

8 House Members View Draft Bill on Independent Science/Technology Probe of WTC 1, 2, 7 Collapses

By BARBARA ELLIS, Ph.D.
Ellis & Associates, LLC, Writing and Editing Services
Member, Scholars for 911 Truth

A draft bill setting up an independent science and technology investigation into the destruction of World Trade Center buildings 1, 2, and 7 to mandate construction-code changes was presented Sept. 16-17 in Washington D.C. for consideration to eight House members and the director and staff of the House Science and Technology committee.¹

The bill proposes a 25-member committee with subpoena power, selected from the national and international community of renown scientists, structural engineers, architects, and other technological specialists including those in demolition, advanced weaponry, and 9/11 first-responders.²

The proposed legislation was researched and authored by four members of the Scholars for 9/11 Truth organization from Oregon and Maryland.³

The pdf of the suggested bill is at the end of this article.

Presentations were made to science and technology legislative staffers of House members Reps. Rush Holt (D-NJ-12), Jay Inslee (D-WA-1), Walter Jones (R-NC-3), Dan Lipinski (D-IL-3), Jim McGovern (D-MA-3), Ed Markey (D-MA-78), Dana Rohrabacker (R-CA-46), and John Tierney (D-MA-6). Two are members of the House Science and Technology committee: Lipinski is vice chair, and Rohrabacker is the third-ranking Republican. Only one staffer (Tierney's) was disinterested. Another (Rohrabacker's) asked the presenters for an additional hour of discussion.⁴

The bill's aim is to investigate the 14 major theories about what destroyed WTC 1, 2, and 7 that have been widely circulating nationally and internationally since September 2001, and, secondly, to urge Congressional action to mandate federal building-code changes for high-rise buildings (115+ feet) both before construction or in remodeling the more than the existing 16,000.⁵

They made three points in the presentation:

- That determination of the cause(s) of WTC 1, 2, 7 collapses are vital for a federally mandated national change in building codes for high-rise structures consistent with the investigation's findings.
- That previous investigations on the collapses were either significantly limited, as was that of the 9/11 Commission in 2004 and the Federal Emergency Management agency (FEMA) in 2002. Two later studies by the National Institute

¹ "A bill to establish an independent committee of scientific and technical experts to investigate the structural failures causing the collapse on September 11, 2001 of New York City's World Trade Center's Buildings No. 1, 2, and 7, and to make recommendations for legislative action and federal regulatory changes to address such problems in present and future high-rise buildings." July 16, 2008, 1.

² *Ibid.*, 1.

³ Barry Ball, Mdiv, facilitator, Portland 9/11 Truth Alliance; Barbara Ellis, Ph.D., former professor of technical journalism, Oregon State University; Joel S. Hirschhorn, Ph.D, former professor of engineering, University of Wisconsin/Madison and senior associate in the Congressional Office of Technical Assessment; Warren Pease, BA, writer and technical editor.

⁴ Personal observation.

⁵ Patrick O'Driscoll, "High-rises remain vulnerable after 9/11." *USA TODAY*, Sept. 25, 2002 (http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/2002-09-25-high-rises-1acover_x.htm [1-3]).

of Standards and Technology (NIST)—2005 on WTC 1/2 and 2008 on WTC 7— at an estimated public cost of \$50 million have been judged by scientific and technical experts to be significantly limited, biased, and heavily flawed in fundamental research methods.⁶

- That both national and international demands are growing for a substantive science and technology investigation by an independent group to determine the collapse cause(s).

If this proposed bill—with a \$10 million price tag—is accepted by one or several House members, it will be revised for hopping in the next session of Congress and presumably assigned to the 40-member House Science and Technology committee for hearings and a vote. If passed, it will move to a House floor vote and, from there, to the Senate committee for the same process. If signed into law by the next President, the House committee will select 25-member investigation group giving it subpoena power to probe the 14 theories of collapses to determine the cause(s). They will have a six-month deadline to issue a report on findings for recommendations to Congress mandating federal codes for developers, builders, and remodelers of high-rise buildings.

The draft bill's origins stemmed from 2007 correspondence between Joel S. Hirschhorn, Ph.D. and Oregon attorney Virginia Ross. Hirschhorn was a former professor of engineering at the University of Wisconsin/Madison before becoming a Capitol Hill veteran as a senior associate at the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. He was involved in providing expertise, drafting bills, and appearing in hearings as an expert witness on technology issues. Ross is former Air Force officer and an expert and lecturer on 9/11 events, and member of the Portland 911 Truth Alliance organization.

The two were among the thousands of science and technology experts questioning as limited, significantly flawed and largely implausible preliminary reports on the WTC collapses issued by FEMA and NIST indicating fire was the cause. This conclusion has even run counter to President George Bush's press-conference statement in mid-September 2006 that "explosives" might have been planted in the three buildings. To draft and promote a bill to Congress, Ross contacted three members of Portland's 9/11 Truth Alliance: Barry Ball, Barbara G. Ellis, Ph.D., and Warren Pease.⁷

Their draft bill took months of research, discussion, and writing before the final draft was sent for review and changes to Hirschhorn and 22 nationally recognized experts either on the 9/11 event or renown in the scientific and technological fields about the collapses. Among them were three others in the vanguard of science and technology experts issuing the initial adverse verdicts on NIST's August 2008 report about the WTC 7.⁸

⁶ NIST's World Trade Center Investigation, Fact Sheets from NIST, Sept. 8, 2006 (http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/factsheet/nist_investigation_911.htm [2]). No data is available yet from NIST specifying WTC 7 research costs, but the budget proposal for laboratory projects in FY2005, the year research on No. 7 began—considered by a House/Senate conference—was \$373,372,000 (http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/budget/2005_table.htm[1]).

⁷ President George W. Bush, press conference, Sept. 15, 2006 (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/09/print/20060915-2.htm> 11-2]. []).

⁸ The three were Richard Gage, Steven Jones, Ph.D., and Kevin Ryan (Letter to Stephen Cauffman, NIST, from Richard Gage, Steven Jones, and Kevin Ryan, Sept. 15, 2008 (<http://stj911.org/blog/?p=42> [passim])).

The last step was determining which of the 435 U.S. House members might have interest in and/or expertise in building-code safety regulations or in settling the 9/11 controversy concerning the WTC collapses. That involved a content analyses of every bill that members hopped from January 2007 to August 2008 regardless of party affiliation. They followed up by the September trip to Washington, D.C. to talk to the Representative's science and technology legislative assistants.

