

ARCHITECTS, ENGINEERS, AND 9/11

Conversations in pursuit of the uncluttered truth

"The control of the media is tremendous. There are very few free media outlets available. We have one free radio station. There's no television that isn't 100% controlled." — Gary Kasparov (former Chess World Champion, regarding the suppression of democracy in Russia, as quoted in the Playboy interview, March 2008

It just happens this recent interview with Kasparov coincides with some reading I've been doing on the John Kennedy assassination[1] and recent news of some artifacts surfacing, courtesy the Dallas district attorney, about that assassination. In the 9/11 truth universe, in December of 2007, Thomas Kean and others of the 9/11 Commission, asserted that the CIA impeded the commission's investigation by withholding evidence of various sorts.[2]

Hell's a poppin' in the 9/11 truth movement; you can tell by a simple surf to the 9/11 Truth.org home page. We see ongoing discovery, the information on that page is as fresh as any on the Web... as many as two or three articles a day. It's hard to keep up, I'm glad to say. I continue to try to do my part; I feel a real kinship with people like Gary Kasparov and the 9/11 truthers, struggling to bring the Power People to their knees and end their centuries-old depredations upon decent humanity.

The spread of consciousness, the development of awareness of the truth (and the individual freedom that accompanies it), moves one mind at a time. Those of us who regard knowledge favorably are normally humbled by realization of our own one-time ignorance of this idea or that one, how we had to trudge along without the knowledge... until, often for reasons unrelated to our own "extraordinary intelligence and strength of will," we somehow got pointed toward the light. That's my own 9/11 Truth experience, for sure.

I want to use today's column to reveal a letter (email) I wrote as part of a conversation with fellow engineers with whom I've worked. Recently, I joined Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth and I conveyed to these fellows some of my reasons for coming to believe that the official conspiracy theory of the 9/11 attacks represents a blatant lie and coverup. Indeed, to the senior engineer among them I submitted Dr. David Ray Griffin's 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions. I was interested in having them all consider joining me in ae911truth.org.

Well, for reasons that will become apparent when you read the note, none of them has yet been moved to deliberate on the several main contradictions entailed in the official 911 conspiracy theory. I empathize with them, along the lines of what Ken Jenkins suggests, and then simply proceed with a single, solitary proposition (the spontaneous destruction of World Trade Center 7) without reference to any implications of that proposition or of any other.

I really don't know what to expect, but I do feel it's critical to land the technical people on the side of truth above politics. My readers are of course welcome to use any or all of my reasoning below in their own persuasive efforts. I'd say there is some urgency to the task, because the power people are showing signs of fear of being found out. We must move fast and sure, one argument, one mind, at a time. As usual, please contact me thru the forum if you would like to discuss:

Followup Letter to Some Friends in Engineering

Guys,

You know, I must confess to being a little bit verklempt that none of you seems to have an interest in considering or responding to any specific evidence or argument that I've made in my previous missive. Homer, you say you find Dr. Griffin's specific arguments and evidence that contradict the official conspiracy theory to be "technically without merit."

Okay, what I'm missing here, Homer (et al), is any reference to a specific fact or inference that you either support or question and what your specific reasoning is one way or the other. I'm sure you realize that simply repeating assertions, or saying the author has an agenda, or saying you have been a public servant for this wonderful country (which is great, by the way), etc. is not an argument or a fact

or even a response to an argument or to a fact. How do we know an argument has no technical merit if we don't know or state what that argument is.

Believe me, I'd love it if any of you would simply respond to any of the handful of specific arguments and/or facts that I've presented in my former message; you know, give me reasons why my argument is flawed or provide contrary specific evidence that an alleged fact is not actually a fact or that it does not logically apply. The question of whether the official conspiracy theory of 9/11 is true or false shouldn't be a matter of he said she said.

Engineers are supposed to consider specific arguments and facts in the discovery of a sequence of causes in the material world. Same goes for architects and crime investigators. We're all supposed to be champions of the laws of identity and causality, to put our emotions aside and look at reality with complete objectivity. And I know all y'all are committed to knowing the truth about what happened on 9/11 regardless of what we are told is true by any particular person or group... including the government group (probably especially the government, given its lackluster track record in the truth department).

That's okay. I think I understand why you're not responding to any of the specific arguments or facts that I presented; your statements/protests are perfectly consistent with what Ken Jenkins has identified in that DVD I reviewed. And I'm totally down with your not wanting to deal with such heavy implications if a lot of these things that I (and literally thousands of learned people) suggest are true are in fact true.

