceeds to engage in a historical analysis that purports to put the activities of the alleged hijackers into what he considers to be a proper historical perspective.

Early on in the first edition of 9-11, he says:

“The horrifying atrocities of September 11 are something quite new in world affairs, not in their scale and character but in their target. For the United States, this is the first time since the War of 1812 that the national territory has been under attack, or even threatened.”

In other words, the perpetrators of September came from outside of the United States and attacked the home mainland of America. No provision is made for the possibility that there might have been elements of that attack that were orchestrated from within the United States by some rogue elements within the intelligence community, the military, the corporate world, and/or the senior executive service (the SES went into effect during the administration of Jimmy Carter consisted of a group of organizational, management executives who occupied positions just beneath various Presidential appointees and were intended to serve as liaisons between such appointees and the rest of the civil service.)

Professor Chomsky goes on to claim:

“The likely perpetrators are a category of their own, but uncontroversially, they draw support from a reservoir of bitterness and anger over U.S. policies in the region,”

Then, he goes on to talk about the “moneyed Muslims” (such as business leaders, bankers, and professionals of one kind or another):

“... with ties to the United States. They expressed dismay and anger about U.S. support for harsh authoritarian states and the barriers that



Washington places against independent development and political democracy by its policies of ‘propping up oppressive regimes.’”

The foregoing comments constitute part of the core set of forces that supposedly induced “the likely perpetrators” (i.e., Muslims) to commit the atrocities of September 11. Yet, the narrative that is being constructed by Professor Chomsky is done in the absence of any evidence indicating that Muslims actually carried out the acts of 9/11, and, moreover, the hermeneutical tapestry that is being woven by Professor Chomsky does not offer any evidence – other than presumed motives – that are capable of lending support to the idea that one should consider the 19 Arabs who were identified by the FBI (and who did so within a matter of hours) as the perpetrators of 9/11 or why one should consider them to be “the likely perpetrators”.

Much of the book, *9-11*, consists in a litany of variations on the same foregoing themes – namely, how the imperialistic, as well as financially and economically exploitive policies of the United States in different parts of the world and in different periods of history have helped bring about a multiplicity of powder kegs of resentment, anger, and bitterness concerning the United States ... especially in the Muslim world. However, at no point during the process of advancing any of the foregoing instances of analysis does Professor Chomsky cite one piece of evidence indicating that Muslims actually were responsible for the atrocities of 9/11.

He is like a detective who says again and again and again: ‘Well, they certainly had the motive to do it. We gave it to them.’ Nonetheless, he does not produce any forensic evidence that has probative value.

Professor Chomsky goes on to say:

“...it is important not to be intimidated by hysterical ranting and lies and to keep as closely as one can to the course of truth and honesty and concern for the human consequences of what one does, or fails to do.”

Yet, as I believe will become clear in due course, Professor Chomsky is the one who is guilty of hysterical ranting and, quite miserably, fails “to keep as closely as one can to the course of truth and honesty and concern for the human consequences of what one does, or fails to do” when it comes to the issue of 9/11.

Later in his book, Professor Chomsky states in response to the question of ‘Who is responsible’ for 9/11, he answers:

“... It was assumed, plausibly, that the guilty parties were bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network.”

Unfortunately, Professor Chomsky never provides an account – either in this book or in others that he has written – capable of demonstrating -- in terms of hard evidence -- what makes such an assumption plausible, other than to say that “No one knows more about them (i.e., al-Qaeda) than the CIA” ... something that we have to take at face value because evidence is never forthcoming to indicate that the CIA either knew them as well as they claimed or knew them in a way that was capable of proving that bin Laden and his al-Qaeda network were responsible for 9/11.

In fact, during “*An Evening with Noam Chomsky: The War On Terror*” that took place at M.I.T. on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2001, Professor Chomsky indicated that while he, more or less, agreed with the official position of the Bush Administration concerning the alleged identity of the perpetrators of 9/11, nonetheless, “...it was astonishing to see how weak the evidence was,” and, then, went on to suggest that for purposes of discussion he was going to assume that such an account was true but, whether, or not, Islamic terrorists were involved in 9/11 didn’t matter much.

What an astonishing thing to say. This is comparable to a system of justice sentencing someone to a life sentence in prison or sentencing them to death and, then, adding, that whether, or not, the person being sentenced in the foregoing manner is guilty doesn’t matter much.

How does one justify such a statement? I have, yet, to come across anything in Professor Chomsky’s books or presentations that is

capable of justifying his claim that whether, or not, Islamic terrorists perpetrated the atrocities of 9/11 doesn't matter.

What is equally astonishing is the utter lack of curiosity that Professor Chomsky seems to exhibit in relation to the fact, by his own admission, that the evidence concerning the alleged guilt of al-Qaeda and bin Laden appeared to be so weak. Why did he just slide pass this issue of weak evidence and proceed to work on the assumption that not only were the allegations true, but, when push came to shove, whether, or not, Muslim terrorists were involved didn't matter?

One could assume that Professor Chomsky feels that the most important aspect of his analysis has to do with providing insight into, and an understanding (i.e. a proper historical perspective) of, the United States and the way in which its political, financial, military, and economic policies create problems that, sooner or later, will have unwanted consequences for both the United States and the world ... one of which was 9/11. From such a perspective, the sort of terrorism that is entailed by groups like al-Qaeda is, relatively speaking, small potatoes when measured against the terrorist activities perpetrated by the United States, and, in this respect, whether Muslim terrorists perpetrated 9/11 doesn't really matter ... what matters are U.S. policies and their problematic ramifications ... both domestically and internationally.

However, if Professor Chomsky is wrong in his analysis of the nature of the events that are taking place in the world and/or why those events are occurring – and I believe he is – then, identifying who actually perpetrated the atrocities of 9/11 really will matter. In fact, Professor Chomsky's flawed analysis of 9/11 serves as proof that either he really doesn't understand why identifying the actual perpetrators of 9/11 is of fundamental importance for gaining insight into the nature of world dynamics or, alternatively, he actually does understand the significance of this issue and chooses to hide the truth as well as be less than honest with respect to his analysis of the 9/11 tragedy and, as a result, he has failed to adhere to his set of previously noted values – namely, “...to keep as closely as one can to the course of truth and honesty and concern for the human consequences of what one does, or fails to do.”

According to Professor Chomsky, individuals who believe that the “official” story concerning 9/11 is suspect or who believe they have uncovered evidence to demonstrate that the “official” story is, in some way, untenable should do what any scientist does – namely, publish their findings in the available scientific and professional journals and arrange talks at various universities to address those issues. Apparently, Professor Chomsky does not know as much about science as his place of employment might suggest because the world he inhabits – that is, the realm of science, engineering and academia -- is not always a bastion for the free flow of information, essential curiosity, rigorous research, and/or objective analysis that he seems to believe it is.

A number of scientists – for example, Judy Wood, Steven Jones, Kevin Ryan, and Niels Harrit – lost their jobs because they questioned the “official” position concerning 9/11. Once people start losing their jobs for engaging in a process of critical inquiry concerning 9/11 – or, any number of topics – the influenza of self-censorship begins to spread fairly quickly among previously inquiring minds.

Furthermore, the fact there were many scientists and engineers associated with NIST, *Scientific American*, *The Pentagon Performance Report*, and *Popular Mechanics* didn’t prevent those individuals from issuing articles, books, and reports that were breathtaking in their ineptitude and the extent to which those individuals betrayed the tenets of objective inquiry. Yet, the foregoing sort of mentality almost completely dominates the activities of many scientific, professional, media, and academic endeavors when it comes to, among other things, the issue of 9/11 ... and Noam Chomsky’s way of engaging 9/11 reflects the same stultifying, incurious, group-thinking mentality.

During June of 2004, Professor Chomsky gave a talk in Budapest, Hungary. At a certain point during his presentation, the topic of 9/11 arose, and he responded as follows:

“Did they [i.e., the Bush Administration] plan on it in any way or know anything about it ... this is extremely unlikely. For one, they would have to have been insane, to try anything like that ... if they had, it is almost certain that it would have leaked out. It is a very porous system. Secrets are very hard to keep. So something would have leaked

out ... very likely, and if it had, they would all have been before a firing squad and that would have been the end of the Republican Party forever.”

In light of Professor Chomsky’s activities over the last 40 years or so – which involves writing scores of books and articles, as well as giving countless interviews and lectures that provide, to a captivating degree, evidence-based details concerning the ways in which successive American governments have consistently attempted to subvert truth, justice, human rights, and democratic processes, one is somewhat surprised to observe Professor Chomsky become preoccupied with speculating about the ‘reasonableness’ of Bush’s innocence based on something other than actual evidence concerning 9/11. Professor Chomsky has developed a reputation for scratching beneath surface phenomena in order to uncover the actual dynamics at work in a given set of circumstances, but, in Hungary, he abandons that *modus operandi* and becomes ensconced in surface phenomena.

Consequently, Professor Chomsky does not begin his comments, before a Hungarian audience as any good scientist might, with something to the effect of: “Well, let’s take a look at some of the actual evidence concerning 9/11 and whether, or not, that data supports the government’s hypothesis because I have spent years demonstrating that government’s often cannot be trusted to speak the truth concerning such events.” Rather, he proceeds by putting forth a straw dog ‘who-done-it’ scenario – i.e., Bush did it – which enables him to avoid having to talk about actual evidence and, instead, permits him to focus entirely on speculating about whether, or not, the “Bush did-it” hypothesis is reasonable given what we supposedly “know” (??) about the phenomenon of government leaks.

By framing the issue in the way he does, Professor Chomsky is able to sidestep the heart of the 9/11 controversy – namely, does the available evidence concerning the events of 9/11 actually support the government’s official story about that day in which, allegedly, 19 Arab hijackers conspired with ‘Usama bin Laden to fly planes into buildings in America. Instead, Professor Chomsky spends his time putting together an argument that -- quite effectively -- diverts attention away from key issues.

Furthermore, one should note that Professor Chomsky offers no evidence to substantiate his foregoing comments concerning the issue of leaks. For instance, he does not provide statistics about, or research concerning, the percentage of hidden government activities that actually are leaked when measured against those activities that are successfully kept from public view.

He merely states that the government system is very porous and that government secrets are very hard to keep. However, none of the foregoing claims are based on anything more than Professor Chomsky's assertion that such is the case, and, therefore, one is not in any position to determine how likely it is that someone would have leaked something, or other, concerning the government's participation in, or knowledge about, the events of 9/11.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, Professor Chomsky also filters his previously quoted remarks through a conceptual framework in which one is not given any opportunity to consider alternative possibilities -- if the government actually were somehow involved in, or had knowledge about, 9/11 -- with respect to which part of government might have played an active role in helping to orchestrate the events of that day. Professor Chomsky restricts his focus to Bush and members of his administration, but if some other dimension of government were involved in the perpetration of 9/11 besides the Bush Administration, then, perhaps, one would be prudent to consider the activities of: Various facets of the "intelligence community" (something of an oxymoron), and/or different members of the military, and/or any number of possible candidates from among the Senior Executive Service branch of government ... none of whom -- despite the fact that Constitutional theory suggests otherwise -- are necessarily under the control of elected officials such as Bush, Cheney, and company.

Professor Chomsky continues his commentary on 9/11 with the following remarks:

"... furthermore, it was completely unpredictable what was going to happen. You couldn't predict that the plane would actually hit the World Trade Center -- it happened that it did, but it easily could have missed. So, you could hardly control it, but what you could be almost

certain of is that any hint of a plan would have leaked and would have destroyed them ...”

The foregoing statement is factually incorrect in several ways. For example, at least from the early 1990s, technology has existed that is capable of remotely controlling commercial – and other – aircraft.

We are most familiar with such technology in relation to the phenomenon of drones. Nonetheless, prior to 9/11, both American Airlines and United Airlines (key companies in the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001) installed flight termination systems in all of their planes in order to guard against, among other things, hijacking and, thereby, enable people on the ground to be able to take over control of such aircraft if circumstances warranted it.

Consequently, if flight termination systems were activated on 9/11 by parties unknown (possibly unknown parties within government), then, one cannot necessarily say that “what was going to happen” on 9/11 was “completely unpredictable.” Only people, like Professor Chomsky, who, apparently, are ignorant of such technological developments, might have been unable to imagine the possibility that what took place on 9/11 in New York, Virginia, and Shanksville, Pennsylvania might have been quite predictable – or was predictable to a considerable degree – as far as the individuals who were running those operations were concerned.

Professor Chomsky’s foregoing remarks are also factually shaky when he says: “You couldn’t predict that the plane would actually hit the World Trade Center – it happened that it did, but it actually could have missed.” There are several ways in which such a statement is factually problematic.

First of all, Professor Chomsky is quite right that a pilot’s chances of hitting either of the Twin Towers were very “iffy” propositions. However, Professor Chomsky apparently fails to appreciate the potential implications that his statement carries with respect to the issue of 9/11.

More specifically, at some point following 9/11, John Lear, part of the Lear jet family, described, for a Project Camelot film crew, how he took a number of professional pilots – including some who had many

years of experience on the type of aircraft that allegedly crashed into the Twin Towers on 9/11 – into a Pan American Flight Simulator in Miami, Florida and discovered that under the conditions described by the FAA in its reports on 9/11, none of his pilots could duplicate what a bunch of novice Arab pilots, who had difficulty flying Cessna airplanes, supposedly pulled off on 9/11.

Lear referred to the challenge of intentionally flying a large commercial jet like American Airlines Flight 11 or United Airlines Flight 175 into a tall steel-framed building as being “impossible”. He added: “At the height of my career, as proficient as I was in every kind of airplane, there’s no way I could have done that. I mean, it’s just too complex.”

Dan D’vato, who flight tests pilots for his airline, also took a number of line pilots into a flight simulator in the weeks following 9.11. He tested them on a 737 -- which is a smaller and more maneuverable jet aircraft than the ones involved on 9/11 – and he discovered that despite many years of experience flying all manner of planes under all manner of conditions, none of those line pilots could hit the World Trade Center Towers at the speeds that were supposedly exhibited by Flight 11 and Flight 175 on 9/11.

Russ Wittenburg, a retired commercial and Air Force pilot, commented on the likelihood that the alleged Arab hijacking pilots of 9/11 infamy could have accomplished what the government’s official story seeks to attribute to them. He said: “I flew the two actual aircraft which were involved in 9/11 -- The Flight number 175 and Flight 93. The 757 that allegedly went down at Shanksville and Flight 175 is the aircraft that is alleged to have hit the South Tower. I don’t believe it’s possible for terrorists ... so-called terrorists – to train on a 172 (single-engine Cessna) then jump in the cockpit of a 757 – 767 glass cockpit and vertical navigate the aircraft, lateral navigate the aircraft ... and fly the airplane at speeds exceeding its designed limit speed, by well over a hundred knots, make high-speed, high-bank turns, exceeding probably 5, 6 7 g’s ... and the aircraft would literally fall out of the sky. I couldn’t do it, and I am absolutely positive they couldn’t do it.”

Professor Chomsky never appears to question the idea that novice pilots who had difficulty exhibiting proficiency with respect to the flying of even single-engine Cessna airplanes (and, therefore, one



wonders if one accurately can refer to such individuals as “pilots”), nonetheless, were somehow able to fly large commercial airplanes on 9/11 in a manner that experienced pilots would have had great difficulty in accomplishing ... if they could have done it at all. Why does Professor Chomsky consider the possibility that for members of the Bush Administration to try to perpetrate something like 9/11 would be “insane”, and, yet, he doesn’t consider the idea equally insane – if not more so -- that individuals who had been rated as terrible pilots by their flight instructors were subsequently capable of performing incredible feats of aviation on 9/11?

Furthermore, Professor Chomsky foregoing remarks are completely devoid of any hint of questions concerning the idea that planes actually hit either the Twin Towers or the Pentagon. The superstructure of commercial jets consists largely of aluminum, and aluminum is not capable of cutting through steel-framed and concrete buildings in the cookie-cutter fashion that is depicted in photographs of the Twin Towers on 9/11, and any reliable witness who has learned about what happens when an aircraft strikes a building will attest that this is the case.

In addition, aircraft do not melt into steel-framed buildings -- that is, show no evidence of meeting with an equal and opposite force of resistance, and, thereby, comply with Newton’s third law of motion. Yet, this is precisely what is depicted in the 9/11 videos that, supposedly, show a commercial jet slamming into the South Tower of the World Trade Center.

Moreover, commercial aircraft do not disintegrate into nothing when they crash into an object – whether that object is a steel-framed tower, the Pentagon, or the ground in Shanksville, Pennsylvania. Yet, on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, we are being asked to believe – and Professor Chomsky seems quite gullible in this respect – that four commercial aircraft disintegrated on 9/11 and left behind no signs of their presence ... except a couple of paper passports belonging to the alleged hijackers.

As pointed out previously, 80,000 pieces of the Columbia shuttle were recovered despite the fact that it was travelling at 17,000 miles per hour when it broke apart. Yet, airplanes that were travelling at 1/34<sup>th</sup> of that speed supposedly just evaporated into thin air since, for

the first time in aviation history, parts to four commercial jets were never located following their alleged crashes on 9/11.

Some individuals have indicated that following 9/11 part of a jet engine actually was found on Murray Street near the World Trade Center. However, the part that lay at the foregoing location – and later on was moved to a landfill on Staten Island more than a year before the 9/11 Commission began its deliberations -- was a General Electric product, but United Airlines only uses Pratt and Whitney.

Consequently, the jet engine part found on Murray Street could not have come from Flight 175 as some individuals have tried to claim. In addition, and, perhaps, somewhat more intriguingly, what was part of a General Electric jet engine doing on Murray Street, and how did it get there?

Professor Chomsky continues to expound on the issue of 9/11 before his Hungarian audience when he states:

“Now if you look at it there is a big industry in the United States ... on the left as well... I mean you should see the e-mails I get ... this huge Internet industry from the left trying to demonstrate ... and there are books coming out ... best sellers in France and so on that this was all faked and it was planned by the Bush Administration, and so on ... if you look at the evidence, anybody who knows anything about the sciences would instantly discount that evidence.”

While it might be true that there is a “big industry in the United States” taking place on the Internet in which various individuals put forth theories about how the Bush Administration perpetrated the events of 9/11 or how things were faked on 9/11, nonetheless, Professor Chomsky never offers any specific examples of what he has in mind when he makes the foregoing sorts of charges. Consequently, one is unable to determine whether, or not, he is correct when he says: “if you look at the evidence, anybody who knows anything about the sciences would instantly discount that evidence.”

What evidence, exactly, is one supposed to be considering? Furthermore, just what aspects of science would “instantly discount that evidence”?

What about those individuals who do know something about science and did not “instantly discount” whatever evidence he is alluding to in very non-specific terms? Should one automatically assume that because some individuals might reach a conclusion that is different from the sort of conclusion that Professor Chomsky has in mind that, therefore, such people must not actually know anything about science?

Why should one suppose that Professor Chomsky’s understanding of science is to be preferred to the understanding of science held by those who might disagree with him on this issue? Certainly, Professor Chomsky’s comments do not offer any way to objectively decide such a question.

In fact, the foregoing assertions of Professor Chomsky are entirely vague in nature. This lack of specificity and concreteness continues when he adds to his previous remarks by saying: “There are plenty of coincidences and unexplained phenomena ... you know, why did this happen and why didn’t that happen ... and so on,”

How can one possibly know if something is a coincidence or an unexplained phenomenon until one has an opportunity to critically reflect on actual evidence? Why should one accept as true something that Professor Chomsky says is the case just because he says it?

According to Professor Chomsky: “If you look at a controlled scientific experiment, the same thing is true ...” (i.e., as far as the presence of unexplained phenomena and coincidences is concerned). He goes on to say: “... when somebody carries out a controlled scientific experiment, at the best laboratories, at the end there are lots of things that are unexplained, and there are funny coincidences.”

Is it necessarily true that at the end of controlled experiments carried out at even the best laboratories there are always “lots of things that are unexplained and there are funny coincidences”? If what he is saying is true, then, why not put forth even a little of the evidence to which he is alluding?

However, if an experiment is really well-controlled, then, there should be a relative dearth of “unexplained phenomena” and “funny coincidences” generated by such a process because that is what a well-controlled experiment is designed to eliminate. The data from an

experiment should, as precisely as possible, either help confirm, or disconfirm, the hypothesis that led to that experiment being performed, and if an experiment leads to lots of “unexplained phenomena” or “funny coincidences, then, by definition, the experiment is not well-controlled.

Professor Chomsky goes on to maintain that:

“If you want to get a sense of it [i.e., that is, the issue of unexplained phenomena and funny coincidences], take a look at the letters columns in the technical scientific journals, like *Nature* or *Science*, or something ... the letters are commonly about unexplained properties of reports of technical experiments carried out under controlled conditions which will just leave a lot of things unexplained ... that’s the way the world is.”

While it is true that the letters columns in various scientific and technical journals do contain comments on various experiments that have been performed and, at some point, have been given written expression in the sorts of journals to which Professor Chomsky refers in the foregoing quote, nonetheless, such comments often tend to involve criticisms about aspects of an experiment that have not been well-controlled or that have failed -- for instance, in the analysis or conclusion sections of an article -- to take into consideration various alternative possibilities that might account for the results that were derived from a given experiment. In other words, the comments in the letters to which Professor Chomsky is alluding in the previous quote often tend to be directed toward pointing out possible flaws with one, or another, facet of the methodology employed in a given experiment rather than being preoccupied with various “unexplained phenomena” or “funny coincidences”.

If an experiment is written up and contains “unexplained phenomena” and/or “funny coincidences,” then, such an article or note is quite likely to be flagged by the peer review process and required to be redone in a more rigorous fashion. Professor Chomsky’s foregoing comments make it seem as if the idea of quality-control is absent from the publication of articles concerning scientific experiments, and in the

process, he seems to confuse the dialogues concerning scientific method that tends to take place in various technical journals with the alleged existence of all manner of – but unspecified – “unexplained phenomena” and “funny coincidences” that supposedly appear in the letters columns of such journals.

During the aforementioned 2004 talk in Hungary, Professor Chomsky goes on to note that:

“Now, if you take a natural event ... you know, not something that is controlled ... most of it will be unexplained. There will be all sorts of things that happen that afterwards you can put them in some kind of pattern, but beforehand you can't ... and the pattern might be completely meaningless ... because you can put into some other pattern too if you want ... that's just the way complicated events are ... so the evidence that has been produced, in my opinion, is essentially worthless ...”

If the foregoing words of Professor Chomsky are to be believed, then, presumably, the 100, or more books, that Professor Chomsky has written should be considered -- that is, if he is to be logically consistent – as being “essentially worthless” in his opinion. After all, his books satisfy the conditions that he outlined in his previous comment in as much as those books explore an array of complicated, natural events involving history, politics, government, media, economics, language, cognitive processes, or philosophy, and, apparently, since, according to Professor Chomsky most of those natural events “will be unexplained”, and, in addition, since “... afterwards you can put them in some kind of pattern, but beforehand you can't ... and the pattern might be completely meaningless ... because you can put into some other pattern too if you want ... that's just the way complicated events are ...”, then, it follows that Professor Chomsky's 100, or more, books are little more than unexplained, meaningless, and arbitrary arrangements of data that could just as easily be explained by “some other pattern” of conceptual framing, and, consequently, should be considered to be “essentially worthless.”

The choices before Professor Chomsky appear to be two. On the

one hand, he could concede that the foregoing analysis of his position is entirely consistent with what he proclaimed to his Hungarian audience in conjunction with the issue of 9/11, and, therefore, anything that he says about such a topic should be considered to be “essentially meaningless,” or, on the other hand, he could admit that his comments about complex, natural events constituting largely unexplained and meaningless patterns of thought that are fairly arbitrary in nature might have played a little too fast and loose with the semantics and syntax of the matter he was discussing.

Professor Chomsky brings to a close his comments on 9/11 in Hungary when he contends:

“I should say that I’m pretty isolated on this in the West ... a large part of the left completely disagrees on this and has all kinds of elaborate conspiracy theories about how it happened and why it happened, and so on ... but I think it is completely wrong, but I also think it is diverting people away from serious issues ... I mean even if it were true ... which is extremely unlikely, who cares ... doesn’t have any significance”

Why should one accept his foregoing pronouncement that one, or another, alternative theory concerning 9/11 is “extremely unlikely”? He cites zero evidence that might justify his perspective concerning any particular theory, and he engages in no detailed critical analysis of concrete issues involving such evidence.

Instead, he spends all his time remarking on how the Internet and many commentators on the left are involved in little more than putting forth “elaborate conspiracy theories about how it happened and why it happened, and so on.” This is nothing more than argument by assertion.

Moreover, one is somewhat nonplussed by Professor Chomsky’s claim that even if any of the theories to which is alluding were true, nevertheless, according to Professor Chomsky, that fact would have no significance. One wonders what the nature of his argument possibly could be which held that if someone were able to demonstrate that 19 Arab hijackers did not perpetrate the events of 9/11, but, rather, those

events were the handy-work of one, or another, facet of the United States government, then such a fact would have no significance.

Millions of people have been killed and maimed as a result of the manner in which successive American governments, the American media, and academia in the United States have interpreted the events of 9/11 in compliance with the official government story. Millions more individuals have been displaced as a result of those “official” interpretations.

Due to the “official story” concerning 9/11, the United States government has spent trillions of dollars on wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere. These are trillions of dollars that could have been, and should have been, spent on helping the people of the United States to improve economically, financially, and educationally, as well as to have access to better health care and an enhanced infrastructure, rather than contributing to the profits of the military-industrial complex.

As a result of the government’s official position concerning 9/11: The Patriot Act was passed, Homeland Security was established; the TSA was introduced; a series of NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) policy initiatives have been implemented; the NSA has stepped up its illegal surveillance of the American people; and a slew of Executive Orders have been written by several Presidents that, given the right opportunity, are designed to turn the American republic into a fascist dictatorship. In addition, the United States government engaged in rendition and torture programs in many parts of the world.

According to Professor Chomsky previously quoted comment, all of the foregoing events could have been perpetrated under false pretenses, but he claims that such a fact would have no significance. Just what are his criteria for defining what constitutes the nature of “significance”, and what justifies his use of those sorts of criteria?

Professor Chomsky completes his analysis of 9/11 before a Hungarian audience by saying:

“... It’s a little bit like the huge energy that’s put out on who killed John F. Kennedy ... who knows and who cares --- plenty of people get killed all the time ... why does it matter that one of them happened to be John F. Kennedy ... If there was some reason to believe that there was some

high-level conspiracy, it might be interesting, but the evidence against that is overwhelming, and after that if it happened to be a jealous husband or someone else, what difference does it make. It's just taking energy away from serious issues to ones that don't matter, and I think the same is true here."

What is the "overwhelming" evidence against the idea that there was a high-level conspiracy involved in the assassination of John F. Kennedy? Professor Chomsky's foregoing claim - as well as the perspective of the multi-volume Warren Commission Report -- can be totally decimated with 5 words - namely, "Back and to the left" - because as is clearly indicated in the video of that event, the fatal shot that killed Kennedy pushed his head "back and to the left," and that shot could not possibly have come from the book depository building where Oswald supposedly was positioned.

In addition, law enforcement ran Oswald through two gun-shot residue tests on the day of the assassination. Both tests were negative.

Jim Marrs (*Crossfire*), Peter Dale Scott (*Deep Politics and the Death of JFK*), Oliver Stone and Peter Kuznick (*The Untold History of the United States*), and James W. Douglas (*JFK and the Unspeakable: Why He Died and Why It Matters*), as well as Michael Parenti (*Dirty Truths*), John Judge (Coalition on Political Assassinations) and others, have all put forth considerable evidence indicating that Professor Chomsky's position is untenable when he tried to contend that the evidence that stands in opposition to the possibility that there was a high-level assassination plot against Kennedy is overwhelming. Moreover, contrary to the repeated claims of Professor Chomsky over the years (e.g., *Rethinking Camelot*) that the assassination of Kennedy had no appreciable effect on U.S. policy, the foregoing authors all indicate that the assassination of JFK fundamentally changed the direction of government policy with respect to an array of international, financial, economic, intelligence, and domestic issues.

The perspective of Professor Chomsky concerning the JFK assassination is fundamentally flawed. Furthermore, even if one were to grant his point that the Internet is filled with wild, unsubstantiated theories concerning the nature of 9/11, nonetheless, he also is wrong when he claims that even if true, such theories are of no significance.



To be sure, not every theory about 9/11 is true just as not every scientific theory is true. Nonetheless, in each case (that is, both in relation to science and in relation to the topic of 9/11), everything depends on the nature of the evidence that can be gathered, as well as on a proper analysis of that evidence.

However, since Professor Chomsky either tends to ignore actual evidence concerning 9/11 or fails to engage that evidence with due diligence, he really has nothing of value to say about 9/11. In other words, almost all – if not all -- of his statements concerning 9/11 are empty of substantive content and, therefore have no probative value.

In 1967, Professor Chomsky released an essay entitled: “*The Responsibility of Intellectuals*”. It was published as a special supplement by the *New York Review* on February 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Among other things, the foregoing essay provides an array of details concerning the many ways in which the media, government officials, and technocrats tend to lie, distort, mislead, deceive, misinform, as well as commit sins of omission concerning the truth at the behest of power structures. Yet, rather ironically and quite inexplicably, despite more than three decades of driving home the foregoing point in a variety of books, articles, lectures, and interviews, nonetheless, in the aftermath of 9/11, Professor Chomsky never seems to consider the possibility that the media, government officials, and a host of technocrats were lying to, misleading, deceiving, or misinforming him and the rest of America in relation to the events of 9/11.

The aforementioned essay (i.e., *The Responsibility of Intellectuals*) also argued that the individuals to whom Professor Chomsky was alluding in his essay were in a privileged position, and, therefore, had a moral responsibility to critically, rigorously, and truthfully address the issues of the day. Furthermore, in that essay, he said: “If it is the responsibility of the intellectual to insist upon the truth, it is also his duty to see events in their historical perspective.”

By failing to insist on establishing the truth concerning the issues of 9/11, and by being derelict in his duty with respect to seeing the events of 9/11 “in their historical perspective,” Professor Chomsky has become actively complicit in helping to enable many of the political events that have transpired since the events of 9/11 occurred. As such,

he has lost his right to be considered as an honest broker of truth ... at least in conjunction with the issue of 9/11, and, perhaps, in other ways as well.

Apparently, Professor Chomsky is an “intellectual” who – at least in conjunction with 9/11 -- has lost his way. If so, then he seems to have betrayed the moral and epistemological framework that he sought to bring to the attention of others nearly 50 years ago in his essay on the responsibility of intellectuals.

Some people might consider him to be a scientist of sorts. However, unfortunately, in the matter of 9/11 he does not appear to conduct himself as such.

Like the high priests during the time of Galileo, he refuses to look at the actual evidence. Instead, he seeks to dismiss, out of hand, such evidence as being of no significance ... even if true.

-----

Nine years after his aforementioned comments concerning 9/11 had been delivered at Budapest, Hungary in 2004, Professor Chomsky again addressed the issue of 9/11 during a question and answer session at the University of Florida (November, 2013). He was asked a question by a member of the audience (Bob Tuskin) along the following lines ... namely, given that Professor Chomsky had said on Z-Net in 2006 that he (Professor Chomsky) wanted to see a consensus of opinion among architects and engineers with respect to the collapse of buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11 and since over 2,000 architects and engineers now have agreed that Building 7 fell at free-fall speeds when it collapsed on 9/11 – and this is a point that NIST acknowledges – then, the questioner asked whether Professor Chomsky was ready to come on board with respect to the issue of 9/11 ... especially given that there is no better evidence of a media cover up than the events involving Building 7 on 9/11.

Professor Chomsky responded to the foregoing question by beginning in the following manner:

“Well, in fact, you’re right, there is a consensus among the miniscule number of architects and engineers ... a tiny number ... a couple of them are perfectly serious.”

Let's assume that Professor Chomsky is right when he claims that there is a consensus among only a "miniscule number of architects and engineers ... a tiny number..." Of the remaining number of architects and engineers, how many of them actually examined the evidence concerning 9/11 or how many of these other architects and engineers were, and are like, the previously discussed case of Peter Michael Ketchum, a former employee of NIST, in which he did not examine the evidence concerning 9/11 for nearly 14 years following those events because he assumed - wrongly - that the scientists at NIST who investigated the collapse of three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11 were competent in, and had integrity concerning, their investigatory efforts?

Suppose one has two groups of people. One group of individuals constitutes a majority of the architects and engineers in America who very likely -- as Peter Ketchum did for nearly 14 years -- might never have taken the time to examine actual evidence concerning 9/11, and another, tiny, miniscule group of architects and engineers who actually have looked at evidence concerning 9/11.

Why assume - as Professor Chomsky does -- that the consensus of the foregoing majority group of architects and engineers that might not know much, if anything, about the issue of 9/11 should be considered to be more important, or should carry more scientific weight, than the consensus of a group of architects and engineers consisting of a tiny, miniscule number of people who actually know a fair amount about the issues of 9/11? Professor Chomsky never appears to consider such a possibility but, automatically, assumes - without any evidence -- that the majority consensus view is the one that should be trusted?

Not content with merely saying that the consensus of architects and engineers who have adopted a contrarian position concerning 9/11 is a tiny miniscule group, Professor Chomsky introduces some ad hominem flavor to his comments by saying that "a couple of them are perfectly serious." I'm willing to wager that Professor Chomsky has not spent much, if any, time with any of the architects and engineers who reject, among other things, the conclusions that NIST reached as to the nature of the cause of collapse for three buildings at the World Trade

Center on 9/11, and, therefore, Professor Chomsky is not in a position to know anything about the individuals whom he is maligning (i.e., all the architects and engineers who, according to Professor Chomsky, are not serious in their pronouncements concerning 9/11).

Professor Chomsky goes on to state that the foregoing group of architects and engineers:

“... are not doing what scientists and engineers do when they think they’ve discovered something. What you do, when you think you’ve discovered something ... what you do is write articles in scientific journals, give talks at the professional societies, to the civil engineering department at MIT or Florida or wherever you are and present your results, and, then, proceed, to try to convince the national academies, the professional societies, the physicists, and civil engineers, the departments in major universities, convince them that you have discovered something.”

How does Professor Chomsky know – or does he know – whether, or not, the foregoing miniscule group of architects and engineers have tried to do exactly what he is indicating? Maybe the reason why their concerns have not appeared in scientific journals, or they have not been featured in gatherings of various professional societies, or their concerns have not been the topic of symposia and forums at places like M.I.T. is because out of fear, vested interests, ignorance, and various kinds of power politics that exist within the scientific and engineering communities, the concerns of the foregoing miniscule group of individuals have been ignored and effectively marginalized by those individuals who make the decision about what issues will, and will not, be explored.

Given that Noam Chomsky’s name, along with that of Edward Hermann) tends to be associated with the issue of manufactured consent [derived from Walter Lippmann’s 1921 (or so) book: *Public Opinion*, in which Lippmann refers to the manufacture of consent as a technique for controlling the views of citizens within a “democracy”], one can’t help but be puzzled by Professor Chomsky’s stance that the miniscule number of architects and engineers to whom he is referring

haven't tried to do what he claims that they should have been doing in order to get people thinking about their concerns. Manufacturing consent does not occur just in the mass media, but takes place as well within science and engineering, and, consequently, one is inclined to believe that Professor Chomsky should have been among the first individuals to recognize that such power dynamics might be in play within the communities of scientists, engineers, and academics when it comes to 9/11.

Professor Chomsky goes on to say:

“Now, there happen to be a lot of people around who spent an hour on the Internet and think they know a lot of physics, but it doesn't work like that. There is a reason why there are graduate schools in these departments and research ...”

Once again, Professor indulges in ad hominem attacks through which he casts aspersions on a group of people about whom, for the most part, he knows nothing.

While it could be true that some people might believe they can acquire facility with the principles of physics by spending an hour's worth of research on the Internet, Professor Chomsky really has no idea what the academic and professional credentials are of the people who take exception with the “official” view of the government concerning 9/11, nor does he have any idea what research those individuals have done, nor does he know how much physics those individuals know and understand. Moreover, one doesn't necessarily need graduate training in physics – as Professor Chomsky seems to be implying in his foregoing remark -- in order to be able to understand various kinds of dynamics that are entailed by 9/11.

In many instances, one doesn't need much more than a high school course in physics and a little common sense to be able to follow arguments or pursue certain lines of investigation involving 9/11. More importantly, many dimensions of 9/11 don't necessarily require any formal knowledge of physics at all.

For example, the fact that the debris from the World Trade Center constituted a crime scene, and, therefore, should not have been

removed without a proper chain of custody being established for it and without it being forensically investigated does not require one to have knowledge of physics. The statement that no steel-frame building has collapsed anywhere in the world due to fires either prior to 9/11 or following it -- does not require a knowledge of physics but of history.

The fact that Eric Lawyer, a New York City fire fighter, stated that NIST, along with the initial investigators, failed to properly protect the scene of the fires at the World Trade Center, and, therefore, violated national standards governing the investigation of the sorts of fires that encountered at the World Trade Center does not require knowledge of physics. In addition, the fact that initial investigators at the World Trade Center failed to comply with NPFA manual requirements in relation to evidence that suggested the presence of “exotic accelerants” (NPFA 19.2.4), alternative fuel sources (NPFA 18.15), and acts of extremism (NPFA 19.4.8.2.6) does not require a knowledge of physics.

The fact that William Rodriguez Kenny Johannemann, Jose Sanchez, Salvatore Giambanco, Anthony Satalamacchia (all of whom worked at the Twin Towers), along with Felipe David (an employee of a company that serviced the candy machines in the Twin Towers) heard, saw, or felt the effects of massive explosions in the basement of the world trade center before the North Tower was hit by something does not require a knowledge of physics. The fact that 118 individuals (including many fire fighters and police officers) made recorded statements concerning the explosions they heard, saw, or experienced in conjunction with the events of 9/11 does not require knowledge of physics.

The fact that Barry Jennings was forced to walk back up the stairs in Building 7 on 9/11 because the floor below him had been rocked by massive explosions and that, subsequently, he and his companion had to walk through a ground floor area that had been devastated by explosions does not require a knowledge of physics. The fact April Gallop reports that she was at Ground Zero in the Pentagon when explosions took place, but when she led people out of the Pentagon, she saw no aircraft debris such as seats, passenger bodies, luggage, or fires from a plane crash does not require a knowledge of physics.

The fact that 17 people – including members of the Pentagon Police staff -- indicated that the plane they saw fly toward the

Pentagon just prior to the onset of explosions at the Pentagon approached the Pentagon on the north side of the Citgo gas station -- rather than the south side as reported in the *Pentagon Performance Report* -- does not require a knowledge of physics. The fact that no parts from any Boeing aircraft of the kind that supposedly struck the North and South Tower or the Pentagon have ever been found does not require a knowledge of physics.