Post 9/11 Code Changes for High-Rise Buildings

No mandatory code changes for construction or remodeling of high-rise structures (115+ feet) seem to have been made since 9/11—except New York City with its nearly 700 units—despite their proliferation in urban areas. That the federal government should step in was a point strongly made to the 9/11 Commission by a member of the newly formed Skyscraper Safety Campaign organized by first-responder survivors. SSC's first goal was:

To have a Federal Comprehensive Investigation, with subpoena power, into the collapse of the WTC, including design, construction, evacuation procedures and fire-fighting techniques.⁹

Only local and state governments have enforcement power on building codes, either by revenue from permits or heavy fines for violations—if they can afford the teeth for compliance. Or stop extortion from building inspectors overlooking violations. Most of the nation's 20,000 jurisdictions tout self-policing via a "model code" decreed by the International Code Council, an industry non-profit group said to be slow to accept changes (3-6 years) for builders and owners. Its policing powers on codes are largely an "honor" system.¹⁰

Insurance payouts for 9/11 property claims—a collective \$5.4 billion—might offer the only policing power. But they don't. Instead, they offset such payouts by charging higher premiums which, in turn, are passed on to tenants—not owners.¹¹

Both FEMA and NIST reports on the WTC collapses provided a lengthy list of recommended changes in construction and remodeling. But they were chiefly geared to fire prevention because researchers insisted fire was the only culprit. Neither agency gave credence to the other 13 possible causes which seem to have greater merit.

Outside of code changes involving fires such as installing a third stairwell, their suggestions, summed up a real-estate editor, included: "emergency access and egress, improvements to structural systems and life safety systems, vertical transportation." Specifics involve relocating parking lots, moving air intakes to

⁹ Evan Lipstein, "City moving towards improved high-rise building safety (<http://www.allbusiness.com/operations/facilities-commercial-real-estate/4506803-1.html> [1-2]). *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*, National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2004), *passim*. Sally Regenhard, Statement to the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Nov. 19, 2003

(http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/hearings/hearing5/witness_regenhard.htm [1]). *Ibid.*, 1-2. Statement of Sally Regenhard to the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, Nov. 19, 2003, Commission Archives (http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/hearings/hearing5/witness_regenhard.htm [4]). Accessed on 10 - 7 - 08

¹⁰ Eric Lipton, "Agency Fights Building Code Born of 9/11," *The New York Times*, Sept. 8, 2008

(http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/08/washington/08codes.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin [1-4]). Y

¹¹ "World Trade Center Insurance Litigation Settles for \$2B," PlanNYC: New York City Planning Information Portal, May 24, 2007 (<http://www.planyc.org/modules.php?op=modload&name=News&file=article&sid=2635> [1]).

higher floors, strengthening connections and joints in structural steel framing, toxic-material screening devices, widening stairwells and elevators, luminous markers on staircases, signal devices, bomb-proof building materials, laminated glass, and tighter security.¹²

The sticking point for applications seems to be that many developers, owners, architects, and builders have also studied the WTC disaster and remain unconvinced that fire caused the collapses or that high-rises will ever encounter such “extreme events” as a 9/11. So why should they invest any more money into additional fire measures when what they have is perceived as adequate? Even changes pertaining to fire prevention seem to confuse and/or infuriate developers, remodelers, and builders working in more than one community or state. So they often ignore them as being either unnecessary or prohibitively expensive.¹³

In New York City, however, compliance to code changes is better than most locales. Prior to 9/11, the Port Authority desperately wanted to demolish WTC 1 and 2 floor by floor because asbestos was driving off present and future tenants and corrosion could drop cladding to the street. But they obeyed the New York City’s Council which repeatedly denied them permits because the Twin Towers were tourist attractions and municipal bondholders would object to dividend losses. But expense certainly has created “bad guys” like the owners and contractors dismantling the 41-story, heavily damaged Deutsche Bank across from the WTC 2 site. It was federal safety regulators who arrived after a seven-alarm fire and revealed that the city had never issued a demolition permit for the job, nor bothered to check 44 deliberate and serious violations involving dangerous working conditions. Yet the owners and contractors have appealed the \$500 million federal fine.¹⁴

That the inspectors were from the Occupational and Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and probably will make that fine stick does suggest that federal “outsiders” are better enforcers of building codes than state and local housing inspectors. All too often inspectors are enmeshed with owners and the building industry.

As to the non-fire recommendations, high-rise tenants want parking around or under the buildings. Real estate officials have pointed out that additional fireproofing and both widening and illuminating stairwells might cost

¹² Barry B. LePatner, “Upgrading building codes post 9/11,” *Real Estate Weekly*, July 2, 2003 (http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m3601/is_48_49/ai_105369952/print?tag=artBody.col1 [1-2]). Patrick O’Driscoll, “High-rises remain vulnerable after 9/11,” *USAToday*, Sept. 25, 2002

¹³ Executive Summary, *World Trade Center Performance Study*, Federal Emergency Management Agency (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002), 4

¹⁴ Eric Darton, “The Process of Creating a Ruin,” *Business Week* (http://www.businessweek.com/print/bwdaily/dnflash/oct2001/nf2001105_5320.htm?chan=db [1-2]). Accessed on Oct. 9, 2008. Patrick Buchanan, “The Unspeakable Truth of 9/11,” ZIUA.com (<http://www.ziua.ro/f.php?data=2008-09-12&thread=242601&id=100848>[1]).

Greg Szymanski, “Ground Zero Worker and 9/11 Hero Dying of Cancer From Toxins at WTC,” *Arcticbeacon.com*, (<http://www.arcticbeacon.com/articles/20-nov-2005b.html> [1]). Accessed on 10-9-08.

“Silverstein Makes a Huge Profit off of the 9/11 Attacks,” *What Really Happened. Com* (<http://whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/silverstein.html?q=silverstein.html> [2]). “Numerous Failures Led to Fatal Fire at Deutsche Bank,” *PlanNYC: New York City Planning Information Portal*, Aug. 20, 2008 (http://www.planyc.org/print_php?sid=4558 [1]). Accessed on 10-9-08. “Huge Fines, Many Violations Found at Deutsche Bank Tower,” Feb. 20, 2008, (http://www.planyc.org/print_php?sid=3799 [1]). Accessed on 10-9-08. If dismantling expenses are significantly higher than anticipated profits, many companies will renegotiate contracts to use demolition; some prefer arson and risking prison. In the Deutsche Bank job, unexpected expenses involved careful removal of 766 pieces of human remains on the roof and bagging and shipping 41 floors of highly toxic materials to foreign repositories (Curtis, interview, Oct. 6, 2008).

\$13 million for a 42-story building and also cost them \$600 million in lost rent because of decreased floor space. The vice president of the Building Owners and Managers Association, which oversees nine billion square feet of office space, warned that the prohibitive cost of just those three code changes could cut high-rise construction significantly.¹⁵

In the ICC's September 2008 meeting, council members were shocked to discover that even the government's property manager, the General Services Administration had joined opponents of codes advocating wider stairs and adding a third staircase, illuminating them, and upgrading fireproofing.¹⁶

The rationale apparently is that both lives and billions of dollars will be saved by the common sense of waiting until an independent committee, drawn from the national and international scientific and technological professions, conducts a thorough and unadulterated investigation about the 14 possible causes of the collapses to produce accurate answers. If fire was not a cause, why upgrade fire-prevention equipment and materials? If explosives were the cause, why invest in widening staircases or adding an escape elevator? If lax security was the cause, that's where to spend.

The section below underscores widespread doubts about the credibility of the FEMA and NIST reports reflected by the reticence to pour billions into fire prevention. It also strongly indicates what can happen to professional integrity and objectivity under an Administration now known to politicize and undermine agencies protecting Americans whether it's the Food and Drug Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, or the Justice Department. It is difficult not to conclude that research results were mandated to fit around the finding that fire alone caused the collapses. And that previously courageous and dedicated public servants yielded to those pressures. That is why a fresh and independent team able to withstand such pressures is vitally necessary to conduct this new investigation—and without fear or favor let the chips fall where they may.

Significantly Flawed Research by FEMA and NIST

Scarcely had the 9/11 evidence of beams, columns and cladding been shipped to Asian ports for scrap than questions about what happened at Ground Zero and the Pentagon began whipping around the world. In the U.S. when the mainstream media failed to provide credible answers about the perpetrators and the Administration started classifying non-military information, millions raced down the Internet's busy highway of "blast lists" and websites to learn or share any scrap of explanation about the event. They did not accept the Administration's explanation that 19 Arabs who could scarcely fly used box cutters to hijack four airliners and destroy the WTC and part of the Pentagon.

Users ranged from engineers, scientists, clergy, and professors to activists, ordinary people—and four women ("the Jersey Girls") widowed by the collapses of WTC 1 and 2. All wanted to know why the Twin Towers disintegrated into the dust of volcanic-like explosions in less than 11 seconds instead of surviving like the Empire State Building had in 1945 when hit by a B-25. Or if they knew about

¹⁵ Eric Lipton, "Agency Fights Building Code Born of 9/11," *The New York Times*, Sept. 8, 2008 (http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/08/washington/08codes.html?_r=1&pagewanted=print&oref=slogin [3]). Accessed on 10 - 7 - 08.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, [1].

WTC 7—which was not attacked—came down at 5:20 p.m. that in less than 7 seconds in its own footprint, a spectacular collapse exactly like planned demolitions of expendable buildings.¹⁷

Many skeptics became amateur detectives or scholarly researchers. It wasn't long before they discovered the neo-conservatives' 2000 tract *Rebuilding America's Defenses* and its shattering message that for the United States to dominate the world—especially with its “vital interests” (aka oil) in the Middle East—a “new Pearl Harbor” might be necessary and would boost its state-of-the-art defense systems. For historians and political experts around the world, that finding set off uneasy parallels between 9/11 and the Bush Administration and the 1933 Reichstag fire and Adolph Hitler's rise to power.¹⁸

Structural engineers, architects, scientists and those in fire science were unsatisfied with the first investigation about the collapses done by FEMA in 2002—and began to say so at professional meetings and in classrooms. Its cursory report on WTC 1 and 2 had ended at the point of impact and blamed their blaming collapses on fire melting the buildings' steel framing. They hedged on No. 7: “The specifics of the fires in WTC 7 and how they caused the building to collapse remain unknown at this time.”¹⁹

Both FEMA and, then, NIST acknowledged that no steel-framed high-rise building—12 to 110 stories—had ever collapsed because of fire, but insisted the WTC collapses were “firsts.” This claim flies in the face of fire history for high-rises, known for a century by engineers, architects, and builders That includes the horrific Triangle Shirtwaist fire of 1911 in the 12-story iron-and-steel framed Asch Building, now a New York University classroom structure. Or that 1933 Reichstag fire which gutted the interior, but the steel frame and stone exterior survived even World War II's carpet bombings. Or that foggy Saturday morning in 1945 when a B-25 hit the Empire State Building and fired the 78th, 79th and basement. Or Madrid's 2005 Windsor inferno that gutted a 32-story office building after a two-day blaze—temperatures reaching 1,432°F. Its steel-reinforced concrete frame and rebar-reinforced concrete columns held firm for 17 floors and even retaining a crane on the roof doing repairs.²⁰

¹⁷ The Jersey Girls are Kristen Breitweiser, Patty Casazza, Lorie Van Auken, and Mindy Kleinberg. Sheryl Gay Stolberg, “9/11 Widows Skillfully Applied The Power of a Question: Why?” *The New York Times*, April 1, 2004, (<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C04E2DC1539F932A35757C0A9629C8B63&sec=&spone=&pagewanted=print> [1-2]).

¹⁸ Paul Wolfowitz, *Rebuilding America's Defenses*, Project for a New American Century, September 2000, 51. Wolfowitz wrote: “Further, the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor.” Alan Bullock and William Foote Whyte, “Hitler, Adolph,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Macropaedia, 15th Ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979), VIII, 967.

¹⁹ Ramon Gilsanz, Edward M. DePaola, Christopher Marrion, Harold “Bud” Nelson, *World Trade Center Performance Study*, Federal Emergency Management Agency (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002), Chapter 5, 1, 20. *Ibid.*, Chapter 5, 1, 31.

²⁰ *Ibid.* Michael E. Newman, “Latest Findings from NIST World Trade Center Investigation Released Probable Collapse Sequences for Both Towers Finalized; Reports Issued for Three Projects,” NIST news release, April 5, 2005 (http://www.nist.gov/public_affairs/releases/wtc_briefing_april0505.htm [1]). Fact Sheets, NIST and the World Trade Center, Aug. 30, 2006 (www.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm [2-3]). Department of Commerce (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office: August 2006), xxxi. NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), 43. “The Brown Building,” Landmark Preservation Commission, March 25, 2003 (<http://72.14.205.104/search?q=cache:s3T7O2qQpiAJ:www.nyc.gov/html/lpc/downloads/pdf/reports/brown.pdf+Asc+h+building%27s+construction&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us>, [2-3]). http://newsimg.bbc.co.uk/media/images/38615000/jpg/_38615905_reichstag_300ap.jpg; <http://www.downtheallotment.merseyblogs.co.uk/berlinersgrowveginshadowofruinedreichstag.jpg>). William Roberts, “July 28, 1945—Plane Hits Building—Woman Survives 75-Story Fall,” *Elevator World*, March 1, 1996 (<http://www.elevator-world.com/magazine/archive01/9603-002.htm> [5]). One of the B-25 engines dropped into an elevator shaft. Harold Heckle and Mar Roman, “High-Rise Office Building in Downtown Madrid, Spain Engulfed by Flames, Top Floors Collapse,” Associated Press, Feb. 13, 2005,