So why don't we just sneak up on the issue one fact at a time:

I.e., let's not form any conclusions from any particular fact we know of the events of 9/11, i.e. let's not immediately decide that the government has to be complicit or culpable. In fact, no respectable 9/11 truth advocate and researcher considers any particular alternative theory to follow from demonstration that the official conspiracy theory is untrue. Sure, we all have speculation, but every one of us wants to see a true crime investigation where evidence is sifted through... followed by charges against any reasonable suspects and determining guilt or innocence in a court of law.

This is what the Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth consider as their mission:

Please Take Notice That:

On Behalf of the People of the United States of America, the undersigned Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth and affiliates hereby petition for, and demand, a truly independent investigation with subpoena power in order to uncover the full truth surrounding the events of 9/11/01 - specifically the collapse of the World Trade Center Towers and Building 7. We believe that there is sufficient doubt about the official story and therefore that the 9/11 investigation must be re-opened and must include a full inquiry into the possible use of explosives that may have been the actual cause behind the destruction of the World Trade Center Towers and WTC Building 7.

Sincerely,

The Undersigned

Doesn't this sound like a pursuit of objective truth that you'd be happy to be a part of? Well, me, too.

So, again, let's just take this one step at a time. Walk before we run. [You know it took a long time for me to reach the stage of understanding I have now; what started the truth train for me was the fact that I could not (and still cannot) find any evidence whatsoever that the Pentagon was struck by a Boeing 757, much less AA Flight 77; and believe me I desperately wanted to believe that such evidence existed. So I know what you're going thru in wanting the official story to be true.]

Accordingly I'm going to present only one fact that you can either confirm or deny. Please don't even think about any of the other arguments or facts that I've brought up in the past; we'll get to them later if you find that there's some relevance or merit to this one fact I'm going to present now:

One and Only Fact about 9/11 to Consider for the Time Being

On 9/11/2001 World Trade Center 7 disintegrated in a manner grossly similar to the disintegration of WTC1 and WTC2; WTC7 was not struck by an aircraft.

From the timeline of events—by the way this series of tables I regard as some of my best and most useful book review work—we see that World Trade Center Building # 7 disintegrated symmetrically on its own footprint at nearly free fall speed at 5:20 p.m. 9/11/2001. (WTC1 and WTC2 fell at 10:58 a.m. and 9:59 a.m., respectively.) [Okay, I'm going to throw in an auxiliary fact: Building owner Larry Silverstein is captured on video stating he decided "to pull" (a term that means to start the implode sequence) building 7.]

###

Okay, da da, that's it.

What I'd like each of you to do is turn this fact over in your minds for a while. Please take all the time you need. Some polls have suggested that more than half of the American people are unaware that a building # 7 even existed, much less that it "collapsed" in the same manner as the two towers that were hit by airplanes.

And you may not even be aware of how the World Trade towers were constructed. [For example, Betty has told me she thought the core of the WT buildings was simply an empty shell enclosure, which is what the 9/11 Commission actually stated! When in fact each core of WTC1and2 consists of 47 massive reinforced steel columns (with 240 perimeter columns) rising the entire height of the building; WTC7 has 24 equally massive columns extending its entire height (with 57 perimeter columns).] There's a lot of literature out there now that explains how the towers were put together (like the proverbial brick shithouse). Indeed, the books by Dr. Griffin {[1], [2]} are great places to start in determining these architectural details.

So if you accept the fact that WTC7 disintegrated on its own footprint on 9/11, the question for advocates of the official conspiracy theory is exactly as the Indian said to the mermaid: "How?"

In fact advocates of the official conspiracy theory have to demonstrate a causal chain connecting the impact of the two jetliners into WTC1 and WTC2 to the consequent destructive sequence that led to the disintegration of WTC7. (The 9/11 Commission Report does not even mention that WTC7 fell, and NIST has stated it will provide a study "sometime in the future.")

