

9/11 Disinformation and Misinformation: Definitions and Examples

By Arabesque¹

*“In this day and age, we all have to become experts on **disinformation**.”*²

Jim Fetzer, *Disinformation: The Use of False Information*

*“One of the telling signs of many **disinformation** artists (who may or may not be gainfully employed by some ‘shadowy government agency’) is that a lot of their claims are simply too strong to be true...*

*I am not suggesting that any of them works for the NSA, the CIA, or the FBI. That creates an exaggerated version of the situation as I see it that makes it easy to satirize. I have no idea why they are doing what they are doing. But there are ample grounds based upon past experience to believe **they are abusing logic and language to mislead and deceive others about the state of research...***

On the basis of my experience with them, I believe this is deliberate. Their function appears to me to be obfuscation...

*There is a serious **disinformation** movement afoot, one that finds the work of those they attack to be too good to ignore. **Disinformation... is the major obstacle to the search for truth about the death of JFK.**”*³

Jim Fetzer, *Signs of Disinformation*

How can we discover the truth about 9/11? Is it possible to be led astray by misleading and incomplete interpretations of evidence? What is *disinformation* and how does it affect 9/11 research? For those interested in the truth about 9/11, evaluating evidence and explanations are essential considerations.

Disinformation is commonly defined as “*deliberately misleading information.*”⁴ According to Jim Fetzer, “*disinformation... should be viewed more or less on a par with acts of lying. Indeed, the parallel with lying appears to be fairly precise.*”⁵

A similar concept called *misinformation* is defined by [Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice](#):

*“Misinformation is information that is **incorrect but not necessarily an attempt to mislead**. Misinformation often arises from poor research, biases, and **misinterpretations**.”*⁶

While *disinformation* requires motive and intent; *misinformation* does not. Jim Fetzer explains:

“While ‘misinformation’ can be simply defined as false, mistaken, or misleading information, ‘disinformation’ entails the distribution, assertion, or dissemination of false,

*mistaken, or misleading information in an intentional, deliberate, or purposeful effort to mislead, deceive, or confuse.”*⁷

The result is the same; the truth is obstructed with “misleading” information. How can we tell if someone is intentionally trying to mislead us? Is intent relevant? Not if the truth about 9/11 can be obfuscated by any misleading arguments regardless of intent. We do not need to distinguish intent to show that *misinformation* and *disinformation* equally harm our ability to discern the truth. Therefore, we should equally understand and combat both *misinformation* and *disinformation*.

When relevant facts are ignored it often results in misleading conclusions. For this reason, 9/11 “official story” skeptics agree that official reports are misleading. David Ray Griffin has argued that the 9/11 commission report⁸ was an *intentional attempt to mislead* the public about what really happened on 9/11 by ignoring many relevant facts.⁹ Indeed, Griffin calls the 9/11 commission report a “571 page lie.”¹⁰ Revealingly, the [9/11 Family Steering Committee](#) asked 400 questions and got 30% of the answers.¹¹ Many of their questions remain unanswered to this day. Consequently, this means that many believe that the 9/11 “official story” is *disinformation*.

How can we be misled about the truth? The most common technique is the *Straw-man fallacy*:

*“The Straw Man fallacy is committed when a person **simply ignores a person's actual position [and the evidence supporting that position] and substitutes a distorted, exaggerated or misrepresented version of that position.**”*¹²

The *straw-man fallacy* is an effective technique for *disinformation* because it is used to ignore relevant evidence and reach false conclusions. However, this fallacy can also be used unintentionally, resulting in *misinformation*. Revealingly, most types of *disinformation* and *misinformation* ignore relevant evidence. In contrast, the *scientific method* does not ignore evidence when a conclusion is reached.

Misleading conclusions are drawn from misinterpretations of evidence. Here is an example:

“The World Trade Center Towers were hit by planes. The planes damaged the buildings and created fires. The World Trade Center towers collapsed. Therefore, the towers collapsed because of the damage from planes and jet fuel fires.”