Fires, no matter how hot, do not melt steel in columns, beams, or flooring. Metallurgists have estimated the melting point of the structural steel alloy used in the WTC complex ranged from 2,500°F to 2,800°F. FEMA did not venture an estimate on the fires' maximum temperatures. But NIST did in the 2005 report on WTC 1 and 2: a maximum of 1,837°F. WTC 7 burned for seven hours, ample time for firefighters to ascertain temperatures. Researchers either didn't ask them for that information or ignored it.²¹

Incredibly, NIST's 2008 report on No. 7 relied on guesses about the combustible "loading" on the 11th and 12th floor from a pair of 13th floor tenants, two American Express managers who were not just qualified to render such a judgment, but were not in the building. Even more remarkable for a multi-million-dollar, supposedly scientific/technological study, NIST resorted to a computer simulation of the fires that placed the range between 392°F to 1,652°F. As if software could emulate actual conditions.²²

Worse for FEMA/NIST researchers, near the end of their study, a mid-afternoon seven-hour, seven-alarm blaze broke out on August 18, 2007 in the 41-story, steel-framed Deutsche Bank building across the street from the WTC 2 site. Opened a year after the Towers (1974), it was built under most of the same codes. It was undergoing floor-by-floor dismantling after six years of being shrouded from heavy 9/11 damage.²³

By the time dismantling had reached the 26th floor, a departing worker on the 17th floor reportedly flung a cigarette into debris. It set off a conflagration that involving 70 fire companies and caused two firefighters' deaths. The fire was fed by oxygen pouring into open areas and air shafts and raged through the 13th to 18th floors. Like WTC 7, water was initially unavailable, but not because of a broken water main. Firefighters faced a vandalized standpipe and, unlike those at WTC 7, found other water sources. Despite its flaming ordeal, the bank remained standing. The official verdict was: "Buildings inspectors and forensic engineers have determined that the building is structurally sound and not in danger of collapse."²⁴

Back in spring 2003, the Bush Administration apparently hoped the FEMA report and the attack and occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan would divert public attention from the WTC collapses. Those hopes now were dashed by a massive body of evidence about 9/11 being spread around the globe that neither aircraft nor fires could have caused the collapses.

Increasing suspicions about the government's growing ferocious secrecy about 9/11 triggered a small publishing industry (Michael Ruppert's *Crossing the Rubicon*, David Ray Griffin's *The New Pearl Harbor*, etc.). Filmmakers began

(<http://cms.firehouse.com/content/article/printer.jsp?id=39297> [1]). "Madrid Windsor fire: the Arup view," ND, (<http://www.arup.com/fire/feature.cfm?pageid=6150> [passim]).

²¹ Brian Kross, "What's the melting point of steel?" Jefferson Lab, ND, (http://education.lab.org/qa/meltingpoint_01.html). Jim Hoffman, "The Twin Tower Demolition," *9-11 Review*, ND, (www.911review.com/coverup/fantasy/melting.html). Joan Killough-Miller, "The 'Deep Mystery' of Melted Steel," *WPItransformations*, Spring 2002, (www.wpi.edu/News/Transformations/2002Spring/steel). Fact Sheets, NIST and the World Trade Center, Aug. 30, 2006, 4, (wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm). *World Trade Center Building Performance Study: Data Collection, Preliminary Observations, and Recommendations*, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration for the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, May 2002), passim. NIST NCSTAR, 1-9, *Final Report on the Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7: Federal Building and Fire Safety Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, August 2008), 55.

²² NIST NCSTAR 1A, *ibid.*, 48.

²³ "NYC Gov't Update On Cause Of Deutsche Bank Fire," *4HD wnbc.com*, ND, (<http://www.wnbc.com/news/13935311/detail.html> [1]).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

making DVD documentaries (*Loose Change, 9/11 Revisited*). Accusatory T-shirts appeared (“9/11 Was an Inside Job”), followed by the start of hundreds of 9/11 Truth groups and professional organizations (Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth, Pilots for 9/11 Truth, Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice, etc). Such interest launched a speaker circuit of experts from the scientific, technological, and military fields. None attributed collapses to fire. They championed an array of far more likely causes ranging from planned implosions using thermate or fissionable compounds to missiles and directed-energy weaponry.²⁵

It didn’t help that the Bush Administration had inexplicably stalled off for months the public’s outcry for a definitive investigation, especially the Jersey Girls. They were unafraid of hounding the President and Congress for action. Congress finally set up a low-budget (initially, \$14 million) 9/11 Commission with the curious order not to blame anyone for the attacks except terrorists. The Commission had no power to demand witnesses be sworn, including President Bush with Vice President Cheney at his elbow. Worse for objectivity, commissioners were chiefly loyal Administration “insiders.” None were drawn from the ranks of science or technology professionals. Work was largely done by an obedient 75-member staff of which more than half were former employees of the CIA, FBI, and Justice Department. They took nearly two years to produce a 567-paged report in 2004 that offered little to explain the collapse causes, and even failed to mention WTC 7.²⁶

Faced with lying and/or uncooperative witnesses, angry politicians, outspoken pro-Bush cohorts, White House obstruction and penury, contradictory testimony, and mountains of vital documents classified. Small wonder that co-chairs Thomas Kean and Lee Hamilton finally admitted they were “set up to fail” in preventing both a White House whitewash and cover-up on accountability.²⁷

When the report appeared, a firestorm of doubt and protests erupted from legions of professionals and lay experts—and the Jersey Girls. They found it significantly incomplete, biased, and deceitful. Accusations began that the Bush Administration used 9/11 as a pretext invading, occupying, and terrorizing Iraq out of its vast oil reserves and for shredding the U.S. Constitution’s guarantee of civil liberties.

As for the Administration, after doubts had been raised about FEMA’s 2002, it tossed the credibility problem to NIST to establish legitimacy to their “official” story with an in-depth scientific and engineering study—on FEMA’s budget. Because its researchers and consultants apparently valued federal contracts and/or careers, they seemed to pick up on the Administration cues about preordained results about the collapse causes—and obeyed. Fire destroyed WTC 1 and 2.²⁸

Its verdict about fire was to bring incredulity and even scorn from peers, but a lawsuit from a former professor of mechanical engineering at a major university. The Request for Correction by Judy Wood, Ph.D. charged NIST with

²⁵ Personal observations. Michael B. Green, Ph.D., ““Loose Change”: An Analysis,” *9-11Research*, Aug. 3, 2005, 1-19 (http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/green/loose_change.html).

²⁶ David Ray Griffin, *Debunking 9/11 Debunking*, (Northampton MA: Olive Branch Press, 2007, 30-31. *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*, National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2004), *passim*; *ibid.*, 339-360; *ibid. passim*.

²⁷ CBC News, August 21, 2006, <http://www.cbc.ca/sunday/911hamilton.html> [NPI]. *Without Precedent: The Inside Story of the 9/11 Commission* (New York: Knopf, 2006)

(<http://www.independent.org/printer.asp?page=%2Fnewsroom%2Farticle%2Easp?id=1785> [*passim*]).

²⁸ NIST 2008 Report (NIST NCSTAR 1A), xxv. Personal observations.

“...fraud and deception, and shows clear evidence that the entire WTC [complex] was destroyed by directed energy weaponry (DEW).” After all, it was remarkably unusual that the Towers had left no rubble except cladding and had been largely reduced to curb-high dust. DEWs’ energy force molecules to burst apart and become dust when targeting steel, concrete, and combustibles. “Dustification” had occurred, she said.²⁹

WTC 7 was a 47-story building, privately built in 1985 and owned by real-estate tycoon Larry Silverstein. He’d only been leaseholder for the rest of the WTC complex for less than two weeks on 9/11. It was not attacked, but like the 8-story WTC 6 directly across the street, had withstood a torrent of fiery debris on its roof from WTC 1. On the late afternoon of 9/11 both BBC and CNN reporters announced No. 7 had collapsed although it was visible over their shoulders. At 5:20 p.m., it collapsed in 6.5-seconds into its foundation. It left a five-story pile of rubble, including pools of molten metal that were to burn for weeks.³⁰

Despite its spectacular visual demise, it suffered an immediate blackout from mainstream media. The 9/11 Commission report never mentioned it. Until 2006 when it “starred” in the video *9/11 Revisited: Scientific and Ethical Questions*, most Americans were unaware that a third WTC skyscraper had been destroyed indicating just how successful the blackout was.³¹

That video perhaps was the most unsettling to 9/11 perpetrators and possibly still the greatest recruiting tool for the 9/11 movement. It was an illustrated lecture by a Utah physics professor, Steven E. Jones, Ph.D. In it, he said that particles of the high-tech explosive compound thermate had been found at the No. 7 site. This cutting-charge mixture (thermite, sulfur, barium nitrate), once ignited, quickly reaches 4500°F and easily slices through steel. The powder comes in bags like bark dust and, now, in spray form. If it could be used to turn discarded railroad tracks into melted scrap, it could do the same on the WTC buildings’ 20-ton beams and 50-ton columns. Besides, thermate is easier to plant than dynamite or the high-yield explosive RDX and does it work silently, but leaves pools of molten iron. In weighing these factors, Jones concluded WTC 7 was brought down by a standard controlled demolition procedure—probably with thermate.³²

Whether thermate or nuclear materials, missiles or DEW weapons were used on No. 7, it became obvious that unlocking the cause of that collapse might well reveal the mystery of what had happened to No. 1 and 2. After all, the Towers had collapsed into mostly dust also in astounding time: under 11 seconds at free-fall speed—and almost exactly in their own footprints, too.

²⁹ Wood v. National Institute of Standards and Technology, filed March 16, 29, April 30, 20007(<http://www.opednews.com/maxwrite/linkframe.php?linkid=39384> [16]).

³⁰ NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), xxi. CNN at 4:10 p.m. 9/11/01 (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N1LetB0z8_o). BBC at 4:57 p.m. 9/11/01 (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6mxFRigYD3s&feature=related>).

³¹ *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*, National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2004), *passim*. Personal observations.

³² *9/11 Revisited*. Richard Gage, AIA, “Undisputed Facts Point to the Controlled Demolition of WTC 7: Response to NIST’s Invitation for Written Comments, Dec. 31, 2007

(<http://209.85.173.104/search?q=cache:j7vYHu3bcUoJ:wtc.nist.gov/media/AE911Truth-NIST-Written-Submission12-18-07.pdf+Undisputed+Facts+Point+to+the+Controlled+Demolition+of+WTC+7&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us> [2]).

———, “The WTC Demolition,” *Take Our World Back*, March 31, 2007

(<http://www.takeourworldback.com/wtcdemolition.htm> [3]). Steven Jones and *9/11 Revisited*,

(http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=printer_friendly&forum=364&topic_id=305772 [1-3]).

An overwhelming din of questions arose about No. 7, along with statements from national and international demolition specialists that its collapse indeed was a controlled implosion. Those conclusions set off the distribution of thousands of postcards depicting the second-by-second drop. Jones and others soon were talking about WTC 7 on talk shows and the 9/11 speaker circuit.³³

The Administration seems to have foreseen this backlash and had handed off explaining the collapse to NIST in 2005. Its team of in-house researchers and “private-sector technical experts” knew what was expected: WTC 7’s collapse was blamed on fire. The report was released without fanfare in August 2008 with the revealing caveat it wasn’t complete “due to the loss of records over time and due to the collapses.” They “firmly” declared:

WTC 7 collapsed due to uncontrolled fires with characteristics similar to previous fires in tall buildings....Had a water supply for the automatic sprinkler system been available and had the sprinkler system operated as designed, it is likely that fires in WTC 7 would have been controlled and the collapse prevented.³⁴

They stunned outside peers by limiting explosives to RDX, quickly ruling it out. Rather than do field testing, they relied upon video soundtracks of the collapse and computer simulations to conclude:

The soundtracks...did not contain any sound as intense as would have accompanied such a blast. Therefore, the Investigation Team concluded that there was no demolition-type blast that would have been intense enough to lead to the collapse of WTC 7 on September 11, 2001.³⁵

For all the fire claims by FEMA and NIST, their researchers somehow failed to explore the obvious possibility that arson—particularly in WTC 7—might have been used to cover the use of “silent” explosives such as thermate. Under any other circumstances, fire inspectors and insurance detectives would have suspected arson because of the fire’s curious starting point (the building’s midsection) and subsequent routes. Nor were questions asked about the unusually quick \$861 million insurance settlement for Silverstein.³⁶

NIST’s research expenses for both 2005 and 2008 reports had been covered by FEMA and it was highly unlikely it would contradict FEMA’s 2002 verdict about causes: “[It]...was due primarily to fire, rather than any impact damage

³³ Personal observations. . European demolition experts included Hugo Bachmann, Ph.D, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology and Danny Jowenko, proprietor of the Netherlands’ Jowenko Explosieve Demolitie, B.V (<http://educateyourself.org/cn/collapseofWTCeyewitness> and <http://www.pumpitout.com>).

³⁴ Fact Sheets, NIST and the World Trade Center, Aug. 30, 2006 (wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm [1]). Department of Commerce (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office: August 2006), xxxi. NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), 43.

³⁵ Interview with Linda Curtis, fire/arson investigator for Portland OR, Oct. 6, 2008 “Silverstein May Use Insurance Money to Pay Bondholders,” *Insurance Journal*, June 7, 2002 (http://www.insurancejournal.com/news/east/2002/06/07/15925.htm?print_1 [1]).

³⁶ WTC 7’s mortgage worth was \$386 million. Sleuths for the insurer, Industrial Risk Insurers, certainly read FEMA’s indecisive verdict on the collapse because Silverstein sued them for \$861 million—a profit of \$475 million. That they settled so quickly—February 2002, five months after 9/11—instead of fighting the claim for years had to have raised eyebrows among arson detectives, insurance adjusters, and most of the insurers’ stockholders (“Silverstein May Use Insurance Money to Pay Bondholders,” *Insurance Journal*, June 7, 2002.

from the collapsing towers....It is likely that fires started as a result of debris from the collapse of WTC 1." The NIST report seconded that notion.³⁷

However, it is doubtful that most arson inspectors or experts would have agreed with the results on WTC 7, just in reading the report. For one thing, no entrance point for flaming debris or sparks existed. No open rooftop doors, no blown-out windows from interior heat, and no fire alarms going off. One of NIST's exhibits showed that on 9/11 the entire fire-alarm system had been "placed on test" at 6:47:42 a.m. for "routine maintenance." Researchers apparently saw nothing amiss in the log operator ("DYJ") calmly reporting "completing test over" at 14:48:22 (2:48:22). The last firefighter presumably was gone and adequate time was left for experienced arsonists to complete a job.³⁸

The report stated that at 11:30 a.m., firefighters discovered no water was available (broken city water mains) except for a sprinkler tank on the 46th floor. Presumably, they were hunting a source to hose off the building's exterior.³⁹

But, suddenly at 12:10 p.m., small fires started in the building's midsection—Floors 19, 22, 29, and 30. Though these blazes blew out a few windows and admitted oxygen, they "did not spread far before dying out," thanks to the sprinklers, the report stated. Then, at 2 o'clock small fires sprang up between Floors 7 and 13—below the sprinkler system's reach, the report stated. With no water from below or above, the remaining firefighters were ordered to leave at 2:30 because someone had concluded saving the building was an impossibility. And so the fires continued to burn.⁴⁰

As yet, no one has questioned why firefighters were not permitted to extinguish the fires. Or why firefighters and lawmen had surrounded the building from noon on, warning bystanders the building was going to fall. Or why a countdown to the 5:20 collapse was clearly overheard on the street.

After the release of the *9/11 Revisited* video, suspicions went around the globe, not about arson, but about Silverstein's possible pre-planned demolition of all three buildings to save millions on repairs should terrorists attempt a repeat of the 1993 bombing of WTC 1 and 2. Repairs had come to \$700 million. The Port Authority had told bidders on the lease during the 2000 negotiations that asbestos removal and cladding replacement for WTC 1 and 2 probably would cost at least \$200 million and plumbing/electrical upgrades might bring the total to \$800 million. Silverstein's 15-year old WTC 7 also needed asbestos removal and utility upgrades. Yet a year later on the PBS 9/11 special *America Rebuilds* he recalled that he told the fire commander around 5 o'clock on 9/11: "We've had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it. And they [sic] made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse."⁴¹

³⁷ Ramon Gilsanz, Edward M. DePaola, Christopher Marrion, Harold "Bud" Nelson, *World Trade Center Performance Study*, Federal Emergency Management Agency (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2002), Chapter 5, 1, 20. NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), 14, 16-19.

³⁸ NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1), 13-19. NIST 2005 Report (NIST NCSTAR 1-4C (<http://wtc.nist.gov/NISTNCSTAR1CollapseofTowers.pdf> [107])). "Timeline: WTC 7, BBC News, ND (http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk/mpapps/pagetools/print/news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/conspiracy_files/7437516.stm [1]). Accessed on 10-9-08□.

³⁹ NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), 14, 16-19. The building was evacuated by 4,000 people within an hour, beginning at 9:45 a.m. (*ibid.*, 14, 16).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁴¹ Charles V. Bagli, "Developer Scrambles to Save World Trade Center Deal," *The New York Times* (<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C0E6DE1539F935A15757C0A9679C8863&sec=&spone=&pagewanted=print> [1]). Eric Darton, "The Process of Creating a Ruin," *Business Week*

Any long-time developer like Silverstein knew the verb “pull” was a demolition term—and he’d used it twice. His spokesman tried to cover that slip by explaining it referred to pulling *firefighters* from the building, though all 4,000 tenants had fled by 10:30 a.m., all firefighters were out by 2:30 p.m. Considering the time involved in preparing a demolition of a building that size, it was plain to demolition and building experts that No. 7 had to have been rigged long before 9/11.⁴²

None of these factors seemed to concern NIST’s researchers as they moved toward their 2008 deadline on the WTC 7 report. And they had been warned about their research methodology. One architect tracking their progress up to late 2007 had warned they were performing substandard and biased work that would negate conclusions. Left unsaid was that such flaws would also harm the Institute’s reputation as a credible source by Congress and subsequent Administrations.⁴³

The warning may have explained the low-profile of the report’s release in August 2008. It was immediately met by withering criticism about those methods and credibility from 16 national and international experts in structural engineering, architecture, physics, and chemistry. Thousands more probably would have joined them had NIST permitted more than a three-week review of the 1,000-page document and demanding \$19,000 for photographic evidence of WTC 7. That such behavior smelled of “cover-up science” was indicated by emails between two members of that group:

NIST employs numerous tactics to distance their research and themselves from public scrutiny while giving the semblance of actual interaction with the public. NIST has never allowed scientists, engineers, architects to directly question them on camera, allowing only time-limited Web casts (advertised only a day in advance) during which they will deal with technical questions submitted by email only if they have time or feel like answering them.

They open themselves up a little more to career reporters from the mainstream media, but largely these reporters were selected by their media companies—perhaps in part because they would not ask tough questions. (This certainly was the pattern of behavior exhibited at the August 21, 2008 press conference coinciding with NIST’s release of their report on Building 7.)

NIST publishes extremely long documents that virtually nobody would bother absorbing (1,000 pages for their WTC 7 report). NIST makes the false promise that it would discuss these matters once the report has been released, but NIST has already denied me a chance to interview them.⁴⁴

(http://www.businessweek.com/print/bwdaily/dnflash/oct2001/nf2001105_5320.htm?chan=db [2]. Accessed on Oct. 9, 2009. ‘America Rebuilds’—World Trade Center Clean-Up & Future, PBS TV, Sept. 10, 2002

(www.pbs.org/americarebuilds/imagining/index.html [1]).

⁴² NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), 51. “WTC Owner Larry Silverstein gave order to “pull” Building 7” (www.youtube.com/watch?v=C3E-26oVIlI). “ ‘Pulling’ Building 7” (<http://www.wtc7.net/pullit.html> [1]).

⁴³ Richard Gage, “Undisputed Facts Point to the Controlled Demolition of WTC 7: Response to NIST’s Invitation for Written Comments, Dec. 31, 2007

(<http://209.85.173.104/search?q=cache:J7vYHu3bcUoJ:wtc.nist.gov/media/AE911Truth-NIST-Written-Submission12-18-07.pdf+Undisputed+Facts+Point+to+the+Controlled+Demolition+of+WTC+7&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=1&gl=us> [*passim*]). Accessed on 10 - 1 - 08.

⁴⁴ NIST 2008 Report (NCSTAR 1A), *passim*. Letter from James R. Gourley, Tony Szamboti, Richard Gage, Graeme MacQueen, Ph.D., Steven Jones, Ph.D., Kevin Ryan, Niels Harrit, Ph.D., Ron Brookman, Chris Sarns, Kamal Obeid, SE PE, Scott Grainger, PE, Frank Legge, Bob Fischer, Justin Keogh, David Chandler, Gregg Roberts, “Scientists, Scholars,

They were also scored on already known and obvious omissions (foreknowledge of collapse, silent demolition compounds such as thermate) However, the major attack was on their sole reliance on computer tests that were rigged to imitate “the highest temperatures [of fires] and the most amount of structural damage” and trying to hide that fact. The last straw was NIST’s refusal to provide peers with the models and data. The first rule in any scientific or technological project is that experiments must be replicable anywhere in the world to be accepted as credible ⁴⁵

A separate and equally scathing verdict from a chemist encapsulated the objections:

The 9/11 Commission told us that the attacks on September 11th succeeded ultimately because of a “failure of imagination.” NIST will never be accused of that kind of failure, as its new WTC 7 report is nothing but imaginary tripe.

This new story contradicts the previous major claims by NIST, ignores the most important of the existing evidence, produces no scientific test results to support itself, and is so obviously false on its face that not even a fictional character from another planet would believe it.

Fires that could only last 2 to 30 minutes lasted 4 hours (what was burning?). Imaginary temperatures that, according to NIST would have easily weakened the same steel in the towers, left beams fully rigid so that they could push one girder a full 2.2 inches, somehow breaking numerous bolts and studs in unison, as well as buckling the girder, before the beams themselves were affected in any way. Suddenly, this one-girder failure caused numerous floors to collapse, one hair-trigger “switch” column to buckle, and the whole building to fall in a total of 8 seconds.⁴⁶

It was plain to outside peers that NIST once again had fiddled results around White House policy concerning 9/11. A major overhaul of the entire study was strongly recommended before publication. Compliance is unlikely because that would mean scrapping the report.

In short, any accurate, objective, and definitive investigation about the collapses will require a truly independent investigation by other experts in science and technology who will be far removed from the influence of FEMA, NIST—and the White House.

New Probe Is Demanded

A new investigation about the collapse causes is not only needed, but wanted by a growing national and international chorus of bellicose peers as well as public figures all demanding a new investigation.

NIST’s chief of Fire Science Division, Jamers Quintiere, Ph.D., resigned over the research quality for the 2005 report and joined 1,550 peers calling for a

Architects & Engineers respond to NIST,” STJ911 Blog, Sept. 17, 2008 (<http://stj911.org/blog/?p=42> [*passim*]). Email from Shane Geiger to Richard Gage, Sept. 30, 2008.

⁴⁵ (Letter to Stephen Cauffman, NIST, from James R. Gourley, *et al.*, Sept. 15, 2008 (<http://stj911.org/blog/?p=42> [*passim*])).

⁴⁶ Kevin Ryan, “The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science Reaches Its Peak,” 911 Blogger, Sep. 11, 2008, (<http://www.911blogger.com/node/17704> [*passim*])). Cartoons ridiculing the report began appearing on the Internet, circulated by those who have never have believed the results of *any* government-sponsored report on the WTC collapses (S. Harris cartoon, “NIST: “Then a Miracle Occurs,” George Washington, Aug. 21, 2008, (http://www.opednews.com/maxwrite/print_friendly.php?p=NIST--Then-a-Miracle-Occu-by-George-Washington-080821-583.html [1])).

second “real” investigation. They ranged from the military, intelligence agencies and pilots to scientists, engineers, architects, scholars as well as first-responders and 9/11 victims’ families. Some 280 architects and engineers from that group and more than 2,000 affiliates and university majors also are now petitioning Congress for a scientific and technical investigation about the collapses.⁴⁷

International critics began speaking out. Former president of Italy Francesco Cossiga told a major Rome daily in late November 2007 that it was common knowledge among global intelligence agencies that the Central Intelligence Agency and Mossad, Israel’s counterpart, had done the attacks to get Western powers to control Iraq and Afghanistan. Japan’s minority party leader Yukihisa Fujita was televised nationally in the Diet in January 2008 demanding it conduct an investigation on behalf of the 24 nationals who died in the attacks. In Canada last June, the New Democratic Party Deputy House Leader, Libby Davies, presented a petition from 500 Canadians to launch its own investigation (24 dead Canadians), and to “pursue the guilty parties in the international courts.” That was the view also of an Italian member of the European Union’s Parliament, Giulietta Chiesa, who wants an international tribunal.⁴⁸

In the U.S., the outcry for a second investigation is monumental set against a poll showing 84% doubt the Administration’s official story about 9/11. Manhattan canvassers from a 9/11 group have started the ball rolling by gathering 25,000 signatures toward the 30,000 needed to get a referendum measure for a 2009 special election in New York City establishing a privately funded, subpoena-powered independent 9/11 commission.⁴⁹

