

## 29 SEPTEMBER 2007 - SCHOLARS' WTC REPORT APPEAL ACKNOWLEDGED BY NIST

Scholars' WTC Report Appeal acknowledged by NIST  
Former Professor of Mechanical Engineering disputes official account

**ABSTRACT.** A former professor of mechanical engineering at Clemson University and a prominent member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, has formally challenged the government's official explanation (jet plane impacts and jet fuel fires) as the cause of the destruction of the Twin Towers and other buildings at the World Trade Center. In her formal complaint, she asserts that directed energy weaponry was instead used to pulverize the Twin Towers.

Madison, WI (OpEdNews) September 29, 2007 -- In March 2007, Dr. Judy Wood, formerly of the Department of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson and a member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, formally challenged the government's official explanation (jet impacts and resulting fires) for the destruction of the WTC complex. This was done in the form of a Request for Correction (RFC) relative to the Data Quality Act (DQA) under the guidance of Connecticut Attorney Jerry Leaphart. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) specifically acknowledged that it understood that Dr. Wood asserted that directed energy weapons (DEW) were used to destroy the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center complex. As well, NIST acknowledged that it did not analyze that part of the event where the destructive effects referenced by Dr. Wood would have been taking place.

NIST also acknowledged that it understood that Dr. Wood was asserting that some of NIST's contractors were in a position to confirm the use of DEW precisely because they, themselves, were manufacturers and developers of such weaponry. Among the contractors that NIST utilized to help it prepare the NCSTAR 1 report, for which corrections were sought, was Applied Research Associates, Inc., which, it turns out, is a founding sponsor of the Directed Energy Professional Society (DEPS).

Other sponsors of DEPS were also substantially involved in the preparation of NCSTAR 1 for NIST, including Science Applications International Corp (SAIC). NIST indicated that while it did a background check to assure there were no conflicts of interest, it did not know that ARA was a manufacturer of DEW. In her appeal, Dr. Wood presents ample information confirming that NIST should have known of ARA's involvement with DEW. Significantly, NIST has acknowledged Dr. Wood's appeal by posting a copy on its Website. "This means they are taking it seriously," Fetzer said.

In 2005, a number of reports were issued by NIST that were meant to explain how the Twin Towers were completely destroyed. Its basic report, designated NCSTAR 1, runs around 298 pages. She was able to pursue these issues under the DQA, because it directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to issue government-wide guidelines that "provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by Federal agencies."

On July 27, 2007, Attorney Jerry Leaphart observed on "The Dynamic Duo", a radio program hosted by Kevin Barrett, Ph.D., on GCN (gcnlive.com), "What I can tell you and the listeners, Kevin, is this. There is more admissible evidence associated with the theory that the World Trade Center was destroyed by directed energy weapons than there is admissible evidence for any single other theory out there that has been promulgated." This part of the show is available at [http://drjudywood.com/media/070727\\_JerryLeaphartRFC\\_Adm.mp3](http://drjudywood.com/media/070727_JerryLeaphartRFC_Adm.mp3). Fetzer, who co-hosts the program with Barrett, emphasized that this is a very important step on behalf of an alternative account of the mode of destruction of the WTC. "Indeed," he said, "the official account now hangs by very slender threads."

The first action initiated by Dr. Wood occurred in March 2007 in the form of an RFC declaring that NCSTAR 1 is "fraudulent and deceptive" because it cannot account for the profound destruction of the World Trade Center, including the massive pulverization of the towers, which she has documented on her web site, <http://drjudywood.com>. She observes, "NIST cannot make a statement that the World Trade Center towers came down in 'free fall,' on the one hand, and then say that doing so is a form of 'collapse,' on the other." According to Fetzer, not only is the use of the word "collapse" inaccurate but the official account does not satisfy the laws of physics and of engineering.

Several studies demonstrating that The 9/11 Commission Report (2004) is not true have been published in The 9/11 Conspiracy (2007), which Fetzer edited. From her analysis of the breadth and the depth of damage inflicted upon the WTC, Dr. Wood has concluded that some type of directed energy weapon (DEW) was involved in the destruction of the

WTC buildings. She has also pointed out that Applied Research Associates (ARA) was a contractor in the preparation of some aspects of the NCSTAR reports and that ARA is also a manufacturer of directed energy weapons, which constitutes a probable "conflict of interest" in producing a truthful account of what happened here.

In a letter dated July 27, 2007, Catherine Fletcher of NIST commented on Dr. Wood's original RFC, stating, "NIST has examined the photographs you provided in conjunction with all the other evidence and has found that the evidence does not support a theory involving directed energy weapons." She also stated, "ARA was determined not to have an organizational conflict of interest". Finally, she added, "NIST is denying your request for correction because the NIST analysis of the initiation of the collapse of the WTC towers was thorough and based on all of the available evidence, and NIST continues to believe that the report is not fraudulent, deceptive or misleading."

The Data Quality Act, however, includes a "right of appeal" of NIST's response and Dr. Wood has worked to further document a significant conflict of interest between ARA and some of the analyses NIST used in its reports. In her appeal of August 22, 2007, Dr. Wood makes six key assertions, including that NIST should have known that Applied Research Associates (ARA) is "a significant manufacturer of directed energy weapons and/or components thereof." Additionally, Dr. Wood states, "NIST should have detected evidence of the use of such weaponry even in the context of NIST's intentional and, I assert, improper limitation of its investigation into "the sequence of events leading up to the "collapse" of the Twin Towers."

Fetzer said that a formal acknowledgement of the appeal has now been posted in two segments at [http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information\\_Quality/PROD01\\_002619](http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619) , which is the government's official web site. Due to technical issues, some of the documents are not available in their entirety. These will be corrected in time. Meanwhile the documents are available at <http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST RFC.html#wood> . The posted versions, however, do not reproduce the evidence Dr. Wood has submitted, but only inferior black-and-white versions of photos. These photos may be viewed in higher resolution, color prints on her site, <http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST RFC.html#wood> . "It is unfortunate that NIST has chosen to post a version with low quality pictures and in black and white," she observed. "Some of the data referenced in the appeal can only be properly evaluated when viewed in color and with good quality reproduction."

The appeal may be found at [http://drjudywood.com/pdf/070822 RFC\\_Appeal17a\\_JW.pdf](http://drjudywood.com/pdf/070822 RFC_Appeal17a_JW.pdf) .

"I don't know why NIST did not simply post the higher quality color images," Fetzer said, "but they are available to the agency and to the public by means of her web site. The course of this appeal should be interesting." According to him, Dr. Wood is the leading scientist who is investigating the destruction of the WTC. "Judy's credentials are impeccable," he said. "She is an admirable example of what an expert can produce. Anyone who wants to understand what happened to the WTC should visit her web site. NIST has a great deal to learn from her."

James H. Fetzer  
Founder  
Scholars for 9/11 Truth