Many accept this explanation without hesitating to question it. However, this “official” version of events ignores a substantial amount of relevant evidence, and is therefore a misrepresentation of the actual events of 9/11. This explanation assumes that a plane crash *could* cause the almost total destruction of the Twin Towers—and that it was the *actual cause* of the collapse. This is a misleading conclusion for the following reasons:

1. It ignores the fact that the buildings were specifically designed to survive plane crashes of the type seen on 9/11—and their jet fuel fires.¹³
2. It ignores the fact that no steel framed building had ever collapsed due to fires of any kind.¹⁴
3. It ignores the fact that jet fuels are incapable of melting steel¹⁵—which is used for structural support of modern buildings.
4. It ignores the fact that there was molten steel at ground zero for months after 9/11.¹⁶ NIST admits that jet fuel fires could not create molten steel. Observations of iron-rich metallic spheres at ground zero now indicate beyond any reasonable doubt that there was molten steel.¹⁷ NIST called the presence of molten steel “*irrelevant*” to their investigation.^{18,19}
5. Lastly and most importantly, this explanation ignores eleven combined features of controlled demolition that were observed in the destruction of the Twin Towers as well as corroborating physical evidence of thermate.²⁰

The official explanation for the destruction of the World Trade Center Towers is misleading because it ignores all of these facts.

But are parts of the “*official story*” the only *disinformation* promoted about 9/11? According to 9/11 researcher Jim Hoffman:

*“Since the tragedy itself, the 9/11 Truth Movement has been plagued by both misinformation, and by deliberate disinformation that has been injected into the debate in order to discredit challenges to the official account... One need look no further than the attack pieces by Popular Mechanics and Scientific American to understand how flimsy, easily debunked claims are highlighted by defenders of the official account to tar the entire community of skeptics as loony conspiracy theorists whose conclusions are not supported by the facts.”*²¹

Hoffman argues that one purpose of *disinformation* could be to “discredit” other 9/11 research through the promotion of theories that are easily debunked or disproved. This strategy is used to suggest “guilt by association”—if some theories are disproved, the incorrect conclusion could be implied that all alternative hypotheses are false.²²

A second function of *disinformation* is suggested by Victoria Ashley:

*“One purpose of such disinformation is the bundling of bogus and real information to weigh down any serious questioning of the official story in nonsense.”*²³

This is an effective strategy to “turn off” potential 9/11 ‘official story’ skeptics. Indeed, physicist Steven Jones earlier included himself among these casualties:

*“Watching the ‘In Plane Site’ video turned me (and many others) away from 9-11 ‘theories’ initially—until I found serious researchers, scientists looking at hard evidences, and avoiding tenuous speculations.”*²⁴

Yet another purpose is the promotion of unsupported “*conspiracy theories*”²⁵ to distract attention away from more compelling alternative explanations and the real questions of importance:

*“...positions are being promoted which are disputed by the scientists specializing in physical sciences from Scholars for 9/11 Truth. Attempts to correct this situation have failed. As of this date the web site continues to **promote assertions which are unsupported by the evidence...** We feel that the promotion of these ideas functions to **distract from and discredit much of the other basic strong material challenging the official story of 9/11** which already exists—the stand down, the war games, the insider trading, the many strong points of evidence on the demolitions, etc.”²⁶*

Aside from the plane damage and jet fuel hypothesis, there are two “competing” alternative theories that attempt to explain the destruction of the World Trade Center Towers. One of which is a “directed energy weapon” hypothesis, which happens to be one of the aforementioned theories “*disputed by the scientists specializing in physical sciences.*”

Dr Greg Jenkins wrote a paper on this hypothesis and found that:

*“The energy required to vaporize all the steel from both towers was pumped into the towers during the collapse time, approximately 10 seconds... **is over 5 times the total power output of the entire earth including all carbon combustion, nuclear power, wind power, hydroelectric power, etc.** This is with no loss... If you take into account losses from scattering and absorption in the atmosphere, reflection by aluminum and steel in the building, and inefficiencies from storing this huge amount of energy and generating photons, then the power required swells to **at least thousands of earths worth of power.** The scenario becomes more bleak when considering beams of particles that have mass since the ionization energies required would add massive amounts of energy in conjunction with the aforementioned inefficiencies... The power output of the mammoth size MIRACL laser is 106 Watts... This means that we would need **57 million MIRACL lasers of power!**”²⁷*

