

27 June 2007 - PURDUE 9/11 SIMULATION EXPOSED AS FRAUD: MEDIA COVERS UP HOAX AND CONCEALS CRIMES

Purdue 9/11 simulation exposed as fraud Media covers up hoax and conceals crimes

ABSTRACT. A study of the Purdue 9/11 simulation of the collapse of the South Tower has exposed it as a fraud. Nick Irving, a new member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, has shown the simulation was based upon false data, the fire could not have caused bare steel to weaken, whether the steel was fireproofed does not matter, and it doesn't even include a collapse. It was meant to cover up the 9/11 hoax and protect the responsible parties.

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) June 27, 2007 - A computer animation by engineers and computer scientists at Purdue University has been exposed as a fraud by a new member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth. James Fetzer, who founded the society, received a study from Nick Irving, replying to his invitation to submit an essay on the Purdue simulation, which can be found on the internet via <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cddlgb1nGJ8> "Nick pointed out that the model was based upon false data about the weakening point of steel and the temperature of jet fuel based fires. He proved that fireproofing was irrelevant because the fires never reached the weakening point of steel. But most importantly of all," Fetzer observed, "he noticed that the simulation does not even model the 'collapse' and cannot have shown that these fires caused one." His study has been archived at 911scholars.org (article)

The Guardian, a prominent UK newspaper, reported that the Purdue study had found that the absence of fireproofing had caused the steel to weaken and the building to collapse. (See <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/latest/story/0,,-6722708,00.html>) "Irving emphasizes that the animation is based on bad data and could not produce a scientifically significant result. In fact, the simulation only covers the impact of the plane that is supposed to have hit the building," Fetzer said. "According to The 9/11 Commission Report, the planes hit the towers causing fires that weakened them and caused their collapse. But we have known for some time that this account qualifies as creative fiction and does not belong on library shelves classified as American history."

"Even students who are new to the study of 9/11 know that the official account cannot possibly be true, which we explain on our web site in "Why doubt 9/11?" Consider:

- (1) The impact of the planes cannot have caused enough damage to bring the buildings down, since the buildings were designed to withstand them, insofar as the planes that allegedly hit were very similar to those that they were designed to withstand, and the Twin Towers continued to stand following those impacts with negligible effects.
- (2) Underwriters Laboratory certified the steel in the buildings up to 2,000F for three or four hours without it even significantly weakening, where these fires burned too low and too briefly at an average temperature of around 500F--about one hour in the South Tower and one and a half in the North--to have caused the steel to weaken.
- (3) If the steel had been weakened, then the affected floors would have displayed completely different behavior, with some asymmetrical sagging and tilting, which would have been gradual and slow, not the complete, abrupt, and total demolition that took place in approximately ten seconds apiece.

According to Fetzer, the situation is even worse than this. The Purdue study claims that it was the impact of the aircraft that caused the fireproofing to fall off the steel. Dr. Mete Sozen, a professor of structural engineering and lead investigator, has said that the aircraft moved through the building as if it were a hot and fast lava flow and, consequently, much of the fireproofing was ripped off the structure. "But if the planes "moved through the building like a hot knife through butter," Fetzer said, "it is rather difficult to see how the fireproofing could have been 'ripped' from the structure. Not even the silverware would have been knocked off the table under those conditions."

Other 9/11 sites have discussed the inadequacies of the Purdue simulations, including [prisonplanet](http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/june2007/200607animation.htm) (<http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/june2007/200607animation.htm>). The article, "New Study Props Up Official 9/11 Theory," makes a lot of good points, such as (a) even without the fireproofing, fires at low temperatures around 500F could not cause the steel to weaken, (b) the jet-fuel based fires themselves endured only very briefly, (c) the conclusions of the study contradict prior statements made by some of the engineers who designed it, and (d) it focused on the top thirty floors and did not attempt to model the rest. "Those were excellent points," Fetzer agreed. "But Irving pointed out that we are dealing with a computer simulation based on bad data, which exemplifies to old adage, 'GI/GO' ('garbage in/garbage out'), which is the key point."

A second article from prisonplanet went further by identifying links between Purdue and the National Science Foundation, which funded the study. As prisonplanet notes, the members of the board of the NSF are appointed by President Bush. Mete Sozen was also involved in the study of the Oklahoma City bombing, which raises further questions (see <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/june2007/220607study.htm>) "I think prisonplanet does well to dig beneath the surface. But it is absurd that changes to building codes are being introduced that will cost millions in additional spending ("Safety Group Proposes 3rd Sttairwell in High Rises", New York Times (June 23, 2007), when the evidence indicates that, whatever destroyed the Twin Towers, it was not the effect of airplane crashes and jet fuel based fires. That is a total fabrication."

"Perhaps The Guardian might be excused for getting this garbled," Fetzer said, "but The New York Times ("9/11 Simulation Taxes Purdue Servers", June 22, 2007) is another matter." According to the article by Sewell Chan, "The (Purdue simulation) video is a counterpoint to the conspiracy theories that still surround the collapse of the World Trade Center (and such outspoken figures as Rosie O'Donnell appear to be sympathetic to these arguments)." Fetzer considers it tragic that The Times, of all papers, has abdicated its responsibility to its readers. "This is dereliction of duty of a high order, which suggests to some that the CIA continues to influence the media, as Carl Bernstein reported ("The CIA and the Media", Rolling Stone, October 20, 1977)."

"We have been able to establish that virtually everything the government has told us about 9/11 is false," Fetzer explained, "which means that it qualifies as an elaborate hoax. What Irving has discovered is that the Purdue simulation qualifies as a fraud that appears to have been perpetrated to cover up the hoax. Our research suggests that the purpose of that hoax has been to conceal the commission of crimes by high-ranking figures in the Bush administration. No one should have spent time and effort in faking simulations and making up stories if 19 Islamic fundamentalists had committed these crimes. It would not have been necessary to frame guilty men."

James H. Fetzer
Founder
Scholars for 9/11 Truth