The fact there are no Muslim names on any of the passenger manifest lists for the allegedly hijacked planes does not require knowledge of physics. The fact that training pilots have testified that Hani Hanjour – the alleged hijacker pilot of American Airlines Flight 77 -- approached them several weeks prior to 9/11 and demonstrated that he could not even fly a Cessna, and, yet, two weeks later he, supposedly, could fly a commercial jet in expert fashion, does not require a knowledge of physics.

The fact that 7-8 of the alleged 9/11 hijackers have been reported by BBC television to still be alive after the events of 9/11 does not require knowledge of physics. The fact that 'Usama bin Laden released a response following 9/11 stipulating that he was not responsible for those attacks does not require a knowledge of physics.

The fact that the FBI did not consider 'Usama bin Laden to be a suspect in 9/11 because there was no evidence tying him to those events -- and made several officials announcements to this effect -- does not require a knowledge of physics. The fact NATO requires evidence that a member country has been invaded in order for military options can be pursued but the United States never gave either NATO or the Taliban government proof of what happened on 9/11 does not require knowledge of physics.

The fact that, among others, John Schroeder – a New York City fire fighter – heard and felt explosions while working his way up the stairwell of the North Tower does not require a knowledge of physics. Schroeder reported that all of a sudden:

“ ... our building got rocked ... we got bounced around in the stairwell like pinball's man, and we just said, you know what, it's time to go. We came down and it looked like a bomb went off in the lobby. Everything

was exploded ... everything was gone, like what is going on here? For every window in the lobby to be exploded, I mean them windows were like as thick as forget it. They were 2-3 inch glass. You know ... come on. They exploded out of the lobby ... you know it wasn't from the jet fuel."

The fact that Mayor Giuliani's testimony also echoed the report by the Department of Labor concerning the existence of 2,000-degree heat at Ground Zero does not require knowledge of physics for one to be able to understand that something is amiss with the official story concerning 9/11. After all, if jet fuel burns at 800-1500 degrees Fahrenheit, and if, as NIST reported, jet fuel and office furnishings were the only source of fuel, but most of this had been eliminated within a fairly short period of time (as a result of the pulverization of almost everything that transpired during the collapse of three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11), then what was the energy source that caused 2,000 degree fires to burn for months?

This is not a matter of physics. This is an issue involving logic and common sense.

Professor Chomsky appears to label all of the foregoing issues, along with many others that have to do with 9/11, as being nothing more than factoids. Factoids are ideas or statements that are repeated and mentioned so frequently that they are assumed to be facts, and, therefore, to refer to evidence cited by those who reject the "official" government theory concerning 9/11 as being factoids is to engage all such matters through a pejorative, and very biased set of, filters.

No evidence is offered by Professor Chomsky to demonstrate that he deals only in facts whereas those who reject the "official" theory deal only in factoids. Like nearly everything else -- if not everything else -- that Professor Chomsky has to say about 9/11 there is an absence of evidence to support his position.

Consequently, Professor Chomsky's manner of negatively characterizing the abilities of people concerning 9/11 is little more than idle speculation. One can't but wonder why he feels it is necessary to stoop to such tactics of denigration.

Professor Chomsky adds to his foregoing statement by claiming:



“... there is one article that has appeared in an on-line journal where someone claims to have found traces of nano-thermite in Building 7 ... I don't know what that means ... you [i.e., the person asking the question] don't know what that means ...”

While the foregoing statement of Professor Chomsky does indicate that he has knowledge, of some kind, involving an Internet article on nano-thermite, nonetheless, he, apparently, has not bothered to read that article because if he had, then he might have discovered what nano-thermite is instead of professing ignorance concerning the subject.

However, what mere awareness of the existence of an – apparently -- unread Internet article on nano-thermite does not entitle Professor Chomsky to do is to make assumptions about what the person at the University of Florida who is asking him a question knows -- or does not know -- about nano-thermite. He shouldn't presume that just because he – that is, Professor Chomsky – is too incurious to look up the meaning of a term -- say, nano-thermite – that, therefore, such people as the person who is asking him a question is also equally incurious about such matters. Like many other things that Professor Chomsky says in relation to 9/11, he tends to be quite presumptuous with respect to what he believes he knows and understands.

Professor Chomsky continues on with his response to the question that was asked of him at the University of Florida about Building 7 and 9/11, He notes:

“Whatever one thinks about Building 7 – and, frankly, I have no opinion – I don't know as much science and engineering as the people who believe that they have an answer to this ... so, I'm willing to let the professional societies determine it if they get the information ...”

Professor Chomsky has no opinion about a 47-storey steel-framed building that was not hit by an aircraft but, nevertheless, for the first time in history, collapsed due purely to fires. Professor Chomsky has no opinion about a building that individuals such as Barry Jennings reported had been rocked by explosions prior to the collapse of the

first tower. Professor Chomsky has no opinion about a building whose collapse NIST explained as a progressive collapse despite the fact that NIST also acknowledged that the building was in free-fall for more than three seconds and, therefore, exhibiting behavior that directly contradicts the notion of a progressive collapse in which each floor must crash down on the floor below in successive fashion and, as a result, provides no opportunity for freefall to occur. Professor Chomsky has no opinion about a building that fell symmetrically into its own footprint despite the fact that NIST's explanation for its collapse is asymmetrical in nature and should have led to an asymmetrical form of collapse but did not. Professor Chomsky has no opinion about the collapse of a building that NIST explains in a manner that is not capable of being reconciled with the video evidence of that building's collapse. Professor Chomsky has no opinion about how a variety of individuals (fire fighters, police officers, and news media) seemed to know prior to its collapse at 5:20 in the afternoon that Building 7 was coming down.

Apparently, Professor Chomsky, by his own admission, has no opinion about Building 7 unless that opinion is fed to him by "professional societies," and, therefore, he has basis for determining whether, or not, the story he is being fed concerning that building is true. How incurious Professor Chomsky seems to be in conjunction with Building 7.

Ironically, and rather tragically, Professor Chomsky seems to have become a cog in the mechanism of manufactured consent. He merely defers to the opinion of people whom he considers to be experts without bothering to determine whether that expert opinion is a reflection of sound evidence and impeccable reasoning, or whether it merely reflects the dictates of power.

By Professor Chomsky's own stated standards and principles, he has a responsibility to insist that truth be established. Yet, in any number of ways, he has reneged on that responsibility in the matter of 9/11.

Next, Professor Chomsky states:

“... so, whatever the facts [i.e., concerning the demise of Building 7], there is just overwhelming evidence that the Bush Administration wasn’t involved.”

One can’t help be incredulous with respect to such a statement. In other words, if the facts of Building 7’s collapse turned out to be due to, for example, the controlled demolition activities of agents appointed by members of the Bush Administration, then how could Professor Chomsky possibly try to argue that “... whatever the facts, there is overwhelming evidence that the Bush Administration wasn’t involved” since those two statements would directly contradict one another?

Leaving aside the foregoing issue, what is the nature of the “overwhelming evidence” to which Professor Chomsky is alluding and that, supposedly, demonstrates that the Bush Administration was not involved in 9/11? Actually, there is no evidence, per se, that Professor Chomsky cites in support of his contention that the Bush Administration had nothing to do with 9/11.

What he does do is advanced some speculative theories about why he believes trying to claim that the Bush Administration was involved in 9/11 makes no sense. In this regard, he cites three points that he considers to be uncontroversial and factual in nature.

First, he says that most people are agreed that the Bush Administration wanted to invade Iraq. Secondly, counter to those interests, the Bush Administration did not blame 9/11 on Iraq, the country that they wanted to invade, but, instead, they blamed 9/11 on their allies, the Saudis, and, the third uncontroversial fact according to Professor Chomsky is that:

“... unless they’re total lunatics, they would have blamed it on Iraqis if they had been involved in any way ... that would have given them open season on invading Iraq ... total support ... international support ... a U.N. resolution ... no need to concoct wild stories about weapons of mass destruction and contacts between Saddam and al-Qaeda ... no reason to invade Afghanistan which, mostly, was a waste of time for them ... But, they didn’t. Well, the conclusion is pretty straightforward

-- either they were total lunatics, or they weren't involved, and they're not total lunatics, so whatever you think about Building 7 - there are other considerations to be concerned with."

Apparently, Professor Chomsky believes he sufficiently understands all the permutations and combinations of the dynamics that underlay strategic and tactical planning to be able to restrict his "facts" to the three he cites. Nonetheless, there are other possibilities.

To begin with, if Afghanistan were really a waste of time, then, the powers that be would not still be ensconced in that country after nearly 17 years. For instance, when the Taliban government took over in Afghanistan, it began to interfere with the lucrative drug trade that was being run by, among others, certain factions of the CIA, and, therefore, various political, economic, financial, and allegedly, humanitarian arguments were introduced in order to bring about war with Afghanistan for reasons that should appear to the public to be about something other than promoting the drug trade, and 9/11 was a perfect excuse in this respect.

Secondly, the Patriot Act already had been written prior to 9/11. Consequently, 9/11 provided great cover for implementing a draconian set of provisions upon the American people that would enable those in power to do pretty much whatever they felt like doing ... including war, rendition, torture, and Guantanamo.

Thirdly, contrary to the foregoing comment of Professor Chomsky, Afghanistan has never been a waste of time for the military-industrial complex. Afghanistan is one of many geese that are laying golden eggs for the profiteers of the military-industrial complex, and that complex tends to pull the strings of government administrations - irrespective of whether this is done in conjunction with Bush, Obama, or other presidential administrations.

Fourthly, 9/11 helped jump-start the whole "war on terror" meme, together with the many ramifications that ensue from that meme. Invading Iraq might have been on the agenda of the Bush Administration, but the war on terror was, and is, larger than Iraq and was used, and continues to be used, to justify an array of policies and activities beyond Iraq such as: Homeland Security; the TSA

(Transportation Security Administration, NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) legislation, as well as wars in Libya, Syria, Yemen, and in whatever other countries the United States decides it wishes to exercise hegemony over.

Fifthly, although members of the Bush Administration identified an amalgam of Saudis, Egyptians, and Yemenis as being the perpetrators of 9/11 -- rather than Iraqi citizens -- those identified individuals were considered to be acting on behalf of al-Qaeda rather than the Saudi government. In this way one can both keep the oil coming and the war on terror going.

Soon, one began to hear about al-Qaeda in Iraq, and al-Qaeda in Syria, and al-Qaeda in Libya, and so on. One easily can charge people with being members of al-Qaeda, and as such, terrorists can be fashioned out of thin air wherever there is a need for them.

The Machiavellian machinations that were taking place within the Bush Administration went way beyond Iraq. The ramifications of 9/11 went way beyond Iraq.

Thus, for Professor Chomsky to try to argue that the Bush Administration wasn't involved in 9/11 because that event didn't provide it with a pretext for invading Iraq constitutes a rather excessively narrow characterization of some of the policy dynamics that were present in the Bush Administration and that could have served as alternative motivations for bringing about the events of 9/11. Many objectives besides invading Iraq were on the Bush Administration's list of things to accomplish.

Consequently, the "facts" that Professor Chomsky cites as constituting "overwhelming evidence" that the Bush Administration was not involved in 9/11 completely fail to exonerate the members of the Bush Administration. One could concede, without controversy, that the Bush Administration wanted to go into Iraq, and one can acknowledge as true the fact that the Bush Administration identified mostly Saudis as perpetrators of 9/11 rather than individuals from Iraq, and one can admit that unless the Bush Administration consisted of lunatics -- which it didn't -- then, the Bush Administration should have implicated the Iraqis in 9/11 rather than Saudis. Nonetheless, despite conceding all of the foregoing facts as being uncontroversial, the conclusion that Professor Chomsky draws -- namely, that the Bush

Administration was not involved in the perpetration of 9/11 – does not necessarily follow from the stated premises because Professor Chomsky has failed to take into consideration an array of alternative motivations – some of which have been mentioned earlier -- for wanting to bring 9/11 about and, as such, could have served a plethora of ambitions that the Bush Administration had for America and the rest of the world.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, one still might argue that although the Bush Administration, per se, was not involved in the perpetration of 9/11, it was, for unknown reasons, neck-deep in the attempt to cover up the nature of that crime. After all, among others, the Bush Administration failed to secure the World Trade Center and the Pentagon as crime scenes and, thereby, ensure that there would be a proper chain of custody in relation to the gathering of all evidence concerning 9/11.

Furthermore, the Bush Administration continuously resisted the idea of investigating 9/11, and it was the Bush Administration that, after succumbing to public pressure to form an official commission for the investigation of 9/11, made sure that the commission was underfunded as well as was provided with too little time, resources, and power to accomplish a truly thorough investigation. In addition, the Bush Administration was responsible for appointing NIST to study the destruction at the World Trade Center and was also responsible for not exercising due diligence with respect to the activities of NIST, and, similarly, the Bush Administration is responsible for the fraudulent activities associated with the *Building Performance Report* that was written in conjunction with events at the Pentagon on 9/11. It is the Bush Administration – via way of the FBI – that confiscated all public and private video recordings of the events at the Pentagon on 9/11 and chose not to disclose the contents of those videos to the public.

Moreover, to suggest that the Bush Administration might not have been directly responsible for the events of 9/11 does not mean that other facets of government – such as various members of the intelligence community, the military, the FAA, and/or the Senior Executive Service working in conjunction with any number of defense contractors – couldn't have played primary roles in the perpetration of

9/11. All of the foregoing dimensions of government benefitted from the opportunities that 9/11 set in motion, and, as a result, 9/11 served an array of purposes for a number of different facets of government that could have constituted motivations for wanting to bring about – directly or indirectly – the events of 9/11.

When Canadian Barry Zwicker interviewed Noam Chomsky on November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2002, the topic of 9/11 came up and Professor Chomsky’s reply was: “Look, this is just conspiracy theory.” Yet, in a 2002 book: *Understanding Power: The Indispensable Chomsky*, edited by Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel, Chomsky is quoted as saying:

“... conspiracy theory has become the intellectual equivalent of a four-letter word. It’s something people say when they don’t want you to think about what’s really going on.”

So, given the foregoing assertion, the fact that Professor Chomsky told Barry Zwicker in 2002 that 9/11 is “just conspiracy theory”, would seem to suggest that, for some unknown reason, Professor Chomsky doesn’t want people to think about 9/11 because he, himself, uses the very term – namely, “conspiracy theory” whose purpose he reported in 2002 was intended to induce people not to think about “what’s actually going on.”

Like Sam Harris, the vast majority of statements that Noam Chomsky makes about 9/11 are devoid of substantive content that is based on actual evidence concerning the events of that day. Instead, they both like to label anyone who rejects the “official” story concerning 9/11 – i.e., that 19 Arab hijackers conspired with ‘Usama bin Laden to hijack four aircraft and use those planes as weapons to in order to attack the United States on that day – as being “conspiracy theorists” or “conspiracy thinkers”, and in doing so – each in his own way -- attempt to actively discourage other individuals from engaging the issues of 9/11 in a rigorous and critical fashion.

As a result, those two individuals cannot be considered to be honest brokers of truth when it comes to the issue of 9/11. In other words, the efforts of such people to acquire insight into the nature of some aspect of existence (e.g., 9/11) is not necessarily rooted in a

rigorous process that is transparent, open, unintended to evade difficult problems, or mislead and distort (through commission or omission) with respect to relevant issues, as well as be critically and fairly responsive to evidence, and as such, both Dr. Harris and Professor Chomsky appear to exhibit signs of willful blindness (see page 14) with respect to the manner in which they engage the issues of 9/11.

Both individuals have made quite a few statements concerning 9/11 which indicate that despite the fact some people might refer to them as scientists, nonetheless, as has been discussed throughout nearly two-thirds of the present work, their respective pronouncements about 9/11 give expression to a totally unscientific way of dealing with that subject ... that is, when it comes to the issue of 9/11, they seem to lack objectivity, diligence, rigor, judiciousness, insight, discernment, or openness in such matters and, as a result, their judgment concerning those issues do not appear to be reliable.

I do not care to speculate about why they carry on as they do with respect to 9/11. I only know that I do not trust what they have to say in relation to either 9/11 or any matter that is affected by the ramifications of 9/11. Consequently, I do not consider them to be objective, honest brokers of truth concerning the matter of 9/11, and I believe there is an abundance of evidence to back up such considerations (some of which has been presented in the present work).

Instead, I believe they are both guilty of exhibiting an array of active symptoms indicating that each suffers from what might be severe, and possibly, untreatable cases of willful blindness with respect to the events of 9/11. More specifically, given that neither Dr. Harris nor Professor Chomsky are stupid people – indeed, they are quite intelligent, although, clearly, Professor Chomsky is the more intellectually gifted of the two individuals – nonetheless, each in his own way, as well as in overlapping ways, could have known and should have known an array of fundamental facts concerning the events of 9/11 but, unfortunately, the two individuals appear to have chosen to evade, ignore, and discount those facts in a way that appears to have induced millions of other individuals (followers, if you will, of those two individuals) to have become equally alienated from serving



as objective, honest brokers of the truth concerning 9/11 and, in the process, those millions of individuals also – like their leaders -- have succumbed to the ravages of willful blindness in matters pertaining to, among other things, 9/11.

Professor Chomsky, in particular, has left a trail of evidential crumbs indicating that his stance on 9/11 fundamentally betrays a variety of his own clearly stated values and principles. For example, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of his 1967 essay, ‘The Responsibility of Intellectuals,’ Professor Chomsky states:

“Intellectuals are in a position to expose the lies of governments, to analyze actions according to their causes and motives and often hidden intentions. ... For a privileged minority, Western democracy provides the leisure, the facilities, and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation, ideology, and class interest, through which the events of history are presented to us.”

Certainly, Professor Chomsky was in a position to expose the lies of government concerning 9/11, but, for whatever reason, he chose not to do so. Furthermore, Professor Chomsky was among the privileged minority who had “the leisure, facilities, and training to seek the truth lying behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation” that was used by the government, academia, and the media, to problematically frame and filter the events of 9/11, to propagandize and indoctrinate the American people, and, yet, Professor Chomsky turned his back on such privilege, facilities, and training and, instead, appears to have taken a variety of active steps (both in some his books and in some of his public lectures) to help facilitate the process of distortion and misrepresentation being perpetrated by the government and media with respect to the events of 9/11.

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of ‘The Responsibility of Intellectuals’ he maintains:

“It is the responsibility of intellectuals to speak the truth and to expose lies”

He, then, proceeds to describe some historical events (e.g., Martin Heidegger's pro-Hitler comments and Arthur Schlesinger's claims that the American sponsored invasion of Cuba was "nothing of the sort") that exemplify how intellectuals betray their responsibility to the truth, but, nevertheless, Professor Chomsky seems entirely oblivious to the manner in which he, himself, has betrayed his responsibility to truth in the matter of 9/11.

Later in "The Responsibility of Intellectuals" Professor Chomsky observes:

"A good case can be made for the conclusion that there is indeed something of a consensus among intellectuals who have already achieved power and influence, or who sense that they can achieve them by 'accepting society' as it is and promoting the values that are 'being honored' in this society."