His paper suggests that the use of ‘directed energy weapons’ to destroy the twin towers on 9/11 is “overwhelmingly implausible.”²⁸ In a separate interview, Dr Jenkins interviewed Judy Wood; the foremost supporter of this hypothesis, and remarked after the interview:

“I’m really not playing a game. I’m just trying to figure out what you have on your website. I’m asking questions regarding it.” ... [Jenkins commenting after the interview:] “I was just trying to see what kind of scientific basis this was in... and I think I found out.”²⁹

There are other problems with this hypothesis, such as the misrepresentation and misuse of relevant data. James Gourley notes:

“Ignoring basic, fundamental tenets of scientific reasoning and analysis, the [Wood/Reynolds] paper [The Star Wars Beam Weapon] ³⁰ forges ahead with a ‘scientific’ analysis that is based on admittedly corrupted and untrustworthy seismic data. The WR paper acknowledges it is using faulty (even possibly manufactured) data, yet presses ahead with the comparison to the Kingdome and asserts that space beams caused the destruction despite this fundamental flaw. All sections of the WR paper that rely in any way whatsoever on this admittedly corrupted data have no scientific value because reliable data is the foundation of any sound scientific analysis.”³¹

Any hypothesis that misuses data is an unreliable hypothesis since it is misleading to base conclusions on data that is unreliable. Tony Szamboti further comments to Jim Fetzer:

“There are many reasons why the use of a beam weapon does not provide an adequate explanation for how the Twin Towers were brought down. It seems your main reasons for considering the beam weapon are the dustification of the concrete and furnishings in the Twin Towers, the large slash through Bldg. 3, the hole in Bldg. 6, the burned out cars, and the damage or lack of it to the bathtub. In looking at the slash through Bldg. 3 it is very rough and jagged. Would a beam weapon do that? I seriously doubt it. The conjecture for the use of a beam weapon seems to be just that. Nobody has explained how it performed the damage to Bldg.'s 3 and 6 other than for Judy Wood to say they were missing the towers and getting the hang of it when they did that damage. That just isn't a very solid explanation.”³²

This reveals another problem commonly seen in the promotion of misinformation and disinformation: a conclusion is accepted without critical examination of alternate explanations. This is special pleading as the following example shows:

- X and Y both could have happened.
- X is speculated to have occurred; therefore Y definitely did not happen

This is not a convincing argument. It must be shown with reasonable certainty that X happened and that Y did not. A common tactic in the promotion of *misinformation* and *disinformation* is the complete lack of consideration for alternate possibilities; a failure to admit that another possibility even exists that could explain relevant evidence.

In summary, the evidence used to support a directed energy hypothesis appears to be contentious at best.³³ In contrast, the theory that controlled demolition destroyed the World Trade Centers is supported by eleven observable features combined as well as corroborating physical evidence.^{34,35}

According to Jim Fetzer there are **five types of disinformation**. After each type is defined, accompanying examples relevant to 9/11 will be examined.

[**DISINFORMATION and its Five Types**](#) by James H. Fetzer, Ph.D.³⁶

Fifth Type of Disinformation:

[Jim Fetzer:] “*The fifth level of disinformation appears to occur when a source presents information that has been deliberately selected to misrepresent, distort or abuse sources with the intention to mislead. Citing only evidence that is favorable to one side as if no contrary evidence exists is known as SPECIAL PLEADING. The key aspect of fifth degree efforts is creating—usually by writing—entire new works (books and article), because of which it has the character of FABRICATING EVIDENCE.*”³⁷

Jim Fetzer defines this type of disinformation as the promotion of misleading interpretations of evidence/data in a deliberate attempt to mislead. “*Special pleading*” is used to ignore relevant evidence without justifiable reason.

Disinformation and *misinformation* fall into two main categories:

1. A misleading interpretation of *evidence*, or
2. A *conclusion* derived from misinterpretations of *evidence*.

If a conclusion is not supported with misleading interpretations of evidence it is not *disinformation*:

- Misinterpretations of *evidence* are the *cause* of *disinformation*
- Misleading *conclusions* are the *result* of *disinformation*

This means that it is not enough to simply call a conclusion “*disinformation*”—it must first be shown that the conclusion is supported by misleading arguments. Consequently, describing a conclusion as “*disinformation*” without showing that it is supported by misleading arguments is in itself a kind of *disinformation*.

The following are examples of the “*fifth type of disinformation*” used as illegitimate evidence to support misleading or false conclusions.

Example #1

[Brian Vasquez:] “So, I decided to contact Steve Chastain (by phone and email), who is the author of the book ‘Build an Oil Fired Tilting Furnace’ and asked him to **verify if those 2 pictures were of aluminum, as Judy [Wood] claimed. He responded and said, that the photos were NOT aluminum, but were photographs of iron**”³⁸

[Jim Fetzer:] “*Judy, Steve [Jones] is right. This whole matter has been a fiasco. I would appreciate it if (a) you would apologize to Steve and (b) remove those posts from st911.org. Thank you. Jim*”³⁹

[Brian Vasquez:] “*Just a few months later, in December [2006], Judy published a new paper named ‘The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis’⁴⁰ and decided to use the SAME 2 EXACT pictures. Here is how she described them this time around...*”⁴¹

[Judy Wood:] “*The two photographs below show glowing metal pouring from a furnace. We cannot tell what kinds of metals these are without additional information.*”⁴²

[Brian Vasquez:] “*This is very misleading! I have to consider it deliberate disinformation. Especially when I know that she is fully aware, that those 2 pictures are of iron! Despite knowing this information, Jim Fetzer recently re-posted the Judy Wood papers on his new website www.911scholars.org. If you were the webmaster of one of the most popular 9/11 sites in the WORLD, would you post papers that contained false/misleading information? Is Judy Wood spreading disinformation with the help of other scholars?*”⁴³

Example #2

This example can only be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to mislead:

[Popular Mechanics:] “*In fact, Underwriter Laboratories does not certify structural steel.*”⁴⁴

[NIST:] “*UL did not certify any steel as suggested.*”⁴⁵

As David Ray Griffin has shown, this is stunningly misleading.⁴⁶ In his book *Debunking 9/11 Debunking*, he quotes Kevin Ryan:

“*Chaplin... Made the misleading claim that UL does not certify structural steel. But even an introductory textbook lists UL as one of the few important organizations supporting codes and specifications because they ‘produce a Fire Resistance Index with hourly rating for beams, columns, floors, roofs, walls and partitions... [Chaplin] went on to clarify that UL tests assemblies of which steel is a component. This is like saying ‘we don’t crash test the car door, we crash test the whole car.’*”⁴⁷

The fact that UL tests assemblies which have steel in them shows that UL does indeed test steel for fire resistance. Popular Mechanics and NIST commit special pleading by ignoring relevant evidence that UL tests steel in assemblies.

Example #3

In this example, NIST misleadingly claims that the laws of physics are breakable in support of their hypothesis. They argue that fire and structural damage are enough to account for the “free fall” rate of ‘collapse’ seen in the destruction of the World Trade Center twin towers:

“*In other words, the momentum... of the 12 to 28 stories (WTC 1 and WTC 2, respectively) falling on the supporting structure below (which was designed to support only the static weight of the floors above and not any dynamic effects due to the downward momentum) so greatly exceeded the strength capacity of the structure below that it (the structure below) was unable to... slow the falling mass.*”⁴⁸

This is very misleading as physicist Steven Jones indicates:

*“Where is the **delay that must be expected due to conservation of momentum—one of the foundational Laws of Physics?** That is, as upper-falling floors strike lower floors—and intact steel support columns—the fall must be significantly impeded by the impacted mass.”*⁴⁹

As Jones suggests, NIST ignores one of the fundamental laws of physics and simply claims that the impossible is possible. Everyone intuitively understands that if an object strikes another object, it will slow down—at least partially. Jones gives this example:

*“From experience you know that if you hit something stationary (like another car) while driving it will slow you down, right? This slowing from collisions is due to conservation of momentum and energy.”*⁵⁰

NIST is being deceptive when they claim that it is possible for the twin towers to ‘collapse’ at approximately free fall speed due to fire and structural damage alone. Their hypothesis could not explain free fall speed since the remaining structure would have offered strong resistance to the upper portion of the towers. In fact, some calculations have shown that the remaining structure would have been enough to stop full collapse of the towers.⁵¹

Example #4

[Dr Greg Jenkins:] *“Dr. James Fetzer and Dr. Judy Wood continue to promote the magical 'dustification' of large amounts of steel in the towers **even though no significant amount of steel dust was found in dust samples**.”*⁵² *They both promote a video clip from '911 eyewitness' which, they say, proves that the steel core spires from the North Tower turn to dust. However, multiple camera angles clearly show the spires merely falling. Either Dr. Fetzer's analytical abilities are inept or his motives are unprincipled since he was aware of the other video perspectives in early December, 2006.”*⁵³

One of the more common features of disinformation is the reliance on out of context photos, poor quality images, and video to illegitimately support theories.

Example #5

[Judy Wood/Morgan Reynolds:] *“He fails to account for what molten aluminum looks like **if heated to the same temperatures as molten iron (1538 °C)**.”*⁵⁴

This claim is very misleading, as I have explained in a letter in the Journal of 9/11 Studies.⁵⁵ Wood and Reynolds neglect to mention that the necessary temperatures needed **are impossible to reach with jet fuel fires as seen in the World Trade Center.**⁵⁶ The maximum temperature of a jet fuel fire is 1000 °C, far below the temperature that Wood and Reynolds say is required to get aluminum to turn orange. In fact, jet fuel fires are not even capable of melting steel.⁵⁷ It is therefore very misleading to say that Steven Jones

had not considered these temperatures (1538°C)—why would he when they are impossible to reach with temperatures from a jet fuel fire? As well, the NIST report indicates that the jet fuel fire temperatures were significantly lower than 1000 °C.⁵⁸ Wood and Reynolds also neglect to mention that a thermite reaction could reach the temperatures necessary to create the observed molten iron that Jones argues is falling outside of the South Tower, just before its collapse.⁵⁹

Fourth Type of Disinformation:

[Jim Fetzer:] “*The fourth level of disinformation appears to occur, not when a work (a book or an article) is being written from scratch, but in **creating a highly biased impression of a study by simply IGNORING its most significant, important, or relevant features to mislead others about the contents of the work, which is another form of SPECIAL PLEADING.***”⁶⁰

This definition is similar to the concept of the *straw-man fallacy* discussed earlier.

Example #6

In this example, Wood and Reynolds claim that Jones argues thermite is the only explanation for the destruction of the twin towers:

[Wood/Reynolds:] “*Why does Dr. Jones continue to boast that he uses ‘the scientific method’ after it has been pointed out repeatedly that his thermite hypothesis does not account for the data? Does not science throw a failed hypothesis overboard after the evidence repeatedly contradicts it?*”⁶¹

[Frank Legge:] “***Jones has never claimed that thermite or its variants account alone for all the observations.** There is obvious evidence that incendiary thermite was used and there is evidence that the towers exploded which may have been caused by nanothermite or may have been caused by something else, such as conventional demolition explosives.*”⁶²

Indeed, this would be a clear case of special pleading since Dr. Jones clearly indicates in his paper and elsewhere that:

“*I maintain that these observations [of molten steel] are consistent with the use of high-temperature cutter charges such as **thermite, HMX or RDX or some combination thereof,** routinely used to melt/cut/demolish steel.*”⁶³

From an interview by Jim Fetzer (January 17, 2007):

Jim Fetzer: *Q: “are you suggesting both [**thermate/superthermite**] were used in the Twin Towers?”*

Steven Jones: *A: “I’m suggesting that’s possible **along with other explosives**”*⁶⁴

Steven Jones' hypothesis about the destruction of the World Trade Center Towers and Building 7 involves thermite and/or its variants possibly used in *combination* with other explosives. It is therefore a misrepresentation of his position to argue that he believes *only* variants of thermite were used. Indeed, it is common for controlled demolitions to use explosives in combination.⁶⁵ This is an example of the “*fourth type of disinformation*” because Wood and Reynolds completely ignore the most important and relevant feature of Jones' theory—that other explosives could have been used in combination with thermite variants. As well, it is not necessary to know which type of explosives were used to observe the eleven features of controlled demolition; all of which this objection completely ignores.

Third Type of Disinformation:

[Jim Fetzer:] “*The third level of disinformation occurs by abusing the man (AD HOMINEM) in attacking the author or the editor of a work on irrelevant or misleading grounds that have little or nothing to do with the position the author or editor represents.*”⁶⁶

As Jim Hoffman indicates, “*One of the telltale signs of disinformation is that the people promoting it engage in personal attacks. Such attacks have been effectively used to intimidate logical critiques of nonsensical theories.*”⁶⁷

Victoria Ashley further comments that “*another important aspect of how disinformation in the 9/11 Truth Movement functions is through the use of **attack and vitriol**. While all types of people—professionals, academics and average people—can resort to nasty or **inappropriate personal attacks** when defending or promoting theories which conflict, the 9/11 Truth Movement has been packed with such attacks. Not surprisingly, however, **most of the individuals who are most vitriolic are attempting to advance the more bizarre ideas...***”⁶⁸

The truth is arrived at by examining ideas—not the individuals promoting them. *Ad-hominem fallacies*⁶⁹ could be used to in an attempt to bait a response from the intended target. Effectively, this creates a divisive environment in which scientific debates are ignored and instead replaced with irrelevant personal insults and commentary. This could be an effective strategy to avoid discussing the relevant scientific issues about 9/11. An *ad-hominem* is not necessarily an insult—it could simply be irrelevant commentary about an individual that distracts attention away from his/her theory.

Examples #7-13

7. “*We gasp at _____’s “analysis” of tower oscillation. Can a Ph.D. physicist be this retarded?*”⁷⁰
8. “*_____ attacks Dr. Wood’s Billiard Ball Example (BBE)—a clear explanation of why the government’s gravitational collapse WTC story is impossible—because people, even _____, can understand it.*”⁷¹
9. “*_____ gives experimentalists a bad name.*”⁷²

10. "Since he is no video expert, the **clueless** professor might ask himself if the Newtonian laws of motion still prevailed on 9/11."⁷³
11. "Perhaps our critique will lead him to conduct **psychological experiments** at BYU."⁷⁴
12. "_____ has this '**baby face**' that - and '**soft personality**' - that seems to 'sell' his positions."⁷⁵
13. "Given _____'s enormous popularity in the 9/11 arena, we must undertake the unpleasant task of social analysis. _____ 'evokes' the **persona of a choirboy** and he plays to the gallery... In effect... 'Elect _____, I wanna be your physicist, I'm a NICE guy.'"⁷⁶

Aside from being inappropriate and uncivil, Frank Legge comments that:

*"one of the serious chips is the risk of being attacked by supposed fellow workers using untruths, unfounded assertions, illogical arguments and **character assassination rather than scientific debate**. Even if true, this failing does not warrant the scale of this attack. No failing of any kind could warrant the scurrilous nature of the attack... How the authors could possibly think they were advancing the 9/11 cause by publishing this offensive material is a mystery to me. As a scientist I look at physical evidence and do not attempt to penetrate the workings of the mind, preferring to leave that very important area to others."*⁷⁷

Example #14

This example is an entire passage that could be considered an ad hominem. I have left my commentary in bold:

[Jim Fetzer:] "And why does he have to persist in misrepresenting the positions of others?[**Straw-man arguments offered as evidence**] He commits straw man fallacies I spent 35 years teaching freshmen to avoid. [**Straw-man arguments offered as evidence, appeal to authority**]