Absent any evidence that the impact of airplanes on two towers several hundred feet away caused this third building to fail (in what appears to be a similar mechanism)—btw, WTC6 (which did not collapse) sustained more damage from fire and falling debris than WTC7—we seem to be left with the obvious conclusion: WTC 7 "failed" by means of exactly what our eyes tell us, controlled implosion. I can also tell you that from my contact with the architects' side at the Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth, I have learned that all the towers that failed have all 15 of the characteristics of a controlled demolition:

- sudden onset of destruction
- destruction occurring at near free-fall pace
- destruction followed path of greatest resistance
- 20-ton steel columns ejected laterally up to 500 ft.
- blast waves blew out windows in buildings 400 ft. away
- 118 first responders report explosions at onset of destruction
- numerous eyewitness reports of flowing molten metal in the rubble
- mid-air pulverization of concrete with outward arching plumes
- rapid expansion and pyroclastic flow of enormous dust clouds
- squibs: explosive ejections below impact zone
- total dismemberment of steel core column structures
- 1200 ft. diameter symmetrical debris field

- chemical evidence of thermate on steel and in dust samples
- FEMA steel analysis: sulfidization, oxidation, and intergranular melting
- no precedent for steel frame high rise collapse caused by fire

These are the engineering and architectural facts behind the failure of building 7 that suggest overwhelmingly a controlled demolition. There is no official government conspiracy theory for what caused building 7 to collapse. I'm definitely interested to know if any of you can come up with a causal chain—stemming from the impact of the airplanes—that explains the observed destruction as adequately as controlled demolition. [My personal, sentimental favorite would be that WTC 7 is like the devoted baby sister to WTC 1 and WTC 2 and became so traumatized at seeing her big brothers obliterated, she simply fainted and collapsed in sorrow... but not too many engineers or architects would buy that story.]

If we agree that WTC 7 came down via controlled demolition, then and only then should we go on to the next step(s) as to what that implies: a) relevance to the destruction of WTC 1 and WTC 2, b) who had custody and access, c) who had motive, d) who had capability, e) possible scenarios of setting the explosives, f) development of suspects, etc. [It's even conceivable Mohammed Atta while he wasn't being treated to lap dances and blow jobs in a Florida strip club, sauntered into the building(s) on a weekend with his pals and took a few minutes to set the charges. So we can't completely rule out the omnipotent hand of Al Qaeda—but I think we should wait until everyone is on board with the fact of controlled demolition before we start searching for likely suspects.]

We cool? Good. We'll just stick to WTC 7 for now. I really don't want to talk about anything else related to 9/11 until or unless we can get this one item squared away. If you have an alternative causal sequence of destruction for WTC7 other than the obvious one, I assure you I'm all ears. (In fact, the entire 9/11 truth industry will be all ears.) If you accept the evidence of controlled demolition of WTC 7, then we can proceed to make the other relevant discoveries at our own pace... and I'm pretty sure at some point you'll want to join me in AE911truth.org to get the truth out in a calm, orderly fashion.

I guess there's a third alternative: that you don't care one way or the other. Frankly, that would be a disappointment for me, but I would certainly accept your decision to take a pass. These are scary times, and it's a hard thing to contemplate any implications—again, I'd ask that you try to not consider any implications until you assess the root facts—that might cast doubt on the immensity of patriotism of the Bush-Cheney corporate-state love nest. And I know we all have full plates, a lot of other important things to deal with in our lives, so far be it from me to judge.

In any case, I look forward to your views on WTC 7 and failing that—no pun intended—to witnessing your exemplary whacksmanship on the golf course in the spring that's just around the corner.

Peace.

bw

Brian Wright
 TheCoffeeCoaster.com
 NewPilgrimChronicles.com
 Webmaster@michiganlp.org
 Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth
 "When men yield up the privilege of thinking,
 the last shadow of liberty quits the horizon."
 -- Thomas Paine

And let me close with another quote from the supremely courageous Mr. Kasparov concerning Russian democracy:

Playboy: Yes you choose to stay in Russia. Why?

Kasparov: It may sound pathetic, but there are just things you must do. I always believe I do things that could make a difference. At a certain point I had to think about my future engagements after my chess

career. I wanted to be useful. It's my nature. I have to fight. I can't see the injustice, especially if it's in my own country, and do nothing. Facing Putin's regime—watching him destroy my country—I had a choice to make: I could either emigrate or stay. Emigrating is wrong. This is my country. I want my country to succeed. My country is in trouble, so I won't leave. Putin wishes I would. He would like to expel me. Maybe instead I should try to expel him.

Bravo!

###

[1] History Will Not Absolve Us: Orwellian control, public denial, and the murder of President Kennedy, by E. Martin Schotz

[2] None of this righteous complaining by Mr. Kean or other members of the Commission alters the fact that the 9/11 Commission Report was and continues to be "a 571-page lie." Further, don't expect the CIA (or the 9/11 Commission for that matter) to give up any incriminating information until an enraged citizenry pries it from their cold dead fingers.

2008 February 26

Copyright © Brian Wright | *The Coffee Coaster™*

9/11 Truth | Gary Kasparov | *Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth*