Andrew Johnson, a tutor on T224 Computers and Processors and a DSA Assessor for the University's Access Centre, explores the official story about 9/11, and shows how important it is to question what it is we are being told.

Unfortunately, for proponents of the official story, the melting point of steel is about 1480°C so nokerosone or steel-flotsam-and-jetsam-based fire could have caused the steel to either melt or weaken to the point of collapse. This was published as a question by Mr. Power on 9/11/2001 - WTC 1 and 2 and WTC Building 7 (sometimes called the Salmonon Brothers’ Building). At 5.30pm, the building collapsed at virtual free-fall rate, in 6.6 seconds, into its own footprint - no plane had hit this building, only a small amount of debris. It has now come to light that BBC World reported that WTC 7 had collapsed about 20 minutes before it actually had. This revelation has made 9/11 researchers question how the BBC was able to see into the future.

These facts seem to me, to represent significant omissions from the story reported on news bulletins and in subsequent documentaries. When news reports consider 9/11, there has been little analysis of what actually happened. The ‘run up’ to 9/11 has been the subject of a significant BBC documentary series called The Power of Nightmares, first televised in 2004. This BAFTA award winner, made by Adam Curtis, exposes the real history of Al-Qaida and concludes that stories of this group’s ability to commit acts of terrorism on a large scale have been grossly exaggerated, if not completely fabricated.

Other documentaries have analysed the events of 9/11, but have been characterised by a lack of critical engagement. In their work, the authors omitted or ‘glossed over’ the facts. A BBC Horizon documentary, The Fall of the World Trade Center (7 March 2002), omitted to state that the three towers fell at a virtually free-fall rate - but contained the statement, the aircraft was swallowed up by the building as it hit at 440 miles per hour. At that speed the force of the impact was massive! The programme did not attempt to explain how the fuselage of the plane – essentially a weak hollow tube made of light materials – could crash through several steel girders, penetrating quite deeply into the building.

Similar omissions were apparent in a Channel 4 documentary, The 9/11 Commission, in which Michael Moore’s Fahrenheit 9/11 (shown on Channel 4 on 27 January 2005), a brief discussion of the free fall of the towers was included, and an interview with Mr. Moore on The Newshour and Earth 2 Earth (10 September 2006) - a Sunday morning religious programme, not a news or news analysis programme.

And C4 Conspiracy Files (18 February 2007), mentioned that steel losses had its structural strength at 600°C. However, the black smoke from the fires in the towers indicates an oxygen-starved fire, which in most places did not even rise above 90°C, and the buildings were over-engineered and would have remained standing even if the steel had lost half of its structural strength.

So, what did official bodies say about 9/11?

The 9/11 Commission Report into 9/11, meant to be a full and complete accounting of the events of 9/11, has some extremely significant omissions. For example, it does not contain a discussion or analysis of the collapse of WTC 7. Retired Religion Professor, David Ray Griffin, has described this report as a ‘sham’ and its cover is essentially that of a small number of people with significant academic credentials, who has looked into what really happened on 9/11. An author or editor of over 20 books on Religion and Religion, he stated in an LA Times article (28 August 2005), that he believed the official story at first, but when he had looked at a detailed timeline of events he became suspicious. In 2004, following extensive research, he published a book called The New Pearl Harbor: Destructive Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11. In this book, he examines the 9/11 attacks in the context of a document called Rebuilding America, which was published by a World Trade Center mitigation project for the New American Century (PNAC - 2000), states that PNAC is a project ‘to promote American global leadership’ and to undertake a large-scale‘surprise attack on America’s enemies in a way unlike a Pearl-Harbour’, which could then afford an opportunity to transform America’s defences.

Another body in the USA, the NIST - the National Institute of Standards and Technology, was tasked with analysing the destruction of the destruction of WTC towers 1, 2 and 7. They have still not yet issued their final report for WTC 7. However, their report for WTC 1 and 2 fail to answer how the ‘pancakes’ collapse theory explains the evidence observed on the day – mainly the speed of collapse and the lack of any ‘pancakes’ in the WTC rubble, of which there is a distinct lack.

The terms of reference for the production of the final NIST WTC 7 report have now have been the subject of a Legal Challenge by Professors Morgan Reynolds (Emurris, Texas A&M University) and Bruce Beveridge (Civil Engineering, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill). Their challenge is for a ‘Right to Request for correction’ and they charge that, as is framework, it is a study of WTC 7 collapse will be fraudulent and deceptive.

All readers are encouraged to check my sources and to verify the evidence in the reports above. Do this and it will become clear to you that you took to be a truism. I think many of you, wonder what former US President Advisor, Karl Rove really meant when he said ‘We’re an Empire now. We create our own history’.

For further information, see:
9/11 Commission Report in Full
www.911commission.gov/report/index.htm

Phala, www.newsweek.com
NIST 9/11/WTC Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)
www.wtc.nist.gov/911_FAQ/911_FAQ.html


And if...

The War on Terror is Fake

Then why are British and US Troops being killed in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Ask your MP, the BBC and all media organisations for answers