*THIS is the sign of a scholar? [**Ad-hominem**] No, this is the sign of a FRAUD. [**Ad-hominem, straw-man offered as evidence**] Neither Judy nor I is "promoting" an energy-beam-from-space theory, other than to advance it as an HYPOTHESIS. [**Illogical: "advancing" a hypothesis is "promoting" it**] I offered the CONJECTURE that WTC-7 may have been the source of the energy required. [**See previous**] I was not endorsing a CONCLUSION [**Illogical: advancing a hypothesis implies advancing a conclusion**] but a theory about the case. Without conjectures and theories, inquiry is impossible. [**Straw-man: his position is not that inquiry is wrong; it is that theories that rely on faulty data are wrong,**⁷⁸ and that non-falsifiable theories are unscientific and can not be tested and/or proved with available evidence⁷⁹] Doesn't he know? [**Don't you know you are committing a straw-man?**] This fraud [**Ad-hominem**] talks the talk about science [**As the examples in this paper clearly demonstrate, Fetzer uses a method that ignores or misrepresents data by accident or design (i.e. misinformation/disinformation)**], but his understanding of and commitment to genuine*

science is superficial and incomplete.” [Misleading conclusion: ad-hominem based on a straw-man argument]⁸⁰

Although this passage contains *straw-men* and other logical fallacies, it uses misleading arguments to attack the personal credibility of the subject. Consequently, this entire example functions as an *ad-hominem*.

This “*third type of disinformation*” requires intent. After all, “*character assassination rather than scientific debate*” is rarely committed by accident.

A similar type of *ad-hominem fallacy* is known as [*poisoning the well*](#):

“*The person making such an attack is hoping that the unfavorable information will bias listeners against the person in question and hence that they will reject any claims he might make.*”⁸¹

Examples #15-21

15. “_____ was involved in controversial research.”
16. “_____ wrote a religious paper involving controversial ideas.”
17. “_____ is a member of a secret organization.”
18. “_____ works for the CIA.”
19. “_____ wears Star Wars pajamas with the death star on them.”
20. “_____ is a democrat.”
21. “_____ voted for George Bush—twice.”

Conclusion [for each example]:

Therefore, everything this person says about _____ is false.”

These examples are illogical arguments. Theories are proved or disproved on their own merit—they are not “debunked” in reference to other *unrelated* theories or ideas. They are also not disproved based on which organizations someone may belong in or any unrelated circumstances. *Poisoning the well* is one of the most popular *disinformation* tactics. After all, disseminators of *disinformation* are not interested in an actual debate of the issues at hand; they are interested in destroying the credibility of the person promoting those ideas. As well, these accusations don’t even have to be true to be effective. This results in *poisoning the well* ‘*disinformation*’. This tactic is hardly surprising considering the fact that *disinformation* itself “*should be viewed more or less on a par with acts of lying.*”⁸²

Yet another similar type of *disinformation* is an [*appeal to authority*](#).⁸³ It could be considered to be the opposite of an *ad-hominem*. An *appeal to authority* suggests that a theory is held to be true because it is believed by an authority.

However, theories are not proved or disproved based on who is promoting them. To believe otherwise would mean that authorities would never lie and that they would never be wrong—ever. In reality, anyone could be coerced, threatened, paid to lie, be forced to make false statements, or even promote misleading arguments (i.e. *disinformation*) if there was strong enough motive or self interest to do so. Or an authority could simply be wrong. This is why all theories must be examined on their own merit. If authorities were never wrong we would still believe that the Sun revolves around the Earth, as the “authorities” believed during the time of Galileo.⁸⁴

Second Type of Disinformation:

[Jim Fetzer:] “***The second level of disinformation occurs when relevant available evidence that ought to make a difference to a conclusion, hypothesis or conjecture under examination is simply dismissed or ignored. EVIDENCE IS RELEVANT when its presence or absence (physical evidence) or its truth or falsity (testimonial) makes a difference to the truth or falsity of the point at issue.***”⁸⁵