Quite ironically, in the matter of 9/11, Professor Chomsky now appears to be part of a consensus among many intellectuals "who already have achieved power and influence" and who have accepted the way in which social institutions involving government, media, education, and corporations have framed the issue of 9/11 and, as a result, he appears to continue to perpetuate the values (i.e., lies, distortions, deceptions, manipulations, and disinformation) concerning 9/11 "that are 'being honored' in this society by such institutions ... the very sort of activities toward which he was so critical in 'The Responsibility of Intellectuals' essay.

In the final paragraph of the foregoing essay, Professor Chomsky brings his commentary to a close with the following remarks:

"Let me finally return to Dwight Macdonald and the responsibility of intellectuals. Macdonald quotes an interview with a death-camp paymaster who burst into tears when told that the Russians would hang him. "Why should they? What have I done?" he asked. Macdonald

concludes: "Only those who are willing to resist authority themselves when it conflicts too intolerably with their personal moral code, only they have the right to condemn the death-camp paymaster." The question, "What have I done?" is one that we will ask ourselves, as we read each day of fresh atrocities in ... " --

not just Vietnam -- but, more currently, Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Palestine, and the United States. What has Professor Chomsky done with respect to 9/11 except, apparently, to be unwilling to resist the siren call of authority concerning that issue despite the fact that such power structures conflict intolerably with his often stated personal moral code concerning the responsibility that intellectuals have to insist on seeking and establishing the truth in all matters ... including, presumably, 9/11, and, as a result, according to his own stated values, he would appear to have lost his right to condemn the government for what he believes it has, or hasn't done, with respect to the issue of 9/11.

In the film *Manufacturing Consent: Noam Chomsky and the Media* by Mark Achbar & Peter Wintonick there is an interchange between William Buckley and Professor Chomsky that runs along the following lines:

First, Buckley refers to Professor Chomsky's book *American Power and the New Mandarins* and says:

"You say the war {i.e., Vietnam} is simply an obscenity, a depraved act by weak and miserable men."

Chomsky: "Including all of us ... including myself. ... That's the next sentence."

There are a few more comments exchanged between the two men, and, then, Buckley continues on with:

"You count everybody in the company of the guilty."

Chomsky: "I think that's true in this case."

And, then Professor Chomsky clarifies his perspective by saying:

“I think the point I’m trying to make, and ought to be made, is that the real ... at least to me and I say this elsewhere in the book [*American Power and the New Mandarins*] that what seems to be, in a sense, a very terrifying aspect of our society, and other societies, is the equanimity and detachment with which sane, reasonable, sensible people can observe such events ... I think that’s more terrifying than the occasional Hitler, or Lemay, or other that crop up ... these people would not be able to operate if not for this apathy and equanimity ... and, therefore, I think it’s in some sense the sane and reasonable and tolerant people who share a very serious burden of guilt that they very easily throw on the shoulders of others who seem more extreme and more violent.”

Professor Chomsky’s concerns with respect to the Vietnam War would seem to be resurfacing in the case of 9/11. More specifically, when one reflects on various comments that Professor Chomsky has made about such events, his words often seem to be remarks of equanimity and detachment in which, apparently, among other things, it doesn’t matter whether Muslims did, or did, not attack the United States on 9/11 just as, according to Professor Chomsky, the topic of who killed JFK doesn’t matter.

Professor Chomsky says things in such a “sane, reasonable and tolerant” way and, then, seeks to “throw on the shoulders of others who seem more extreme and more violent” (such as successive political administrations in the United States) a burden of guilt, when, there is a very real and terrifying sense in which the kind of indifference to, detachment from, an apathy toward the truth of things that seem to be exhibited by Professor Chomsky in his comments concerning 9/11 indicate that, perhaps, some of that assigned guilt ought to be shared by those – who through their sanity, reasonableness, tolerance, sensibility, equanimity, and apathy (as appears to be the case with respect to Professor Chomsky) – have helped to perpetuate the obscenities that ensued from 9/11.

If Professor Chomsky feels comfortable with referring to the response of people concerning the obscenities of the Vietnam War as being that of “weak and miserable” individuals who have become

entangled in their own web of equanimity, sanity, reasonableness, detachment, and apathy, then surely, those individuals – as seems to be the case with Professor Chomsky – who tend to engage the events of 9/11 with equanimity, detachment, reasonableness, and apathy would also deserve to be included among the referents to whom his phrase “weak and miserable” might appropriately be applied.

Furthermore, one is dismayed to discover the ways in which Professor Chomsky has been perpetrating his own form of manufacturing consent in conjunction with 9/11 since, for so many decades, he has been warning his reading and viewing audiences about the ways in which processes of manufactured consent are used by the power elite to deprive people of what Walter Lippmann referred to in *Public Opinion* as: “The means to detect lies” (that is, the capacity to think critically and independently). Yet, Professor Chomsky appears to be deeply entangled in a process of manufacturing consent that seeks to induce his audience to defer to the opinion of professional scientists concerning the matter of 9/11 and insists that those people who feel they have discovered something important about 9/11 should go to the institutions of power – the media, academia, professional journals – and seek their assistance to help address the issue of 9/11.

According to Professor Chomsky, people need to acquire the ability to detect illegitimate modes of control concerning the nature and flow of information so that those processes can be challenged and resisted. Unfortunately, his stance on 9/11 constitutes a major obstacle in relation to those who hang on his every word and, as a result, are prevented – as well as prevent themselves – from being able to challenge and resist propaganda concerning 9/11 ... propaganda that interferes with being able to access the truth about what transpired on 9/11.

Professor Chomsky maintains that the power elite have hegemony – or control -- over social and cultural institutions and use that control to distract, manipulate, misinform, marginalize, and unduly influence ordinary people through the propagation of various kinds of Necessary Illusions or frameworks of propaganda concerning the alleged nature of the society in which we live. Necessary Illusions are the myths and narratives that are fed to the populace in order to induce them to

believe that certain things are true when this is not the case, but the consumption of such illusions is necessary in order for the power elite to be able to maintain its control over the people.

Necessary Illusions are meant to manipulate or deceive, and, unfortunately, this is what Chomsky seems to have done, and apparently continues to do, in relation to his comments and perspective concerning 9/11. For example, he puts forth one necessary illusion – namely, that Muslim’s are responsible for the atrocities of 9/11 – and, then, he puts forth another necessary illusion – namely, that we can overcome our current political problems by ignoring evidence concerning 9/11 – and, as a result, the possibility of substantial change seems to recede from the collective grasp of many people who follow Professor Chomsky because the element of truth has been removed from their presence in the case of 9/11.

Near the conclusion of *Manufacturing Consent*, Professor Chomsky says:

“The question, in brief, is whether democracy and freedom are values to be preserved or threats to be avoided. In this possibly terminal phase of human existence, democracy and freedom are more than values to be treasured; they might be essential to survival.”

I think Professor Chomsky is focusing on the wrong issues ... we should be focusing on the principles of sovereignty (instead of on democracy) and we should be focusing on the duties of care that are entailed by those principles of sovereignty (rather than on freedom per se). Furthermore, one of those duties of care is to serve as honest, objective brokers of truth concerning different facets of existence (such as 9/11).

Apparently, Professor Chomsky – who has been a long-standing proponent of a ideological system that weaves together strands of democracy, socialism, libertarianism, anarchy, and syndicalism, (i.e., an idea centered around the transfer of property, means of production, as well as the means of distribution to labor unions) – fails to realize that there might be something more fundamental than democracy, socialism, libertarianism, anarchy, and syndicalism. As indicated in the

previous paragraph, this something more is encompassed by the idea of sovereignty (For those who would like to explore the notion of sovereignty further, please refer to my works: (1) *The Unfinished Revolution: The Battle For America's Soul*; (2) *Final Jeopardy: Sovereignty and the Reality Problem, Volume V*, and (3) *Democracy Lost and Regained*).

Professor Chomsky believes that in order to overcome the Propaganda Model that the power elite use to convey various Necessary Illusions to the citizens in an attempt to induce the latter group of people to become compliant with the way of power, citizens must take two crucial actions. First, citizens should seek information from alternative media rather than from sources that are firmly ensconced in the operations of the propaganda mill that serves the interests of the power elite, and, secondly, citizens need to become involved in grassroots community action through which they work, in concert with one another, toward establishing some sort of libertarian-socialist-syndicalist-anarchist political and economic system through which to realize, at least in part, the inherent potential for creativity that Professor Chomsky believes people, in general, possess.

However, media literacy involves something more than just seeking out alternative media sources. Media literacy is about developing a capacity to be independent with respect to the process of critically reflecting on all media options ... including the alternative media.

In short, one must do one's own research. In addition, one is responsible for exercising due diligence and, therefore, engaging in a process of critical reflection concerning such information irrespective of its source.

In my opinion, Professor Chomsky fails his followers in an essential way in conjunction with the foregoing issue. More specifically, Professor Chomsky is supposedly interested in helping people to become disengaged from systems of propaganda and, as a result, develop independence of thought. Yet, Professor Chomsky seems to have abdicated his responsibility to assist many, if any, of his followers, to develop the sort of intellectual independence that would enable those individuals to be able to identify and challenge Professor

Chomsky's own system for generating propaganda and manufacturing consent concerning the events of 9/11.

By failing to exercise due diligence with respect to the events of 9/11, Professor Chomsky would seem to have denied his followers the very thing they might need – i.e., the truth -- to serve as a seed from which grassroots community action could grow, and, as a result, he sabotages his own proposal for how to overcome the Propaganda Model of the prevailing power elite. Instead, Professor Chomsky appears to have offered his followers little more than several Necessary Illusions (e.g., that 19 Arabs perpetrated the atrocities of 9/11 and that the truth doesn't matter when it comes to 9/11) that appear to be designed to establish and maintain his own ideological hegemony or control over the conversation concerning our collective futures.

As previously noted, Professor Chomsky claims toward the end of *Manufacturing Consent* that: "Democracy and freedom are more than values to be treasured; they might be essential to survival." Nonetheless, a value that is to be treasured even more than democracy and freedom, and, as well, a value that is even more essential to our survival than democracy and freedom is the truth ... the very value that Professor Chomsky seems to want to jettison when it comes to the issue of 9/11.

Without truth, neither democracy nor freedom is possible. Without truth, survival becomes corrupt.

Professor Chomsky could have known the foregoing reality and should have known it, but, apparently, chose to ignore its importance in conjunction with the issue of 9/11, and, as a result, his reasoning process seems to have been captured by forces of willful blindness concerning that topic. The tragedy of Professor Chomsky is that he appears to believe that by proceeding as he does – i.e., in active denial of the actual nature of 9/11 – he is furthering his political agenda through persuading people not to be distracted by various truths concerning 9/11, but, in actuality, such an ideological stance merely undermines, corrupts, and delegitimizes the political and economic project he has been actively trying to promote for more than fifty years.



### **16.) Methodical Illusions and Deceptions**

Rebekah Roth is the nom de plume for an individual who had been a flight attendant for more than thirty years. She called upon the knowledge and expertise she had garnered from all those years in the aviation industry to serve as a resource for acquiring, and, then, sharing, insight into various aspects of 9/11.

More specifically, over a period of several years – with research beginning somewhere around 2007 – she began to write the first volume of the *Methodical* trilogy (*Methodical Illusions*, *Methodical Deception*, and *Methodical Conclusion*). The trilogy is a fictionalized story that is utilized as a method for introducing readers to an array of facts and ideas concerning the events of 9/11.

Once written, the manuscript gathered dust on a shelf for several years while she tried to figure out how to proceed. At some point a few years later, as another 9/11 anniversary approached, she had a two-hour conversation with a retired New York City firefighter.

During the ensuing conversation, the person with whom she was speaking indicated how many of the bodies of the more than 300 firefighters that had been recovered from the World Trade Center had been almost completely disintegrated. To degrade the human body to that degree requires a great deal of heat and pressure -- much more than could be generated by the sort of fires that, according to the official story, occurred at the World Trade Center on 9/11 – and, such information, along with other facets of the foregoing conversation, induced Rebekah Roth to try to find a way to publish her already completed manuscript.

Some people have objected to the fictional format in which Rebekah Roth embedded the 9/11 information. However, she went about things in the literary manner she did – and quite legitimately I believe -- in an attempt to engage readers in a way that many people might find more amenable to their style of thinking about various issues and, perhaps, as a result, her readers found the relevant data somewhat less intimidating than might have been the case if she had written some didactic exposition encompassing the events of 9/11..

Jean Paul Sartre, a French philosopher of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, once indicated that he felt novels, plays, short stories, and the like had a

potential for exploring existential issues in a way that might be difficult to convey through a non-fictional format. Consequently, Rebekah Roth's *Methodical* trilogy is not without its justification for assuming the form it does.

Other people seem to have taken exception with the fact that Rebekah Roth's efforts have been commercially successful ... as if there were some unwritten rule of the universe that stipulated how commercial success and searching for the truth were inherently incompatible with one another. I, for one, am happy about her success because that success means a lot of people who might not otherwise have begun to think critically about the issues of 9/11 have started to do so as a result of reading the *Methodical* trilogy.

Although I had been seeing references, now and again, to the work of Rebekah Roth for a couple of years, I was busy with other projects and, therefore, was unable to begin to investigate her research until a few months ago. However, during the month of Ramadan, I took the time to read the *Methodical* trilogy, as well as to listen to and view a half dozen, or so, presentations and interviews that she had done in conjunction with those books.

Reading fictional stories and engaging information about 9/11 might not seem very spiritual in character. Nonetheless, I believe that seeking the truth is always an exercise in spirituality.

The following material does not exhaust what Rebekah Roth has to offer and is only intended to serve as a very brief overview of, or introduction to, her research. Therefore, for those who have not already done so, I would urge readers of the present chapter to go to any of Rebekah Roth's websites and/or read her trilogy in order to get a fuller, more detailed account of her understanding of 9/11.

Before purchasing her trilogy series, and as indicated earlier, I listened to, and watched, a number of presentations and interviews she did. The first recording to which I listened started off with a bang.

Toward the beginning of the that presentation, Rebekah Roth indicated how, based on Freedom of Information requests (she has over a terabyte of such information now), she was able to access, among other things, an mp3 recording that had been uploaded to the FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. on 9/11. The recording featured

the voice of Mohammed Atta – one of the supposed leaders of the 19 Arabs who, allegedly, hijacked planes on 9/11 and flew those craft into three high-profile targets in America.

The aforementioned recorded voice had an Israeli accent, and Mohammed Atta's parents – who, following 9/11, had been interviewed by a journalist from Britain -- indicated during the interview that not only did their son work for Mossad (the Israeli national intelligence agency) but, as well, the parents related that they had spoken to him following 9/11 (on the 12<sup>th</sup> of September) and, therefore, despite the alleged demise of Flight 11 on 9/11, its supposed hijack pilot – Mohammed Atta – was still alive ... at least at that time. The words Mohammed Atta allegedly spoke on the mp3 being referenced above were: "We have some planes. We're going back to the airport."

One of the intriguing aspects of the foregoing mp3 recording is that according to the meta-data associated with the recording, the short statement was uploaded to FAA headquarters at 6:27 a.m. on the morning of September 11, 2001. This was approximately an hour prior to the time when American Airlines Flight 11 was slated to push back from the terminal and begin to taxi toward its appointment with 'wheels up'.

Another interesting aspect of the foregoing recording is that the FAA had the material copyrighted. Why someone at the FAA would pursue such a course of action raises a lot of issues that deserve answers ... especially given that the recording obviously had been put together in a place and at a time that was well-before any alleged hijacking of Flight 11 had taken place.

Prior to becoming the first woman administrator for the FAA in 1997 (her term ended in 2002), Jane Garvey had been the director of Boston's Logan Airport. As the director of Logan, she would have known that her facility – along with many others -- was subjected to a yearly review process by the FAA so that the operation could be endorsed as a certified airport, and, consequently, she likely would have known, based on her personal experience at Logan, that the airport had not, yet, installed security cameras.

Among other things, this meant there was no video footage at Logan that was capable of identifying the hijackers who, supposedly,

boarded Flights 11 and 175 at that airport on the morning of September 11, 2001. Since nearly half of the alleged hijackers supposedly went through Logan on 9/11 and despite the fact that, within 72 hours of the hijackings, the FBI had released photos and names revealing the alleged identity of the hijackers, nonetheless, there were at least 9 of the 19 hijackers whose identity could not possibly have been known by the FBI in any factual manner ... especially in light of the fact that the names of the so-called hijackers did not appear on any of the original (unaltered) passenger manifests for Flights 11 and 175.

In the aforementioned presentation, Rebekah Roth informs her viewing audience that after the first book in her *Methodical* trilogy had been published, many flight attendants got in touch with her to let her know that Mohammed Atta was a million-mile passenger. Aside from being recognized by, and known to (including one's name), all of the regular flight attendants for American Airlines, one of the perks associated with being a million-mile passenger was that regardless of circumstances (such as showing up at Logan airport at the last minute as, supposedly, Mohammed Atta did on the morning of 9/11 -- due to an alleged side-trip to Portland, Maine), the luggage of a million-mile passenger would never be left off a flight as occurred in the case of Mohammed Atta.

In other words, the implication of Rebekah Roth's foregoing point is that the luggage of Mohammed Atta's that, after 9/11, was uncovered at Logan airport was meant to be found. She considers the luggage to be a plant that had been intended to implicate Mohammed Atta as an active participant in the events of 9/11 ... much as the slightly-worse-for-wear passport for Mohammed Atta that was later "found" on a street near the destroyed World Trade Center in New York seems to have been a plant.

Moreover, three of the individuals who were identified by the FBI as having been aboard the hijacked Flight 11 on 9/11 - including someone who was working in Florida as a flight instructor -- later turned out to be alive and kicking elsewhere in the world . This is a rather remarkable fact given that those individuals supposedly had died when their plane allegedly crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center on 9/11, while a fourth, alleged hijacker identified

by the FBI as having been on Flight 11 was discovered to have died in a small plane crash precisely one year prior to 9/11.

The FBI was batting 0 for 5 in relation to establishing the identity of alleged hijackers on Flight 11. Yet, the FBI never changed its stance concerning who it considered responsible for hijacking Flight 11 or it considered responsible for any of the other alleged hijacked flights that supposedly took place on that day despite the fact that its information concerning the alleged identity of individuals purportedly involved in the latter hijackings also suffered from the same sort of reliability issues as did the information concerning the alleged hijackers of Flight 11.

Rebekah Roth spends a great deal of time in the various presentations and interviews that I watched going over the details of the statements and actions of various flight attendants who, supposedly, made calls from their respective airplanes while flying at altitude on 9/11. Because she had been a flight attendant for more than three decades, Rebekah Roth was very familiar with the FAA protocols and training that form the woof and warp of a flight attendant's professional life, and, one of the many things that bothered her about the events of 9/11, is that although the media were describing the flight attendants as heroes and heroines, the fact of the matter was that none of the flight attendants who had been recorded on 9/11 were operating in accordance with the FAA protocols for hijackings, nor were they behaving in a way that reflected what their professional training should have inclined them to be doing.

To say that something peculiar was going on in conjunction with the comportment of flight attendants in relation to Flights 11, 175, and 93 on 9/11 would be a gross understatement (there are no recordings involving flight attendants on Flight 77). However, as will be pointed out shortly, Rebekah Roth began to look more closely at such behavior, and this became one of the keys that helped her grasp what might have taken place on the morning of 9/11.

Another red flag concerning the official account of 9/11 that surfaced for Rebekah Roth during her research involved the 302 witness statements that had been taken by the FBI in conjunction with various aspects of that day's events. Among other things, she

discovered information had been removed and/or altered in relation to a number of 9/11-related 302s.