A tsunami of supporters for a substantive investigation has come from the Jersey Girls, former United Nations weapons inspector Scott Ritter both co-chairs of the 9/11 Commission, but a host of national figures: writer Gore Vidal, actor Ed Asner, former Senators Lincoln Chafee and Mike Gravel, former Minnesota Governor Jesse Ventura (a onetime demolition expert in the Navy Seals), presidential candidates Reps. Dennis Kucinich and Ron Paul, former Rep. Cynthia McKinney, Ralph Nader, U.S. House candidate Cindy Sheehan, Daniel Ellsberg, MD (of Pentagon Papers fame), the Green party, and Arizona state senator Karen S. Johnson. And if elected president Nov. 4, Democratic Sen. Barack Obama vowed he would take action (“...if I found out that there were high officials who knowingly, consciously broke existing laws, engaged in cover-ups of those crimes with knowledge forefront...”).⁵⁰

⁴⁷ Alan Miller, “Seven Senior Federal Engineers and Scientists Call for New 9/11 Investigation,” *OpEdNews*, Dec. 13, 2007 (http://www.opednews.com/maxwrite/print_friendly.php?p=genera_alan_mil_071211_seven_senior_federal.htm [3]). Bill Willers, “Why Are ‘Progressive’ Media Burying 9/11?” *OpEdNews*, July 11, 2008 (http://www.opednews.com/maxwrite/print_friendly.php?p=Why-Are--Progressive--Medi-by-Bill-Willers-080711-105.html [1]). “Seven Senior...,” *op. cit.*, 4.

⁴⁸ Interview, *Corriere della Sera*, Nov. 30, 2007. Philip Dru, “Transcript of Japanese Parliament’s 9/11 Testimony,” Jan. 14, 2008, New World Order Truth, ([http://www.nwotruth.com/transcript-of-japanese-parliaments-911-testimony\[passim\]](http://www.nwotruth.com/transcript-of-japanese-parliaments-911-testimony[passim])). Drew Nofle, “Petition to Investigate 9/11 Read in Canadian Parliament,” June 13, 2008 (http://www.911truth.org/article_for_printing.php?story=2008061583720429 [1-2]). Kiwi Clare, “Russia Will Televis 911 Truth on Sept. 11,” *PrisonPlanet Forum*, Sept. 9, 2008. (<http://forum.prisonplanet.com/index.php?action=printpage.topic=57924.0> [1]).

⁴⁹ The New York Times/CBS News, Oct. 5-8, 2006. *Without Precedent: The Inside Story of the 9/11 Commission* (New York: Knopf, 2006) (<http://www.independent.org/printer.asp?page=%2Fnewsroom%2Farticle%2Easp?id=1785> [passim]). ———, “Ed Asner Wants Ballot Referendum for New 9/11 Probe,” *gothamist*, Aug. 13, 2008, (http://gothamist.com/2008/08/13/ed_asner_wants_ballot_referendum_fo.php [1]).

⁵⁰ Nick Juliano, “9/11 widows call for new investigation after revelations of White House, commission ties,” *therawstory*, Feb. 5, 2008, (<http://rawstory.com/printstory.php?story=9156> [1]). 9/11 co-chairs Kean and Hamilton have declared that an independent second investigation of experts, rather than political appointees, was vital to getting at the truth about 9/11 and accountability.⁵⁰

The proposed new bill to investigate 14 possible causes of the WTC collapses provides Congress and a new Administration a major avenue to stave off the embarrassment of international inquiries and tribunals. More importantly, however, it provides a second chance to rectify the heavily discredited, significantly limited studies of FEMA and NIST and the Administration's questionable concealing of most WTC data as a national security risk. If builders and owners cannot find out what caused the collapses of WTC 1, 2, and 7, what kind of construction codes can protect tenants and property against future attacks? Biased and implausible research combined with indefensible secrecy can only continue and intensify the current public and professional charges that "9/11 Was An Inside Job." And cast doubt on the veracity of any research contracted to FEMA and/or NIST.

These are much the same conditions that have confronted juries or truth seekers for centuries. But ultimately as Galileo's work proved, truth has a way of slipping through the most suppressive and censorious hands. As the poet (and retired censor) John Milton observed nearly four centuries ago:

Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter.⁵¹

Whatever the outcome in this proposed investigation, at least definitive information helpful for safety protection—other than fire—in high-rise buildings is likely to emerge. It may also lay to rest once and for all whether 9/11 was an inside job.

Aaron Dykes, "Gore Vidal Calls for New 9/11 Investigation 'Before We Find Our Leaders Dragged Off to The Hague in Chains'," *Jones Report*, Nov. 2, 2006 (http://www.jonesreport.com/articles/021106_vidal.html [2]).———, "Ed Asner Wants Ballot Referendum for New 9/11 Probe," *gothamist*, Aug. 13, 2008, (http://gothamist.com/2008/08/13/ed_asner_wants_ballot_referendum_fo.php [1]). Sen. Mike Gravel, "The Real Lessons of 9/11," *The Huffington Post*, Oct. 3, 2008 (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sen-mike-gravel/the-real-lessons-of-911_b_63733.html?view=print [1]). Carly Zander, "Former Governor Jesse Ventura Says WTC Collapse a Controlled Demolition," *Send2Press*, April 3, 2008 (http://send2press.com/newswire/print/news_2008-04-0403-004.shtml [1]). Justin Martell, "Dennis Kucinich—'Because I can, I will' investigate aspects of 9/11," 911truth.org (<http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20070406830339464> [1]).———, "Ron Paul Wants New 9/11 Investigation," *Operation Awakening*, April 4, 2008, (<http://operationawakening.wordpress.com/2008/04/04/ron-paul-wants-new-911-investigation> [1]). Scott McLarty and Starlene Rankin, "Greens express support for Cynthia McKinney's call for a new investigation and release of 9/11 files..." *Green Party.org*, Sept. 11, 2008 ([1-2]). Steve Watson, interview with Ralph Nader, Infowars website, Sept. 11, 2008 (<http://www.infowars.com/?p=4454&print=1> [1]). Cindy Sheehan, "Reflections on 9-11," Cindy for Congress, Sept. 10, 2008 (www.CindyforCongress.org [1]).———, "Highly Credible People Question 9/11," April 9, 2008 (<http://www.opednews.com/maxwrite/linkframe.php?linkid=56565> [3]). Scott McLarty and Starlene Rankin, "On the 5th Anniversary of 9/11, Greens Call for a new probe of Unanswered Questions," *Green Party.org*, Sept. 11, 2006 (http://www.gp.org/press/pr_2006_09_11.shtml [1]). Karen S. Johnson, "Backing my claims about 9/11 questions," *East Valley Tribune* (Phoenix AZ), May 2, 2008, (<http://www.eastvalleytribune.com/story/115376> [3]). Will Bunch, interview with Barack Obama, *Philadelphia Daily News*, April 14, 2008 (http://www.philly.com/philly/blogs/attytood/Barack_on_torture.html [2]).

⁵¹ John Milton, *Areopagitica*, 1644, paragraph 79.