Rebekah Roth first began to dig into anomalies concerning various FBI 302 statements in conjunction with the Zacharias Moussaoui trial that had taken place a few years earlier. She discovered that a number of those reports had been altered after the fact, and she began to find similar sorts of anomalies in relation to the FBI's 302 statements involving certain aspects of the alleged events of 9/11.

For example, Betty Ong was a flight attendant on American Airlines Flight 11. The FBI had statements concerning phone calls that, allegedly, she had made while flying above 2,000 feet, and Rebekah Roth found evidence indicating that different aspects of those statements subsequently had been altered by the FBI.

According to some of the statements being alluded to, Betty Ong had been using an air phone that was located near the jump seat she said she was occupying at 3-right (which is situated toward the rear of the airplane). The only problem with the foregoing claim is that Rebekah Roth stipulates that all such air phones had been de-activated by American Airlines as of January 31, 2001 ... more than seven months prior to September 11, 2001.

In addition, Betty Ong couldn't possibly have made the foregoing phone calls using a cell phone at altitudes approaching 20,000 feet or above – which is where she would have been at the times her recorded calls supposedly were made on the morning of 9/11. So, whether one is talking about air phones or cell phones, Betty Ong couldn't have made phone calls while aloft on American Airlines Flight 11, yet, Rebekah Roth found that a number of the FBI's 302 statements for 9/11 indicated how various aspects of the conversations that supposedly came from the four hijacked planes were being altered after the fact ... something that, theoretically at least, should not be happening in conjunction with those kinds of statements.

Similarly, irrespective of the multiplicity of conflicting versions given by Ted Olson -- he was Solicitor General for the United States at the time – concerning the events that took place on the morning of 9/11, nonetheless, his wife, Barbara Olson – who, supposedly, was a passenger on American Airlines 77 that allegedly hit the Pentagon on 9/11 – could not have phoned him by means of an on-board air phone.

As indicated previously, those phones had been de-activated by American Airlines some seven months earlier.

Moreover, Barbara Olson could not have called her husband via cell phone either. The calls she supposedly made would have had to have occurred when she was above 2,000 feet, and, therefore, in light of the cell phone technology that was available in 2001, Barbara Olson would not have been able to contact her husband from altitude.

Calls, of one kind or another – some by flight attendants and some by passengers -- were allegedly made from all four of the hijacked planes on 9/11. For a variety of reasons -- which Rebekah Roth explores at length during various presentations and interviews she has given -- the available evidence seems to indicate that all those calls could not have been made while any of the, allegedly, hijacked airplanes were in the air but, were likely made, while at some location on the ground.

Rebekah Roth used the information (involving, for instance, the times and length of phone calls) that she obtained through FOI requests – either her own or those of others – to begin to piece together a picture of what might have happened on the morning of 9/11. For example, by combining information concerning the timing of all of the foregoing calls and juxtaposing that data with other FOI information she obtained concerning Flights 11, 175, 77, and 93, she was able to deduce that all four flights could have been taken – without being detected by radar -- to Westover Air Force Base in western Massachusetts (the location from which Rebekah Roth believes the various calls from the ‘hijacked’ planes were actually made) since that base was the only candidate – within the requisite flight distance for all four “hijacked” planes -- that had the necessary minimum length runway (10,000 feet) to land large commercial jet planes and, in addition, possessed hangers that were sufficiently large to be able to hide four commercial jets since the hangers at Westover Air Force base normally were used to house C-5 military transports that are much larger than commercial jets.

Aside from the fact that the times of the alleged phone calls were consistent with the idea that all four planes could have been diverted to Westover Air Force Base within the temporal and logistical parameters that were fixed by an array of events on the morning of

9/11, there were four other pieces of information that are consistent with, or relevant to, Rebekah Roth's identification of Westover Air Force Base as being the likely destination for the four hijacked flights of 9/11. To begin with, since the release of the first two installments of the *Methodical* trilogy, Rebekah Roth indicates that independently of one another, several individuals have come forward in western Massachusetts and reported that on the morning of 9/11 they observed a large commercial jet that flew so low to the ground near Westover Air Force Base that the individuals thought the planes were going to crash.

In each case the planes being identified seemed to be different from one another (i.e., the two individuals did not appear to be talking about the same plane). The planes to which the individuals were referring also appeared to fit the description of American Airlines Flight 11 and United Airlines Flight 175.

In addition to the foregoing eye-witness accounts, Rebekah Roth also heard from members of the Massachusetts National Guard following the publication of *Methodical Illusions*. Those individuals reported for duty at Westover Air Force Base on the morning of 9/11 in response to the events of that morning.

However, those individuals were not permitted to enter Westover Air Force Base. Instead, without any explanation being given, they were billeted in local hotels for a number of days.

Thirdly, Rebekah Roth relates an incident in which she was contacted by the son of one of the flight attendants who, supposedly, died on 9/11. According to the young man – who was just a young boy in 2001 – his father took him on a drive prior to 9/11 and told his son that he (i.e., the father) was going to take the job that had been offered to him by the CIA ... a possibility about which his child previously had been informed by his father.

The father went on to tell the boy that when he (the father) took the job, he would never be able to see his son again. Rebekah Roth claims that this sort of scenario is only likely if a person's death were going to be faked at some point in the future.

Apropos of the foregoing information, Rebekah Roth indicates that following the publication of *Methodical Conclusion* (3<sup>rd</sup> book in the



trilogy), she was contacted by a variety of flight attendants indicating that being recruited by the CIA was a fairly common occurrence among flight attendants and other aviation personnel. Apparently, the CIA liked airline employees because the jobs of the latter individuals not only offered a great cover for off-book assignments but, in addition, flight attendants often had schedules containing a lot of free time during which the flight attendants would be able to carry out CIA assignments.

Prior to being contacted by the son of one of the flight attendants that, supposedly, had died on 9/11, Rebekah Roth had not been willing to entertain the possibility that individuals employed by the airlines industry might be willing participants in the perpetration of a deception of the American people. Nevertheless, her contact with the son of a flight attendant who had told her about the conversation he had with his flight attendant father prior to 9/11 helped her to overcome her resistance to, and cognitive dissonance toward, the idea that airline employees might be willing to betray their fiduciary responsibilities to the airline company for which they worked as well as be willing to betray their duties of care involving passengers.

The foregoing anecdote involving a boy whose flight attendant father appears to have taken a job with the CIA prior to 9/11 and, as a result, seemed to know that he (i.e., the father) was going to have to disappear – and, then, actually did disappear (all four “hijacked” planes supposedly disintegrated on 9/11, leaving no trace behind) -- does not directly link with the Westover Air Force Base. Nonetheless, it does provide evidence suggesting that people within the airline industry might have been willing to participate in a CIA operation that had something to do with their jobs as flight attendants and, therefore, had something to do with the “hijacking” incidents that took place on 9/11.

Finally, it turns out that, apparently, the sheriff for the county that surrounds the northern, northwestern, and western borders of Westover Air Force Base was married to someone whose name we have heard previously. More specifically, the sheriff for the foregoing areas in Western Massachusetts on 9/11 that are of potential interest to Rebekah Roth’s investigation was reported to have been married to

Jane Garvey, who -- on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 -- was administrator for the FAA.

Of course, the foregoing might be apropos of nothing. On the other hand, such information might be worthy of a thorough investigation in order to determine whether there is something more to such connections than coincidence.

The FAA also is connected to another set of anomalous events on 9/11 that makes Rebekah Roth's "spidey-sense" tingle. This involves Delta Flight 1989.

As the foregoing flight -- which was heading to Los Angeles -- is approaching Cleveland on the morning of 9/11, the FAA contacts the captain of the plane and informs him that not only does he have a hijacker on board but there is also a bomb present on the craft. Rebekah Roth has recordings and transcripts of the Captain's conversation with the FAA concerning the foregoing set of events, and the Captain is reported as saying to FAA officials: "We're not having a hijacking, we're having breakfast ... the flight attendants are serving breakfast ... there's nothing going on."

However, the FAA officials in Washington, D.C. continue to insist that there is a hijacker and bomb on board of Flight 1989. The Captain is ordered to land the plane in Cleveland ... which he does.

Rebekah Roth indicates that the foregoing sequence of events is not the way things take place. Officials from FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. would never contact the captain of a commercial flight and inform him or her about a hijacking that is supposedly going on in the captain's plane.

Flight attendants are the first individuals to know about a hijacking that is taking place on a commercial airline. They inform officers in the cockpit, and, the officers relay that information to flight controllers on the ground, and, then, that information is passed on to other FAA officials, and, eventually, after going through a couple of dozen steps, such information finds its way to FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Upon investigating further, Rebekah Roth discovered that Delta Flight 1989 was listed as having crashed on 9/11. However, the plane

wasn't involved in any kind of accident on that day but, instead, landed safely in Cleveland.

Nonetheless, the foregoing incident could be linked to another reported accident on 9/11 that also never occurred. More specifically, around 10:20 or 10:30 a.m. that morning, a purported member of the Secret Service supposedly called CNN to inform the news agency that a commercial plane had crashed at Camp David.

To begin with, Secret Service protocol does not involve notifying news agencies about plane crashes. Moreover, no plane actually crashed at Camp David.

Rebekah Roth believes that, conceivably, just as Flights 11 and 175 were scheduled to “crash” into the Twin Towers (but did not) and just as Flight 77 was scheduled to “hit” the Pentagon (but did not), so, too, Flight 1989 was supposed to “crash” near Camp David. Apparently, something went awry with the latter plan.

According to Rebekah Roth, several years before 9/11, flight termination systems -- sometimes referred to as flight interruption systems -- were installed on commercial jets, including the planes associated with Flights 11, 175, 77, and 93 that, allegedly had been hijacked on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. Delta Flight 1989 might have been another plane that was scheduled for “hijacking” on 9/11 that had had a flight termination system installed at some previous point in time.

Various models of those termination systems have been around since at least the early 1990s (the system is used in drone technology). In the event of various kinds of in-air problems -- such as a hijacking -- the flight termination process could be activated, and this enabled people on the ground to take over control of such craft and land them safely at designated airports.

The flight termination system is turned on much like a phone operates. In other words, each plane has a specific activation frequency associated with it, and, when that frequency is sent out, the flight termination system for that plane is turned on, and this enables pilots on the ground to take over control of the plane.

However, from time to time, as a result of some kind of mechanical or electrical problem with a plane, a last-minute switch is made, and another craft is used. When this occurs, the radio frequency for

activating the flight termination system changes, and, consequently, if the people trying to activate that system were not aware of the last-minute switch in aircraft, then, a commercial plane that was scheduled to have a “crash” – say at Camp David – would not do so, and other people who also were not aware of the switch – say, purported Secret Service personnel -- would report that a crash had occurred when this was not the case.

Rebekah Roth believes that someone at FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. became aware -- possibly through either of the two companies (P-Tech or MITRE) that were in the basement of the FAA’s headquarters on 9/11-- that this part of the operation had to be scrubbed. As a result, the captain of Delta Flight 1989 was contacted by someone from FAA headquarters who told Delta’s Captain a story about hijackers and a bomb being on board and ordered the Captain to land in Cleveland so that handlers on the plane – who were supposed to end up at Westover Air Force Base – would be able to deplane and disappear.

When the flight termination system is activated, it shuts down all communications within the plane as well as between the plane and the ground. In addition, it prevents pilots from activating the 7500 responder code that notifies flight controllers that a plane has been hijacked.

The foregoing factors tend to provide a context for a number of statements made by some of the flight attendants who were aboard some of the ill-fated flights on 9/11. For instance, one of the flight attendants had been recorded as saying that she had not been able to contact pilots in the cockpit, and this would have been consistent with a scenario in which a flight termination system had been activated and, consequently, communication between the cabin and the cockpit would have been cut off.

On the other hand, if, as Rebekah Roth believes, the phone calls that were recorded in conjunction with the “hijacked” airplanes actually took place on the ground rather than in the air, then, one is not entirely certain what to make of some of the content that occurs in those recorded calls. For example, if the flight termination system already had brought the “hijacked” planes to a successful landing at, say, Westover Air Force Base, then, why provide information that

could serve as an important clue concerning the possible role that flight termination systems actually might have played in the events of 9/11?

Then, again, the flight termination scenario could lend significance to the following possibility. More specifically, despite the fact that on the morning of 9/11 all four “hijacked” planes were being flown by seasoned pilots of many years experience, not one of those pilots activated the foregoing code. Given that all of the pilots on the hijacked planes had failed on that day to follow standard protocol (as far as activating the four-digit responder signal – 7500 -- indicating that a hijacking was in progress), such a universal failure could be explained by the possibility that before any of the pilots knew what was happening to their airplane, the flight termination systems on those craft had been activated by a person, or by persons, unknown and, as a result, the pilots were prevented from contacting air traffic controllers, either via radio or via the previously noted four-digit emergency code.

Another interesting dimension to the flight termination system aspect of things is that, apparently, the technology was invented by a company known as SPC. The CEO of that company, Rabbi Dov Zackheim, just happened to be the same individual who was Comptroller of the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 and was being investigated by the Army Audit Office of the Pentagon as well as the Office of Naval Intelligence in conjunction with 2.3 trillion dollars in the Pentagon budget that couldn't be accounted for and that had been announced as being MIA by Donald Rumsfeld on the day before 9/11 ... and, oh yes, the offices of both of the foregoing investigatory units were among those that were blown up at the Pentagon on 9/11.

There is a section of the first book in her trilogy – namely, *Methodical Illusions* – in which one of the primary characters – Vera Hanson – has a conversation with a character by the name of Gary Gill who, among other things, informs her about his experiences in relation to 9/11. Rebekah Roth maintains that the foregoing conversation actually occurred, and the person to whom the Gary Gill character alludes really exists, but his name has been changed in the book to protect his identity.

According to the real-world individual behind the Gary Gill character, he had been inside and outside the Pentagon on the

morning of 9/11. He saw no evidence that a 757 commercial jet actually crashed into the Pentagon on that day [and this corroborates the testimony of another military witness – April Gallop – who also indicated that although she had been at Ground Zero when explosions occurred at the Pentagon on 9/11, she saw no evidence (in the form of wreckage, fuselage, engines, tail, luggage, or bodies) of a plane crash as she left the building].

Rebekah Roth remembers the 9/11 reports of Jamie McIntyre -- at the time he was Senior Pentagon correspondent for CNN – who indicated that he did not see any evidence of a plane crash at the Pentagon. As a flight attendant, Rebekah Roth had gone through years of training in relation to the issue of plane crashes, and, therefore, she knows what they look like, but on the morning of 9/11, there didn't seem to be – as there should have been -- any parts of a 757 that were visible at the Pentagon or in the field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

During the same aforementioned conversation that was being given expression through the voice of the fictional character, Gary Gill, the actual special forces soldier whose story is being told by Rebekah Roth also relates how a few weeks following 9/11, he had been deployed to Afghanistan and saw 'Usama bin Laden on several occasions. However, the real-life Gary Gill – along with his comrades – had been given specific orders by people very high up in the chain of command not to shoot bin Laden ... apparently because bin Laden was more valuable to the war effort as a live "terrorist" than as a dead one.

There are an additional set of connections that are mentioned by Rebekah Roth that have to do with the military. For instance, she identifies Colonel Robert Marr as a person of interest in her investigation.

Prior to 9/11 he had been called out of retirement to be the head of NEADS (The Northeast section of NORAD). On 9/11 he became entangled in the whole fiasco surrounding the scrambling of air defense forces.

Before assuming his duties at NEADS, he had been working with Phoenix Air that, among other things, was involved in the rendition of prisoners. Somewhat more intriguingly, Phoenix Air also was associated with Hoffman Aviation.

According to the government's version of things, Hoffman Aviation was the place where Mohammed Atta and Waleed al-Shehri supposedly received flight training. Rebekah Roth finds it interesting that there could be a possible link (via Phoenix Air and Hoffman Aviation) between Colonel Robert Marr, who played a role on 9/11 with respect to the numerous problems surrounding the scrambling of jets on that day, and the training of the aforementioned two alleged terrorists.

In addition to the Betty Ong phone calls, Rebekah Roth also looked into another set of calls that were supposedly made at altitude from American Airlines Flight 11. These calls involved Amy Sweeney who also was a flight attendant.

During her calls, Amy Sweeney identified the hijacker as someone who had been sitting in 9B. According to the passenger manifest, the person in 9B was an American-Israeli dual citizen by the name of Daniel Lewin.

After doing some research, Rebekah Roth discovered that Daniel Lewin was a member of Sayeret Matkal, a special-forces unit of the Israeli Defense Forces that has expertise in, among other things, hostage rescue and hijackings.

Amy Sweeney described Lewin as someone who spoke perfect English. He also spoke Hebrew and Arabic.

The official story has Lewin sitting directly in front of two of the alleged hijackers of Flight 11. That same story also indicates that Lewin was killed by the two aforementioned, alleged hijackers when they decapitated him by using a plastic box cutter.

However, Lewin was well-trained in martial arts. People who knew him in Israel said he was the best of the best ... someone that could kill anyone and do so with nothing more than a credit card and a pen.

Yet, two Arab hijackers who were 5 feet 6 inches, or so, in height -- that, also, were armed with just flimsy plastic box cutters that would have had, difficulty cutting a piece of chicken -- supposedly overpowered someone who was highly trained in martial arts, as well as overpowered someone who was an expert in hostage rescue and

disruption of hijacking scenarios. At best, the official story seems highly unlikely at this point if not rather preposterous sounding.

One's skepticism concerning the foregoing portion of the official story tends to deepen when one learns that among the passengers of the four "hijacked planes" there were individuals who were, about, 6-2, 225 lb., (including: a judo champion, a hockey player, a rugby player, as well as a number of other individuals who were gym-rats and, therefore, quite fit), and, yet, none of these individuals challenged some Arabs who were diminutive in stature, armed, for the most part, with nothing more than box cutters.

In addition, the cockpit of every commercial aircraft is equipped with a crash ax. Why didn't the pilots – all of whom were ex-military – use those weapons to fight off the hijackers with box cutters?

Another mysterious dimension of 9/11 pointed out by Rebekah Roth concerned the activity of the cell phone that belonged to Flight 93's Todd Beamer – the media hero of "Let's roll" fame. More specifically, according to phone records that were subsequently obtained by investigators, on 9/11, Todd Beamer's cell phone continued to make and receive calls until between 8:00 and 9:00 p.m. that night, ten to eleven hours after the commercial jet supposedly disintegrated upon impact at Shanksville, Pennsylvania (but, quite coincidentally, the plane did not disintegrate before ejecting the non-titanium passport of Ziad Jerrah, one of the alleged hijackers).

An additional red flag for Rebekah Roth involved the ELT system on airplanes. This is the Electronic Locator Transmitter that is activated when a plane crashes and enables search crews to quickly find the downed aircraft.

On September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001, the ELT system for American Airlines Flight 11 was activated at 8:44 a.m. However, this presents something of a problem because the time of the ELT's activation is two minutes before something -- allegedly Flight 11 -- crashed into the North Tower of the World Trade Center.

One might also keep in mind that two companies were in the basement of the FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C. on the morning of 9/11 They were involved in various facets of the 37, or more, war games that were being orchestrated on that day.



Those companies were P-Tech and MITRE. They had the technical capabilities to create bogies on the radar screens of both military and civilian flight controllers, and those two companies also had the capacity to remove blips from radar screens as well as alter the information (such as operating velocity) that was associated with those blips.

There was a considerable amount of bogie creation, blip disappearance, and information altering that was taking place in conjunction with radar monitoring during the morning of September 11, 2001. Such events were creating a great deal of confusion on both the civilian as well as the military sides of things, and, on more than one occasion during the morning of 9/11, various people were asking whether what was being reported or “seen” on radar screens was real world or virtual world in nature.

Incidentally, several of the many facets of government that come under the supervision of the MITRE organization are the FAA and NIST. NIST is the government agency that – to be kind -- severely botched the investigations into the cause of the collapse of three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11, and the FAA seems to be intimately connected – both directly and indirectly -- with a great many problematic events that took place on 9/11.

With help from a variety of aviation experts (air traffic controllers and pilots), Rebekah Roth, eventually, uncovered another piece of information amidst the terabyte of FOI information she had acquired. This information had to do with the operational status of a number of east coast radar facilities since, for one reason or another, many of those installations (including long-distance radar facilities) ranging northward from Cape Cod and extending up toward Bangor, Maine were not functional on 9/11.

Given all of the foregoing information, an obvious question to ask Rebekah Roth is what happened to the people on the “hijacked” flights that, according to her, were transported to Westover Air Force Base. The answer is fairly simple and straightforward.

The individuals on those planes (whether flight attendants, pilots, or “passengers”) who were part of the 9/11 operation were, within a relatively short period of time, placed on another plane and whisked away to a life of anonymity somewhere else in the world. However, the

individuals on those planes who were not part of the operation were eliminated ... just as thousands of people in the World Trade Center had been eliminated and just as many people at the Pentagon had been eliminated.

Amidst the data on the terabyte of FOI material obtained by Rebekah Roth is information indicating that on the evening of 9/11, 3 medevac planes (DC 9s) flew into Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland at 9:40 p.m. Apparently, these planes all came in from the same area – possibly from Westover -- and had a landing sequence that was spaced out at 3 to 6 minute intervals.

Medevac planes are used to transport dead bodies and injured soldiers. The only military personnel that lost their lives on 9/11 were at the Pentagon and, consequently, there would have been no reason to use medevac planes to transport those individuals to Andrews.

According to Rebekah Roth, the foregoing three medevac planes were used to transport the bodies of dead passengers to Andrews from the four “hijacked” planes that, initially, had been taken to Westover Air Force Base. She believes the reason why Andrews was selected is because there is a crematorium at Bethesda, and, presumably, the perpetrators would have wanted to make sure that no one could ever recover the bodies of the hijacked passengers and, thereby, be able to discover what had happened to them.

The information presented in this chapter – together with other information that has been presented in previous chapters -- needs to be investigated further. Rebekah Roth wants such an investigation to take place and so do I ... but neither one of us wants the government to have oversight into, and control of, such an investigation.

At some point, a person reaches a potential tipping point and, as a result, is confronted with the decision of whether, or not, to treat all of the anomalous events that were occurring on the morning of 9/11 as being merely coincidental oddities or whether those events are part of some larger pattern. For individuals such as Rebekah Roth (as well as myself and a variety of other researchers), the sheer number of problematic dimensions entailed by the events of 9/11 cannot be dismissed out of hand as sheer coincidence and, instead, are worthy of being critically engaged in an objective, diligent, rigorous fashion ... something that, among others, FEMA, the United States Congress, the

9/11 Commission, NIST, the Pentagon Performance Report, and the media have not done.



### **17.) The 9/11 Delusion and its Consequences**

A word that tends to be associated with the issue of 9/11 is the term “conspiracy”. However, a much more relevant and heuristically valuable concept might be “delusion” or “delusional” because so much of the commentary concerning, analysis of, and fallout from the aforementioned day seems to be delusional in nature.

Oftentimes, a delusion is considered to be an idiosyncratic understanding that is contradicted by what is believed by most people within a given community. From the perspective of the foregoing characterization, the metric for evaluating what constitutes a delusion becomes a function of what is accepted as being true by the majority of people within a given social setting, and, consequently, such an approach fails to address the problem of what to do in situations when the viability of the framework that normally frames the understanding of most people is brought into serious question.

The proper metric for identifying delusional content should not be a matter of what a majority of people believe about some issue. Presumably, the only reliable basis for determining what constitutes a delusion should be the degree to which a given belief or set of beliefs is capable of reflecting actual facts, and, as a result, the greater the extent to which a belief or system of beliefs fails to reflect available evidence, then, the greater is the likelihood that one is dealing with a delusion or delusional system.

More specifically, a delusion is a belief that not only is contradicted by demonstrable facts but continues to be held by an individual, or group of individuals, despite the existence of evidence that runs contrary to the features to which such a belief gives expression. Thus, a delusion is a firmly held false belief or system of beliefs in which an individual is unaware of evidence that is capable of refuting a belief, or an individual chooses -- for arbitrary, and, therefore, unjustifiable reasons -- not to accept evidence that runs contrary to a given belief or system of beliefs.

Delusions might, or might not, play a major role in shaping behavior. When one, or more delusions, actively shapes a person’s understanding and/or behavior in an on-going fashion, then that individual is delusional and such understanding and behavior is

pathological to the degree that delusions orient the person's way of engaging the world.

Of course, being able to differentiate between the delusional and the non-delusional is not necessarily a straightforward process. This is because determining what constitutes a fact or evidence is, itself, a topic that entails considerable difficulties involving a variety of historical, social, methodological, scientific, and philosophical nuances.

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, enough 9/11 material has been critically explored in my two books (*The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, as well as the present work, *Framing 9/11, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*), plus the work of Dr. Judy Wood (*Where Did The Towers Go?*), David Ray Griffin (e.g., *Debunking 9/11 Debunking, The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7*, and *9/11 Contradictions: An Open Letter to Congress and the Press*), Webster Tarpley (*9/11 Synthetic Terror*), Rebekah Roth (*Methodical Illusion, Methodical Deception, Methodical Conclusion*), together with the research of, among others Richard Gage, Craig Ranke & Aldo Marquis, Steven Jones, Kevin Ryan, and Barbara Honegger) to establish the following fact: The official account of the events of 9/11 (as given expression through: (1) *The 9/11 Report: The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*; (2) the series of reports issued by NIST – National Institute of Standards and Technology -- concerning the demise of the Twin Towers and Building 7; and (3) *The Pentagon Performance Report*) has failed to evidentially establish that 19 Arab hijackers working in conjunction with 'Usama bin Laden conspired to hijack a number of commercial airlines and, then, flew those craft into a variety of targets on the morning of September 11, 2001 and, in the process, caused the death of more than 3,000 people as well as brought about the destruction of the World Trade Center in New York and inflicted considerable damage upon the Pentagon in Virginia. As a result of the foregoing fact, one is confronted with a second fact – given (via the first fact) that the official account of the events of 9/11 is untenable at virtually every point, there is need for a fully-funded, new grand jury investigation (on both the federal as well as state levels) into the events of 9/11.

Presumably, the foregoing new investigation could be sanctioned or authorized by the people, in accordance with the possibilities inherent in, among other things, Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, along with the possibilities present in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments. Therefore, such an investigation will be independent of government control, oversight, or influence because Article IV, Section 4 requires federal government officials not to be judges in their own cause, and under such circumstances, the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments come into effect.

The two, aforementioned facts – that is, (a) the official explanation for 9/11 is completely unviable, and (b) the need for a new, fully funded, people-based (rather than government-based), rigorous investigation (with full subpoena power) into the events of 9/11 – both run contrary to the beliefs of a majority of people in the United States. Nonetheless, despite constituting a majority of the population, those people who hold to a belief that is incapable of plausibly rebuffing available evidence (such as is the case with respect to the official account of 9/11) are, by definition, delusional in nature because their perspective is filled with content that can be – and has been -- shown to be false and because those false beliefs are actively shaping their manner of engaging the world.

As indicated previously, the majority should not be permitted to decide what constitutes the grounds for something to be considered delusional. Instead, delusions should be identified as a function of the extent to which falsehoods surround, ground, and permeate a given set of beliefs.

On the basis of considerable evidence (see the references cited several pages earlier), the official narrative concerning the events of 9/11 amounts to little more than government-sanctioned propaganda that, almost from the very start, was promulgated to the public, via government officials, the media, and academia,. Irrespective of whether, or not, the foregoing individuals believe their own propaganda concerning 9/11, the propaganda has been shown to be false, and, therefore, is conducive to the formation of delusional thinking and behavior.

Due to a multiplicity of biases, prejudices, assumptions, fears, anxieties, motivations, and vested interests, many citizens decided

(on an individual, non-conspiratorial basis) to cede their agency to such propaganda, and, in the process, succumbed to the delusional virus that was being transmitted (whether intentionally or unintentionally) through the government, the media, and academia. As a result, much of America (including most of its leaders, officials, and professionals) became delusional in relation to 9/11 ... that is, important aspects of their understanding and behavior tended to be rooted in, and oriented by, a network of delusional beliefs.

Starting on 9/11, an ideological epidemic took place. Delusions concerning 9/11 began to spread rapidly across the urban and rural landscapes of America, and, within days, the 9/11 delusion had laid waste to much of the population.

The first response (or non-response) of the government to the events of 9/11 was not against al-Qaeda, Afghanistan or Iraq but against the American people. The foregoing response occurred when officials in all three branches of government (Executive, Legislative, and Judicial) ignored the requirement of Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution to “guarantee” citizens a republican form of government, and, instead, induced (knowingly or unknowingly) many Americans to operate in a delusional manner.

In order to provide an appropriate framework through which to explore some of the consequences of the 9/11 delusion, one should have at least a nodding acquaintance with a number of issues (e.g., sovereignty, republicanism) that have become entangled in the aforementioned delusion. Consequently, over the next nine or ten pages, several themes that bear upon human potential will be explored, and this discussion will help establish a backdrop against which some of the problematic consequences of the 9/11 delusion will be considered.

-----

Republicanism gives expression to a moral philosophy that emerged during the Enlightenment and came to assume a prominent role in the American form of constitutional self-governance. Republicanism gives emphasis to qualities of character such as: Honesty, impartiality, objectivity, integrity, nobility, honor, independence, equanimity, fairness, tolerance, and not being a judge in one’s own cause.



The revolutionary dimension of the so-called Framers of the Constitution was not just about the idea of people governing themselves (rather than being governed by a class of elites). Rather, an essential feature of the revolutionary character of republicanism was the 'how' of governance – namely, that governance would be done in accordance with the moral principles of republicanism that were outlined in the last sentence of the previous paragraph.

Therefore, good governance was not just about citizens governing themselves. Governance was good precisely to the extent that officials pursued it through the qualities of republican character that were outlined previously.

Republican values were intended to protect the sovereignty of people – both individually and collectively – and that is why the Constitution guaranteed the people a republican form of government. Although the lexicon (e.g., freedom, liberty, rights, independence, self-governance) varied that was used to refer to and describe the idea of sovereignty -- at least as this notion was conceived in the 1780s and 1790s -- the essential dimension of the underlying meaning was rooted in a sense of the inalienable rights to which human beings (as long as you weren't female, Black, Native, Latino, poor, or the like) were entitled, and this presumption of innate sovereignty is what gave legal direction to the Bill of Rights and, therefore, served as the moral wellspring from which the principles listed in the latter set of Amendments were drawn.

The term "sovereignty" doesn't figure prominently in the wording of the Constitution. Nevertheless, at nearly every juncture that document presupposes such a concept even if the Framers did not always fully or adequately articulate the possibilities entailed by that principle.

Their constitutional deliberations were, for the most part, preoccupied with nuances involving procedure and structural form. Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution – i.e., the guarantee of a republican form of government – supposedly ensured that the details of procedure and structural form would be used in the service of helping to establish, protect, and enhance the principles of sovereignty.

Unfortunately, almost from the very beginning, an array of federal officials ignored the requirements of Article IV, Section 4 when going about the business of governance. In other words, instead of using the principles of republicanism to serve the sovereign interests of citizens, over the course of more than 230 years, all too many federal officials leveraged the articles of the Constitution to wield power that was used (in direct violation of Article IV, Section 4) to serve the political, commercial, and legal interests of themselves and their supporters.

As a result, much of the history of the United States has been a story of how, again and again, abuses of power have corrupted the principles of republicanism that are entailed by the guarantee given in Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution. Such corruption of the body politic tended to thwart opportunities for being able to realize the promises set forth in the Preamble concerning issues such as: Forming a more perfect union; establishing justice; ensuring domestic tranquility; providing for the common defense; promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity.

Although the notion of sovereignty is often associated with states and nations, the fact of the matter is that individuals have a greater claim to sovereignty than do governments, states, or nations. This is because individuals have a natural, existential priority relative to the artificial constructs (i.e., governmental institutions) that are derived from the aforementioned condition of ontological priority.

However, the principles of sovereignty to which reference is being made here are not synonymous with the rather childish notion of sovereignty that is bandied about by individuals who often refer to themselves as “sovereigns”. These latter individuals often think of sovereignty in terms of their own absolute rights to do as they please quite independently of any considerations concerning duties of care that they might have to others or to themselves with respect to the purpose or purposes for which sovereignty might be used, and, as such, sovereignty becomes rudderless amidst the existential seas through which human beings journey.

In order to distinguish the kind of essential sovereignty to which reference is being made in this chapter from the rudderless sort of

sovereignty to which members of the so-called “sovereign movement” refer when they show up in various courts in different parts of America and, as well, in order to be able to distinguish an essential sort of sovereignty from the presumptuous, and power-driven edition of sovereignty to which governments, states, and nations lay claim, the term “inalienable sovereignty” will be used. This latter notion of sovereignty seems to best resonate with the sense of sovereignty that has been felt by people throughout history and that has helped inform discussions concerning the rights of human beings since the Charter of the Forests in 1217, if not back to the earliest times when human beings first emerged on the Earth.

In its most basic sense, “inalienable sovereignty” gives expression to two themes. The first has to do with the basic right to which all people are entitled – namely, the right to seek the truth concerning the nature of one’s relationship with Being and to act in accordance with one’s understanding of that truth.

The foregoing considerations lead to a second dimension of sovereignty involving the duty of care that is entailed by the foregoing notion of a basic right. This fundamental duty of care is a countervailing obligation that places constraints or limits on how an individual – or the collective – can proceed with respect to the exercise of their basic rights.

This countervailing duty of care consists of efforts – both individually and collectively – to help create the conditions that are conducive to establishing, protecting, and enhancing the basic right of everyone to operate in accordance with her, his, or their own basic right to seek the truth concerning the nature of one’s relationship with Being as long as this does not interfere with, undermine, unduly influence, or deny such a basic right to others. A variety of details concerning the notion of “inalienable sovereignty” – consisting of 41 principles or conditions – can be found in either *Final Jeopardy: Sovereignty and the Reality Problem Volume V* or *Final Jeopardy: Education and the Reality Problem Volume VI*.

During the nearly three-year period of ratification that followed the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, those individuals who were not already committed to the cause of the Federalists had a great many reservations concerning the newly minted Constitution and often

voiced those reservations by making reference to an array of rights that they wanted to see incorporated into the Constitution over the objections of the Federalists who wanted the Constitution ratified as is, without emendations. The concerns of the non-Federalists were all variations on a single theme – namely, to what extent could the proposed Constitutional process serve – or thwart -- their aspirations for pursuing “inalienable sovereignty” in the foregoing sense of a person’s right to seek the truth concerning the nature of one’s relationship with Being, together with a countervailing duty of care that would be capable of helping to preserve the possibility of such sovereignty for oneself and one’s posterity.

In 1803, the Supreme Court of the United States, engaged in a process of legal legerdemain when Chief Justice John Marshall used the case of *Marbury v. Madison* to accrue to the Court the right to exercise judicial review and, thereby, determine the meaning of the Constitution. This is a right that is not mentioned in Article III of the Constitution.

Article III, Section 1 indicates that judicial power is “invested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress might from time to time ordain and establish”. However, what, precisely, is entailed by the investiture of such judicial power is left unspecified.

Similarly, Article III, Section 2 of the Constitution indicates that the aforementioned judicial power “shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;

-- to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;

-- to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;

-- to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;

-- to controversies between two or more states;

-- between a state and citizens of another state;

-- between citizens of different states;

-- between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants of different states;

-- and between a state, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

Nevertheless, nowhere does one find in the Constitution an explication of what exactly is meant when one “extends” judicial power to all of the foregoing cases. The foregoing text does establish the parameters of jurisdiction but leaves unaddressed the issue of what principles are to govern or regulate the exercise of jurisdiction that has been established through Article III, Section 2.

Furthermore, Article III, Section 2 indicates that the Supreme Court will have original jurisdiction “in all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party”, but will have appellate jurisdiction in all other cases. Yet, since the meaning of “affecting” in the foregoing quote is left vague and since one might suppose that almost any legal case will carry a potential for affecting, in some fashion, “ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a state shall be party,” one could argue that the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction in almost any case that takes place within the judicial system.

A legal fiction is a concept employed by judges for the purpose of resolving legal problems that have been created by the existence of ambiguities in the documents and practices that circumscribe the judicial process. For example, in England, courts do not have the power to legislate and, consequently, for centuries, judges have characterized what they do as a process of declaring what the law is on the basis of a court’s reading or interpretation of past practices and customs. The fictional aspect of the foregoing process is that, in reality, such declarations were, and are, a function of the judge’s interpretation of past practices and customs as filtered through a judge’s own political, economic, social, religious, and philosophical sensibilities concerning the times in which they live or lived.

Consequently, a judge was not merely declaring the nature of the common law that was in place. Rather, the judge was engaging the

past through the filters of his own perspective and, then declared that perspective to be reflective of the past.

The legal fiction permeating such cases gave the impression that no form of legislative action was taking place. However, in reality, a judge was legislating in subtle ways by interpreting past practices and customs in a manner that conformed to his, her, or their political, religious, historical, economic, and legal framework of understanding.

The legal fiction in such cases was that the judge was engaged in an objective exercise that permitted the official to make impartial declarations concerning the practices and customs of the past. However, there was nothing objective about what was taking place and, instead, the declarations that were made were a function of the hermeneutical sensibilities of a judge.

Common law was what judges said it was. Common law was what the forces of history, economics, politics, and religion imposed on the members of society through the assistance of judges who served as agents for those forces.

Judicial review is another legal fiction. It is the fiction that makes all other legal fiction possible (such as corporate personhood and precedent).

Judges consider the foregoing sort of legal fictions to be necessary because those conceptual devices address issues that are vague or ambiguous within the context of political, economic, and legal activities. However, legal fictions are fictitious precisely because they are not reflected in, or derivable from (in any non-arbitrary fashion) first principles concerning fundamental rights and duties but, instead, are imposed on people at the discretion of judges.

The foregoing imposition is extra-legal in the sense that it has not been specifically sanctioned by rights and duties that are clearly delineated in foundational documents or practices ... such as a Constitution. Because these impositions are arbitrary, legal constructions (i.e., fictions), they have no valid connection to anything more constitutionally basic or foundational in nature.

Similarly, the notion of precedent is – with two exceptions – another legal fiction. Precedent is an idea that seeks to create the impression that a logical, rational, link exists between, on the one

hand, the issues and circumstances inherent in a current legal case, and, on the other hand, basic principles that are clearly articulated in a foundational document, such as the Constitution.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the two exceptions that will be outlined below, no such connection -- that is, one that is rooted in first principles -- actually can be demonstrated or shown to exist. Instead, ideas (from the present and the past) are placed in juxtaposition to one another and a link between, or among, those ideas is assumed to exist without a substantive, underlying network of connections being present that is capable of verifying the inference that is being made concerning the allegation that there is a logical and rational linkage between the properties of a current case and the properties of first principles of a foundational document such as the Constitution.

Consequently, although the contents of all of the books of federal case law that have been compiled over the years might have considerable value as a source of food for thought concerning legal issues, those books of compiled case law have, for the most part, limited, if any, value as a source of precedents. The only source from which to draw valid precedents is given expression through the specified rights and duties that are contained in foundational documents such as the Constitution and the Amendments.

The bases for establishing valid precedents are of two kinds: Primary and Secondary. In the context of the American system of government, Primary Precedents are a function of the dynamics that are generated by playing off against one another the following principles: The Preamble to the Constitution, Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights (including the many possibilities that are opened up through the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments), as well as the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1 and the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1.

Secondary Precedents are a function of all other sections of the Constitution and Amendments that fall beyond the parameters of the foregoing Primary Precedents. Such precedents are called secondary because they concern issues that are, for the most, purely procedural and structural in nature and in order to acquire substantive value with respect to basic rights and duties, those Secondary Precedents must be filtered through the requirements of Primary Precedents.

Thus, stipulating that Article III of the Constitution indicates: Judicial power is to be vested in the Supreme Court and other, inferior courts, or that judicial power is to be extended to certain kinds of cases (previously listed), or that the Supreme Court is to have original jurisdiction in certain kinds of cases and appellate jurisdiction in other kinds of case, all of this has to do with procedural and structural considerations that govern judicial processes, and those properties say absolutely nothing about the purposes for which, and principles in accordance with, such properties are to be used.

The above sorts of purposes and principles arise through the manner in which the different components of the aforementioned dynamics of Primary Precedents play off against one another. Whatever it is that the judicial system does, it must do so in a way that is fully compliant with: The promise of the principles in the Preamble, the guarantee that is present in Article IV, Section 4, as well as the constraints and degrees of freedom that are entailed by the Bill of Rights, together with the provisions of the Bill of Rights (including the many possibilities that are opened up through the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments), as well as the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1 and the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1.

In other words, the judicial system must be capable of showing that its exercise of judicial power is in full compliance not only with the goals or purposes for which the Constitution supposedly was constructed (i.e., the principles set forth in the Preamble), but, in addition, must be in compliance with the guarantee of a republican form of government that is afforded by Article IV, Section 4, and, as well, must be in compliance with the permissions and constraints that are entailed by the Bill of Rights (including the many possibilities that are opened up through the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments), as well as the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1 and the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1. Unless a judgment is capable of giving expression to the Primary and Secondary Precedents that are present in the foundational documents (e.g., the Constitution and Amendments), then, such a judgment is not legally valid.

Implied powers are another form of legal fiction, and this is the case whether considered in conjunction with the Executive Branch



(e.g., Executive Orders or Signing Statements), the Legislative Branch (e.g., income tax), or the Judiciary (e.g., judicial review). Unless one can tie an alleged power directly to provisions explicitly stated in sources of Primary and (not just) Secondary Precedent, then the claim to such a power is without validity.

Everything that has been said over the last nine pages is entirely consonant with the texts of both the Constitution and Amendments. Everything that has been said over the last nine pages places those documents in an appropriate historical, philosophical, political, and legal context (For a more detailed analysis of the foregoing issues, please refer to: *The Unfinished Revolution: The Battle for America's Soul; Democracy Lost and Regained; Final Jeopardy: Sovereignty and the Reality Problem Volume V*, and/or *Final Jeopardy: Education and the Reality Problem Volume VI*.)

If the Constitution and Amendments do not exist in order to establish, serve, protect, and enhance the inalienable sovereignty of the people – not the government – then, those documents begin at no beginning and work toward no end except that of power and control which is the antithesis of both sovereignty and republicanism. Indeed, sovereignty and republicanism have been adversely affected by the 9/11 delusion that infected so much of America.

Many Americans were, and are, extremely susceptible to such a delusion. This is because so much of the previous 230 years of governance have been spent (educationally, economically, socially, politically, and legally) in undermining the aspirations of inalienable sovereignty that are present, and have been present, in Americans since America's inception as a nation.

There are consequences for both the oppressed as well the oppressors when the aspiration for inalienable sovereignty are thwarted, denied, corrupted, and compromised. Oppression is steeped in, as well as leads to, delusional states.

Delusion, in turn, is conducive to the creating of conditions that help generate sociopathic and psychopathic behavior. Because truth is a bulwark against the emergence of so many problems, delusion (which marks an absence of truth to some degree) renders people vulnerable to, among other things, narrowing their concern for the welfare of others outside one's basic frame of reference (which is a

group, family or circle of friends in the case of sociopathic behavior and which is an individual -- or those who serve the interests of such an individual -- in the case of psychopaths.).

Not all psychopaths are born. Some people become psychopathic through the ideologies to which they cede their moral agency, and, become what I refer to as ideological psychopaths ... individuals who have lost their capacity for conscience and compassion in relation to other people and, consequently, are willing to sacrifice those 'others' on the altar of one's political, religious, scientific, economic, philosophical, or educational ideology.

There is a difference between naturally occurring psychopathic behavior and ideologically driven psychopathic behavior. The person who is biologically predisposed toward such behavior has little control over his, her, or their actions, whereas the ideologically driven individual has chosen to act in such a problematic manner.

-----

The following discussion explores some of the ways in which the 9/11 delusion has led to sociopathic and psychopathic behavior among many Americans, especially its so-called leaders. The work of Rebecca Gordon in *American Nuremberg: The U.S. Officials Who Should Stand Trial for Post-9/11 War Crimes* served as an important source for much of the background information that helped inform the ensuing reflections.

On October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2001 -- less than a month following 9/11 -- the United States military invaded Afghanistan. To justify its act of aggression, American officials indicated that the government of Afghanistan had given, and continued to give, safe harbor to remnants of al-Qaeda -- including 'Usama bin Laden -- that government officials considered to be responsible for perpetrating the events of 9/11.

After 9/11, but prior to October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2001, the Taliban leaders in Afghanistan had offered to turn 'Usama bin Laden over to American authorities if the latter would provide evidence that clearly implicated bin Laden in the events of 9/11. The Americans failed to provide the requested information but, nonetheless, proceeded to attack Afghanistan militarily under the banners of Operation

Enduring Freedom (2001 to 2014) and Operation Freedom's Sentinel (2015 to present).

Initially, the United States carried out the foregoing invasion in conjunction with forces from Canada and Britain. However, in 2003, other NATO forces joined the war of aggression against Afghanistan.

Even though, superficially, the United States had provided a legal basis for its attack on Afghanistan in the form of the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF), that legislation was in fundamental conflict with other Constitutional provisions that, supposedly oriented American policies. For example, not only is it unclear whether Congress has the right to declare war (or grant letters of marque and reprisal) in any circumstances other than ones requiring defensive measures against the aggression of others, but, as well, the supremacy clause of Article VI indicated that the activities of the United States were circumscribed by its obligations under a variety of treaties.

For instance, Article 51 of the United Nations Charter – to which the United States is a signatory -- does entitle its members to resort to the use of military force when defending themselves against armed attacks. Nonetheless, the foregoing military activities were – and are - - acts of aggression because the United States had not proven -- in any objective, rigorous fashion -- that either the Taliban or al-Qaeda was responsible for the events of 9/11.

Similarly, in order for Article 5 of the 1949 NATO treaty to be invoked, there must be proof that the member country asking for military assistance (in this case, the United States) suffered an armed attack at the hands of a specified enemy (e.g., Afghanistan). However, although Colin Powell promised to give such proof concerning Afghanistan to other NATO members, that proof was never provided.

The American-instigated conflict in Afghanistan has led to the deaths of – at a minimum -- more than 150,000 individuals. Although 3,100 Allied soldiers did die as a result of the hostilities that have been waged in Afghanistan since 2001, the vast majority of those who died have been civilians.

In addition, more than 1 million people have been displaced as a result of American and NATO aggression in Afghanistan.

Furthermore, at a minimum, more than a trillion dollars have been consumed by America's military adventure in Afghanistan ... money that could have been committed to far more constructive, and far less delusional, purposes.

The 9/11 delusion played a fundamental role in facilitating all of the aforementioned death, destruction, displacement, and wasted resources. In other words, the 9/11 delusion was so overwhelmingly virulent in early October of 2001 that it problematically impacted virtually every dimension of understanding among American officials, as well as among much of the general public, and, in the process, distorted, corrupted, and undermined the thinking -- as well as the behavior -- of many Americans concerning, Afghanistan and other parts of the Muslim world.

Nineteen days after the initiation of hostilities against Afghanistan, the United States government opened up a second battlefield. This one was directed toward the American people and came in the form of the Patriot Act, known more technically as: "Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001."

The foregoing Act claimed to be about providing the government with the sort of tools that officials claimed were necessary for combating terrorism, and, yet, passage of the Act was entirely due to the hysteria that was generated through the 9/11 delusion. Instead of trying to remedy the damage to democracy that such a pathological delusion was about to unleash, the Patriot Act became like a multi-trillion-dollar backed Man from La Mancha titling away at illusory enemies and, as a result, lavishing all manner of collateral damage upon the American public (e.g., bloated deficits, rapidly rising national debt, The Department of Homeland Security, the TSA -- Transportation Security Administration, as well as enhanced forms of electronic surveillance that intruded ever more deeply -- and illegally -- into the lives of citizens.

There was no real need to invade Afghanistan or pass the Patriot Act. Indeed, the United States government could have saved tens of thousands of lives, trillions of dollars, as well as its integrity if government officials in all three branches of government merely had adhered to Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution and applied the

qualities of: Impartiality, objectivity, honor, nobility, honesty, fairness, equanimity, and courage to the issues of 9/11 ... qualities that supposedly had been guaranteed some 230 years ago to a succession of generations of American citizens.

In February of 2002, George W. Bush released a memorandum that claimed, among other things, that “the war against terrorism ushers in a new paradigm” and that “our nation recognizes that this new paradigm – ushered in not by us but by terrorists – requires new thinking in the law of war.” Furthermore, he claimed that if he chose to do so, he had: “... the authority under the Constitution, to suspend Geneva as between the United States and Afghanistan”

Fully caught up in the corrosive dynamics of the 9/11 delusion, the foregoing memorandum clearing indicates the extent to which Bush’s thinking had been severely debilitated by such a delusion. First of all, contrary to what President Bush maintained in his February 2002 memorandum, the new paradigm was not ushered in by the terrorists but by none other than the United States government, because, as previously noted, it was the United States that -- without provocation -- attacked Afghanistan on October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2001.

Secondly, despite his belief – based on a delusional premise -- that there was need for a new paradigm to govern the law of war, already were provisions in place governing many of the things that President Bush seemed to have in mind (e.g., treatment of prisoners and detainees) in conjunction with his new paradigm. Among these provisions are: (1) The 1976 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights that states in Article 7 that “No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment;” (2) the 1984 United Nations Conventions against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; (3) Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 113C -- Sections 2340, 2340A and 2340B concerning torture under the Federal Criminal Code; or, (4) the Geneva Convention of 1864 that, subsequently was revised in 1906, 1929, and 1949 and to which Common Article 3 had been adjoined (and The United States has signed and ratified all of the foregoing provisions of International Law).

Moreover, notwithstanding President Bush's contention that he had the Constitutional authority to suspend the Geneva Accords, his claim to such authority was as devoid of substantive content -- and, therefore, as delusional -- as his beliefs about 9/11. And, indeed, the latter pathological delusion informed, shaped, and oriented the former claim concerning his alleged Constitutional authority to suspend the Geneva Accords

Even if the United States had not been one of the signatories of the Geneva Conventions, and even if Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 113C were not part of Federal law, nonetheless, Article IV, Section 4 of the Constitution placed substantial constraints on how federal officials could conduct themselves. As noted previously, Article IV, Section 4 guaranteed that government officials would conduct themselves in all matters with: Impartiality, honesty, fairness, integrity, objectivity, equanimity, honor, and nobility ... including during armed conflicts and quite independently of how enemies were labeled (e.g., prisoners, enemy combatants, enemy non-combatants, terrorists, and so on).

The 9/11 delusion tended to obscure the foregoing considerations. In fact, the 9/11 delusion appeared to assume more importance to many members of the government, media, and academia than did the Constitution since the meaning of the latter document was, to a large degree, framed, filtered and oriented by the dynamics of the 9/11 delusion, and, consequently, when push came to shove for government officials, the Constitution tended to be set aside and, in many respects, was replaced by a variety of policies (e.g., the Bush doctrine; the aforementioned "new paradigm" that, supposedly, had the capacity to override the Geneva conventions in conjunction with the laws of war; the Military Commission Acts of 2006 and 2009) that were little more than legal fictions that were posing as Constitutional principles and for which there were no supporting Primary Precedents that were articulated in either the Constitution or ensuing Amendments.

The thinking and behavior of government officials such as: George Bush (President), Dick Cheney (Vice President), Donald Rumsfeld (Secretary of Defense), George Tenet (Director of the CIA), Robert Mueller (Director of the FBI), Condoleezza Rice (National

Security Adviser), Alberto Gonzales (Counsel to the President, and, later, Attorney General), David Addington (Counsel to the Vice President and Counsel to the National Security Adviser), as well as John Yoo and Jay Bybee (Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel), together with many others, had all been adversely affected by the 9/11 delusion to which they had succumbed. As a result, the capacity of those officials to perform their duties in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution they had sworn to protect and defend became severely compromised.

As a result, Guantanamo, extreme rendition, enhanced interrogation, and black sites were among the policies that were made possible by the 9/11 delusion that dominated the thinking and behavior of, among others, the aforementioned government officials. I've worked in a mental hospital, and, therefore, I have had the opportunity to see how delusions undermine the capacity of people to cope with reality.

The derangement of the foregoing officials (due to the 9/11 delusion) was as great – if not worse – than anything I witnessed during my working days at a mental hospital in Massachusetts. Those individuals should have been removed from office due to the manner in which their delusional condition was adversely affecting Americans and other people around the world.

Unfortunately, the inmates (who occupied all three branches of government) were running the asylum. Consequently, their delusions were not only permitted to stand without challenge, but those delusional influences were allowed to seep into the surrounding community and infect the thinking and behavior of other individuals and institutions.

It was like watching some sort of nightmarish sequel to the invasion of the body snatchers. The pods of delusion concerning 9/11 -- that had been nurtured (knowingly or unknowingly) by: Government officials, the media, and academia -- were placed in close proximity to unsuspecting members of the public, and, after being induced to go to sleep, soon thereafter, those people underwent a transformation of emotional and conceptual understanding that turned them into pod people who – despite appearing normal in

every other sense -- were now governed by the dynamics of the 9/11 delusion.

What are pod people – or, at least, some of them -- prepared to do? Perhaps, the case of Majid Khan will prove to be instructive in relation to the foregoing question.

Khan was kidnapped by the CIA in 2003. This did not take place in Afghanistan or Iraq, but in Pakistan.

Without any trial or due process, the CIA began to direct its pathology toward the hapless prisoner. These activities included: Isolating Khan in total darkness for nearly a year; submerging Khan again and again in ice water; subjecting him repeatedly to the experience of drowning; inserting a tube into his rectum and, then, using that tube to feed him a pureed meal, as well as stripping Khan naked and hanging him from a beam for three days.

In 2002, Jay Bybee and John Yoo -- as members of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel -- wrote a memorandum concerning, among other things, the issue of torture. They claimed that in order for some given practice to qualify as torture and, thereby, violate US law (e.g., Title 18, Part 1, Chapter 113C), the practice must "... be associated with a sufficiently serious physical condition or injury such as death, organ failure, or serious impairment of bodily functions ..."

According to the foregoing perspective, if a person did not die from the procedures to which the individual was exposed, then, whatever took place was not torture. Unfortunately, the foregoing is little more than confabulation ... that is, it consists in nothing more than a fabrication of imaginary Constitutional grounds to justify a given practice.

There is nothing in the Constitution that serves as a precedent that justifies, and, therefore, entitles CIA officials to perform any of the acts that were visited upon Majid Khan or upon anyone else. There are no implied powers in the Constitution that sanction torture or enhanced interrogation.

However, the Constitution does indicate that government officials (including CIA officials) are constrained by a guarantee – Article IV, Section 4 – that requires them to act in accordance with republican



moral values ... none of which are in evidence in the aforementioned behavior of the CIA officials involving Majid Khan. In addition, government employees – including CIA officials – are required to observe the restraints that are entailed by an array of international agreements (such as the Geneva Conventions) for which the United States is a signatory.

Under the influence of the deranged machinations of the 9/11 delusion to which Bybee and Yoo had ceded their moral and conceptual authority, the two foregoing members of the Office of Legal Counsel sought to mold government policy in accordance with the dynamics of the 9/11 delusion rather than in compliance with the provisions of the United States Constitution. In true Orwellian Newspeak, torture was no longer torture

Within a few hours of events unfolding on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 – before the dust had even begun to settle and certainly long before there had been time to collect, analyze, or reflect on evidence -- Vice President Dick Cheney wanted to expand the scope of the 9/11 delusion by claiming – incorrectly – that not only was Afghanistan in some way responsible for the events of 9/11, but -- equally incorrectly – that Iraq also was implicated in the attacks that took place on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, along with the latter's Deputy Defense Secretary, Paul Wolfowitz, were also eager to implicate Saddam Hussein and Iraq as having some sort of responsibility for the death and destruction that were imposed on the United States that day.

In the absence of concrete proof, government officials set about creating the “evidence” they desired. For example, in 2002, the CIA subjected Ibn al-Shaykh al Libi to extreme rendition and transported him to Egypt. While in Egypt, al-Libi underwent a rigorous, waterboarding protocol that continued until he was prepared to “confess” that Iraq had been engaged in a program that not only trained members of al-Qaeda to make bombs, but, as well, trained them to use various kinds of toxic gases and poisons.

The foregoing information was incorporated into President Bush's address to the nation in October, 2002. The President indicated in the same speech that such intelligence had been gleaned from -- among other sources -- individuals who were in custody ...

although, of course, the precise nature of such gleaning went unmentioned.

Secretary of State, Colin Powell, made references to the same so-called “intelligence” in his 2003 address to the United Nations. The address formed part of the propaganda campaign being waged by the United States as it sped inexorably toward war with Iraq.

Later, al-Libi recanted his earlier confession concerning the alleged relationship between Iraq and al-Qaeda, indicating that the “confession” had been coerced through torture. By then, however, the truth of the matter was irrelevant because the United States already had attacked Iraq and was well on its way to becoming an occupying force.

Once again, the delusion of 9/11 had been assigned a government classification that, in effect, gave it priority over the Constitution. The torture of al-Libi was about operating in accordance with the dynamics of the 9/11 delusion rather than being in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution.

A million people have died as a result of the 2003-initiated war with Iraq. Another million people were forced into refugee status as a result of those hostilities, and a further 2.5 million people were subject to internal displacement within Iraq.

A previously vibrant country of 24 million people was destroyed physically, economically, environmentally, educationally, financially, politically, and socially. Iraq, like Afghanistan, was being sacrificed on the altar of the 9/11 delusion.

The architects of the war (e.g., George Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, Condoleezza Rice, Colin Powell, and so on) appear to be remorseless with respect to their war-related activities. Having ceded their moral and conceptual agency to the 9/11 delusion, they became indifferent to the suffering and pain of other human beings and were only interested in satisfying their own impulses and desires.

For instance, consider the following actions of President Bush. During the May 2004 Radio and Television Correspondents Dinner, the Commander in Chief joked about the fact that despite the repeated insistence of both the American and British governments

that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, nonetheless, after nearly a year of intensive searches, no WMDs had been discovered in Iraq.

While speaking at the aforementioned dinner, some photos of President Bush searching for something in the Oval Office were presented to the audience on a large screen. His accompanying commentary was: “Those weapons of mass destruction have got to be here somewhere ... Nope, no weapons over there ... Maybe under here,” and the foregoing comments were interspersed with his chuckles as he enjoyed his presumed cleverness.

Irrespective of whether President Bush was lying about WMDs or merely badly mistaken, nonetheless, during the Radio and Television Correspondents Dinner of 2004, apparently, he didn’t have the decency to appreciate the horror of the policies he had helped to unleash upon Iraq. Seemingly, he had become so fully mesmerized by the 9/11 delusion that he appeared to have taken on some of the characteristics of a psychopath who is indifferent to the pain and suffering that he had helped inflict on hundreds of thousands of other human beings.

Even if Saddam Hussein had possessed WMDs, such a “fact” would not have justified the U.S. led war of aggression against Iraq. Article 2 of the UN charter – for which the United States is one of the signatories – indicates that: “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.” Moreover, while Article 51 of that same charter does acknowledge the right of nations to defend against actual armed attacks, nevertheless that right does not include preemptive self-defense in which the possibility of a future attack is treated as being equivalent to an actual, imminent military threat.

The modern standard for what constitutes the sort of provocation against which a nation has the right to defend itself was established by Daniel Webster when he was serving as Secretary of State between 1841 and 1843. Webster wrote a letter to Britain criticizing the fact that during the latter’s 1837-1838 conflict with Canada, British forces: (1) Captured the Canadian ship, Caroline; (2) boarded that craft; (3) killed an American who was on board that

vessel, and, then, (4) burned the Caroline before, finally, (5) scuttling that ship when the craft was released and permitted to flow over Niagara Falls.

In the aforementioned letter, Webster stated that the only justification for attacking another vessel was if the threat presented by the latter was: "... instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means." This became known as 'the Caroline test' and has played a role in helping to govern international affairs since the early 1840s.

Neither Afghanistan nor Iraq satisfied the conditions set forth by the foregoing Caroline test. Unfortunately, people who were willing to ignore constitutional constraints, federal criminal statutes, international law, as well as treaties and moral principles concerning kidnapping, torture, killing, oppression, aggression, and collective punishment were also likely to be quite prepared to ignore evidence (such as has been put forth in both *The Essence of September 11<sup>th</sup>* and the present work, *Framing 9/11, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*) which contradicted the delusion concerning 9/11 that enabled those officials to feel justified in violating a litany of laws (both federal and international) as well as a bevy of moral principles.

In fact, some government officials were ready to do more than just ignore evidence concerning 9/11. As the aforementioned torture-induced false confession of al-Libi indicated, various federal officials were prepared to manufacture "evidence".

Indeed, the foregoing willingness to confabulate evidence also reared its ugly head in the Niger yellowcake fiasco (yellowcake is a concentrated form of uranium powder that is an intermediate step in the process of uranium enrichment.). More specifically, evidence existed clearly indicating that the smoking-gun documents that allegedly were the basis for intelligence claims concerning yellowcake and Iraqi nuclear ambitions had been forged.

For example, one of the documents being used as "proof" that a deal involving yellowcake existed between Niger and Iraq involved a letter dated October 10, 2000 that supposedly was signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Niger, Allele Elhadj Habibou, However, Habibou had not been Minister of Foreign Affairs in Niger for more than a decade and, therefore, the letter obviously was not authentic.

Furthermore, the envelope containing the foregoing letter bore a postmark of September 28, 2000. Inexplicably, the latter date was nearly two weeks prior to the date appearing on the enclosed letter.

Another letter found among the documents that were being used to sell the allegations concerning a Niger-Iraq yellowcake deal carried a July 30, 1999 date. Yet, the letter referred to transactions that would not take place for another year.

The willingness of people within the federal government to either doctor evidence or use doctored evidence in, among other cases, the Niger yellowcake issue as well as the previously mentioned al-Libi torture-induced confession formed part of a continuum that characterized the behavior of all too many members of the federal government who had been willing to fabricate evidence in a variety of circumstances. Indeed, *The 9/11 Commission Report*, together with various reports from NIST concerning the destruction of the World Trade Center and the *Pentagon Performance Report* (as well as numerous reports from *Scientific American*, *Popular Mechanics*, and other compromised accounts) were little more than exercises in framing and filtering information through the distorted lenses of the 9/11 delusion and, then, used those confabulations to induce others to succumb to the 9/11 delusion.

On November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2001, President Bush warned the public not to tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning 9/11. Yet, he, and his partners in crime, were quite willing to push aside an array of moral and legal constraints concerning torture and initiating battles of aggression as they conspired with one another to go to war in Afghanistan and Iraq on the basis of falsified evidence concerning responsibility for the events of 9/11, nuclear threats, and various weapons of mass destruction.

Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Rice, Powell, Wolfowitz, Addington, Libby, Bybee, Yoo, Gonzales, and a host of others presumably knew right from wrong. However, they all actively – but quite uncritically -- embraced the 9/11 delusion because it served their political and economic purposes.

Due to their willingness to completely gave themselves over to the 9/11 delusion, they ceded their moral and intellectual agency to the dynamics of that delusion. As a result, their behavior became

pathological even as each of them was fully responsible for the many problematic, if not deeply disturbing, choices they made throughout the eight years they were in power.

In the year following 9/11, the Bush Administration released a document entitled: *"The National Security Strategy of the United States"*. Among other things, this policy statement gave expression to what has become known as the Bush Doctrine.

More specifically, the foregoing document stated that because the "... security environment confronting the United States today is radically different from what we have faced before ...", the number one priority of the federal government was "... to protect the American people and American interests." Furthermore, the aforementioned document indicated that in order to be proactive in its defense of the American people and American interests, "... the United States will, if necessary, act preemptively."

The foregoing perspective is just another manifestation of the 9/11 delusion. On the basis of that delusion, the Bush Administration was trying to argue that the most fundamental, solemn duty of the President, or any of his federal officers, was no longer to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States" but, was instead, "...to protect the American people and American interests."

The Bush Doctrine sought to militarize and weaponize the Constitution. In other words, rather than treating the Constitution as a document about forming a more perfect union, establishing justice, insuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, as well as securing the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity through the exercise of republican moral qualities that were guaranteed in Article IV, Section 4, under the Bush Doctrine, the U.S. Constitution became a tool for justifying the use of force – both domestically and internationally – to bring about whatever the Administration considered to be necessary to "protect" the American people (minus rights and sovereignty) and American interests (meaning financial, corporate, and military interests that often were in direct conflict with any real protection of the American people).

The Patriot Act, Homeland Security, the TSA (transportation Safety Agency), extraordinary rendition, enhanced interrogation, the

Military Commission's Act, FISA Courts, and a succession of bloated budgets that were top-heavy with military expenditures were all a product of the way in which the 9/11 delusion had taken control of the thinking and behavior of many officials in the federal government. However, contrary to the aforementioned claims of "The National Security Strategy of the United States," the security environment that confronted the United States in September 2002 was no different than the security environment that confronted the United States on September 10th, 2001.

As far as the idea of a "security environment" is concerned, nothing changed on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. While there still were an assortment of individuals in different parts of the world who were under the mistaken impression that they could use terror to accomplish whatever their goals might be, nonetheless, the evidence concerning the events of 9/11 (as articulated in the present book and in a variety of other works by, among others: Judy Wood, David Ray Griffin, Webster Tarpley, and Rebekah Roth) does not demonstrate that the security environment with which the United States was confronted as a result of 9/11 was radically different that what previously had been the case.

The fundamental change that took place on 9/11 was that the minds, hearts, and souls of a variety of people in America – including many individuals from government, the media, academia, the military, and the corporate world – had become entangled in a delusion that began to rule everything those individuals thought, said, and did. Vice President Cheney was right when he said that "9/11 changed the rules," but he completely failed to understand that such changes were, at best, the result of a delusional condition to which he and many others had succumbed.

George W. Bush tends to confirm the foregoing contention in his 2010 memoir: *Decision Points*. While describing the purposes of the Bush Doctrine (and leaving aside, for the moment, the fact that the aforementioned doctrine was in violation of the Constitution and international law), Bush indicates that the Bush Doctrine was intended to "... take the fight to the enemy overseas before they can attack us again here at home," even though Bush had failed to prove (to the Taliban, the United Nations, NATO, or the American public)

that 9/11 was perpetrated by 19 Arabs conspiring with 'Usama bin Laden or that the death and destruction brought about at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on 9/11 were due to the damage caused by crashing commercial jets into those facilities along with the fires that ensued from those crashes.

Instead, declaration and mere repetition on the part of people like former President Bush have been substituted for proof in the matter of 9/11. Meanwhile, evidence with respect to the actual nature of the events concerning 9/11 have been, and continue to be, ignored, manufactured, or confabulated.

To demonstrate the utter moral, legal, spiritual, and intellectual bankruptcy that is at the heart of the "official position" involving 9/11, consider the case of Abu Zubaydah. The CIA believed him to be a high value target.

According to the CIA's intelligence (something of a euphemism), within a very short period of time, Abu Zubaydah supposedly had risen from being just a lowly foot soldier to becoming one of the top three or four leaders of al-Qaeda, and as such, one of 'Usama bin Laden's top aides. In Abu Zubaydah's alleged capacity as a leader, he, supposedly, had been assigned the task of organizing and supervising a variety of camps to train terrorists from Egypt, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, as well as had been given responsibility for serving as a clearing house of sorts involving communications between al-Qaeda and various foreign entities.

Consequently, Abu Zubaydah was captured in Pakistan in 2002 and, subsequently, was renditioned to a CIA black site in Thailand known as "Detention Site Green." Given his status as an alleged high value target, Abu Zubaydah was afforded the honor of being the first experimental subject in the interrogation program that was being developed for the CIA by psychologists James Mitchell and Bruce Jessen and which was built around the notion of "learned helplessness."

The concept of learned helplessness first emerged through the experiments that Martin Seligman had performed in conjunction with dogs when he subjected those animals to constant, unavoidable shocks. As a result, eventually the dogs seemed to sink into a state Seligman referred to as learned helplessness so that even when



shown how to escape being shocked, the traumatized dogs would resist doing so on their own.

Abu Zubaydah was subjected to 83 cycles of waterboarding. During each cycle, Abu Zubaydah first would be asked for information, and, then, when the information the CIA desired was not forthcoming, he would be subjected to a round of waterboarding, followed by further questioning that, in turn, would lead to an intensified and more rigorous application of the waterboarding technique, followed by further questions.

In essence, the foregoing process was an experimental protocol that consisted in running numerous cycles of: Rinse and repeat as desired. In addition, Abu Zubaydah was also subjected to a variety of other forms of torture including: Being squeezed into a small box for hours at a time that prevented him from either being able to stand or stretch out; sleep deprivation; slamming his head against a wall (referred to as “walling”), and being subjected to loud, constant noise for extended periods of time.

The CIA video-recorded the waterboarding part of Abu Zubaydah’s torture. However, in 2005, Michael Hayden, Director of the CIA at that time, had those tapes destroyed.

On a number of occasions, President Bush publically referred to the example of Abu Zubaydah as proof that enhanced interrogation was working. The President claimed that as a result of the efforts of the CIA, the government had learned that Abu Zubaydah was playing an important role in, among other things, smuggling al-Qaeda members out of Afghanistan.

However, in 2006, the CIA released a report – namely, “Countering Misconceptions About Training Camps in Afghanistan, 1990-2001” – in which the CIA’s own pre-9/11 assessments indicated that Abu Zubaydah was neither a top operative in the al-Qaeda leadership, nor even a member of al-Qaeda. In fact, Abu Zubaydah was a Saudi national who had fought against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s.

Notwithstanding the foregoing acknowledgement, the Bush Administration continued to characterize Abu Zubaydah as a top lieutenant in the al-Qaeda hierarchy. For example, in 2007, during a

June hearing of the congressional Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, John Bellinger, State Department Legal Advisor, was trying to make a case -- on behalf of Condoleezza Rice -- for why Guantanamo should remain open, and he indicated that the facility housed extremely dangerous detainees such as Abu Zubaydah who he claimed had been one of the architects of the 9/11 attacks.

In addition, Donald Rumsfeld continued to refer to Abu Zubaydah as being either the number two person in al-Qaeda or someone who was closely affiliated with the number two individual in that organization. On a number of occasions, Rumsfeld described Abu Zubaydah as being a high-ranking member of al-Qaeda leadership who had been providing a variety of key services for al-Qaeda.

In 2009, the Obama Administration issued a 109-page legal brief that was in response to a habeas corpus petition that had been filed by the defense team for Abu Zubaydah. The attorneys for Abu Zubaydah wanted to have access to certain government documents that they believed indicated that Abu Zubaydah's detention in Guantanamo was illegal.

Deep within the government's aforementioned 109-page brief there were statements indicating that the government no longer considered Abu Zubaydah to be a member of al-Qaeda and no longer considered him to have had any involvement with the events of 9/11, and, as a result, the government argued that the US District Court for the District of Columbia should reject the habeas corpus petition of the defense since the documents being sought by the defense attorneys would only have legal relevance if Abu Zubaydah was a member of al-Qaeda ... which, according to the government, he wasn't and never had been.

Notwithstanding the foregoing admissions -- that is, despite acknowledging that Abu Zubaydah had never been a member of al-Qaeda and did not have anything to do with 9/11, and despite the government's admission that Abu Zubaydah had no connection to the 1998 bombings of the embassies in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania or Nairobi, Kenya and was not linked to the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole, or involved in the "Millennium" plots concerning proposed attacks on U.S targets in Los Angeles and Jordan, and despite the government's admission that Abu Zubaydah did not have knowledge

of any impending terrorist attacks -- nonetheless, the government (via a Senate Intelligence Committee report) was of the opinion that Abu Zubaydah should be held "incommunicado for the rest of his life".

Like a character in a Kafka novel, Abu Zubaydah had been tortured for years for no reason other than that Jay Bybee -- on behalf of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel -- had assured John Rizzo, the general counsel for the CIA, that it was legal for the CIA to have its way with Abu Zubaydah, and, in addition, Abu Zubaydah was being condemned to being imprisoned for life simply because he existed and because faceless people had been empowered to reduce his life to abject misery. Abu Zubaydah had become caught up in the the 9/11 delusion's pathological dimension of the Twilight Zone.

Abu Zubaydah is not the only one who has been treated in the foregoing fashion. As of 2016, there were 51 men who have been cleared of any wrong doing but who are still being detained at Guantanamo, and, in addition, there are nearly another sixty individuals who, despite more than a decade in captivity, have not been charged with any offense and very likely will never be tried because all of the "evidence" against them has been secured through torture.

In a signing statement that was affixed to the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act, President Obama claimed that the United States had the right to detain non-US citizens indefinitely. Obviously, the thinking and behavior of the former President has been as pathologically affected by the 9/11 delusion as the thinking and behavior of officials in the Bush Administration had been because there is no Primary Precedent in the Constitution (that is, a precedent derivable from: The Preamble, Article IV, Section 4, The Bill of Rights, the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1, and/or the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, Section 1) or that is derivable from international law which is capable of justifying the right that was claimed by former President Obama in 2011.

The first slippage downward into the foregoing quagmire of pathology did not begin with the 9/11 delusion. Rather, susceptibility to the latter delusion was made possible by individuals (both would-be leaders and regular citizens) who were willing to cede their moral

and intellectual agency to the way of power (or control) and, thereby, actively deny sovereignty to both themselves and others (domestically and internationally).

As stated toward the beginning of this chapter:

“In its most basic sense, “inalienable sovereignty” gives expression to two themes. The first has to do with the basic right to which all people are entitled – namely, the right to seek the truth concerning the nature of one’s relationship with Being and to act in accordance with one’s understanding of that truth.

The foregoing considerations lead to a second dimension of sovereignty involving the duty of care that is entailed by the foregoing notion of a basic right. This fundamental duty of care is a countervailing obligation that places constraints or limits on how an individual – or the collective – can proceed with respect to the exercise of their own basic rights.

This countervailing duty of care consists of efforts – both individually and collectively – to help create the conditions that are conducive to establishing, protecting, and enhancing the basic right of everyone to operate in accordance with her, his, or their own basic right to seek the truth concerning the nature of one’s relationship with Being as long as this does not interfere with, undermine, unduly influence, or deny such a basic right to others. A variety of details concerning the notion of “inalienable sovereignty” – consisting of 41 principles or conditions – can be found in either *Final Jeopardy: Sovereignty and the Reality Problem Volume V* or *Final Jeopardy: Education and the Reality Problem Volume VI*.”

When leaders presume they have the right to impose their way of thinking, feeling, and behaving on others (through public policy, defense strategies, wars, and so on), and when citizens do not properly resist that sort of thinking, feeling, and behavior, then both the oppressor and the oppressed become vulnerable to pathological ways of thinking. The 9/11 delusion was a function of the foregoing sort of vulnerability, and, as a result, many people (involving both leaders and ordinary citizens) began to think about 9/11 in a

distorted, problematic way that led to those people ignoring and misunderstanding a great deal of evidence concerning the events of that day.

Instead of engaging the events of 9/11 through republican values of: Honesty, objectivity, equanimity, impartiality, patience, fairness, tolerance, nobility, integrity, compassion, and independence, all too many individuals (both within and without the government) engaged those events through the filters of power, greed, hatred, dishonesty, bias, prejudice, impatience, fear, injustice, intolerance, and ignobility. As a result, truth was lost and the 9/11 delusion began to control the thinking, feeling, and behavior of a great many people.

Once the 9/11 delusion was firmly established (and this took place within a matter of hours and days), that condition led to crimes against peace (wars of unprovoked aggression). These crimes against peace led, in turn, to war crimes as well as crimes against humanity, and some of those crimes have been outlined at various junctures in this chapter.

However, to reiterate, the first step toward pathology were taken in conjunction with 9/11 when leaders and ordinary citizens ceded their moral and intellectual agency to anti-republican forces, conditions, and understandings that were not conducive to permitting the truth about, among other things, the events of 9/11 to be discovered, grasped, and applied. Consequently, such pathological forces, conditions, and understandings actively denied people (both domestically and internationally, leaders as well as ordinary citizens) the opportunity to pursue and realize the principles of inalienable sovereignty.

Thus, in the matter of 9/11, the denial of inalienable sovereignty began with a failure (on the part of both many leaders and ordinary citizens) to seek the truth concerning the events of 9/11. This led to the emergence of conditions conducive to the formation of the 9/11 delusion that, in turn, led to sins of omission and commission involving crimes against peace, as well as war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The only way to resolve the foregoing morass requires two actions. First, we (both individually and collectively) must become committed to seeking the truth about, among other things, 9/11

(which is why there is a need for a new, independent investigation into the events of 9/11) and, secondly, people must be willing to engage the principles of inalienable sovereignty through the filters of republican values.

Only a little bit of reflection is necessary to be able to understand that republican values overlap with, or coincide with, the moral principles that are at the heart of virtually all spiritual paths as well as various traditions of humanism. Inalienable sovereignty is about creating conditions in which truth and republican-like values have an opportunity to flourish and, thereby, assist people to pursue the truth concerning the nature of their relationship with Being.