Example #22

[Wood/Reynolds:] “*Steven Jones claimed that nano-enhanced thermite or thermate could account for pulverization of the Twin Towers. One difficulty with his hypothesis is that nano-enhanced thermite apparently did not exist in 2001 and only recently has the Department of Defense awarded contracts to prove and develop such a product.*”⁸⁶

[Frank Legge:] “***This is incorrect. The history of nanothermite appears to go back far enough to be considered as a possible explosive in 2001.***”⁸⁷

Example #23

[Wood/Reynolds:] “*Thermite does not explode and pulverize. It cannot explain the data.*”⁸⁸

[Frank Legge:] “***Note the words here: ‘thermite does not explode’. Jones has never said that it did. It is therefore not logical to ask this question.***”⁸⁹

Example #24

[Jim Fetzer:] “*The initial point of impact (prior to the collapse of the floors above) was only about 10' high and 16-17' wide, about the size of the double-doors on a mansion.*”⁹⁰

[Jim Hoffman:] “*In fact, photographs clearly show that the region of punctures to the facade extended to a width of **at least 96 feet on the first floor and 18 feet on the second floor.** Thus, the hole was approximately six times as large as Fetzer admits. **Fetzer continues to promote the ‘small hole’ fantasy despite the efforts of several people, including Fetzer’s colleague Steven Jones, to point out his error.***”⁹¹

First Type of Disinformation:

[Jim Fetzer:] *“The first level of disinformation might equally well be characterized as apparent incompetence by someone who assumes the task of offering criticism but for which he is not well-positioned to provide. This may be due to any number of factors, including lack of mental acumen, **specific misunderstandings, or lack of familiarity with relevant evidence (simple ignorance).**”*⁹²

Is it possible to tell whether someone is unfamiliar with relevant evidence? This is difficult to determine and this definition implies unintentional ignorance. However, this “first type” of *disinformation* could be interpreted as the overlooking of obvious explanations—intentional or otherwise.

Example #25:

[James Gourley:] *“Judy Wood stated that she believes... [that] space beams [reflected] off the buildings and somehow end up burning the cars on a bridge seven blocks away from the WTC complex...⁹³ **there is a perfectly reasonable alternative hypothesis...they were towed away from Ground Zero and deposited there as a part of the clean-up and rescue effort... perhaps carried by the huge dust clouds seen in the videos of the collapse; the thermite [could have fallen] on the cars and burned them exactly as seen in [this] [video](#).**”*⁹⁴

Example #26:

[Jim Fetzer:] *“...the story is inconsistent with the evidence we had. **It’s not even physically possible, given the laws of aerodynamics, that a Boeing 757 could have taken the trajectory attributed to it, which I assume he confirmed, which was this plane barely skimmed the ground en route to it’s target. That’s not even physically possible.**”*⁹⁵

Amazingly, Jim Fetzer somehow maintains that it is “impossible” to fly a plane into the lower floors of a building at the same time he argues that is “possible” to destroy two 110 floor office buildings with a “space beam.”⁹⁶

[Jim Hoffman:] *“Proponents of the no-Boeing theory have made the... [claim that] **‘the final approach was impossible due to ground effect’**... [This claim] **fails to acknowledge that the increased lift due to ground effect can be negated by lowering the angle of attack.**”*⁹⁷

Example #27

From an Interview:

- [Judy Wood:] *“Did they sample the **dust that went up into the upper atmosphere?**”*
- [Greg Jenkins:] *“**I didn’t see a lot of dust go up into the upper atmosphere; I saw it all come down first...**”*

- [Judy Wood:] “*Maybe you should review the pictures.*”
- [Greg Jenkins:] “*I have... a lot of that was the oxygen starved fire [from the North tower]... before, during and after the collapse*”⁹⁸

[Greg Jenkins:] “*Figure 2 is taken directly from Dr. Wood’s website. It is her data that she ‘uses to emphasize’ that the south tower debris [i.e. “dust”] ‘went up into the upper atmosphere’.*”⁹⁹ *She points at the smoke to accentuate her point to the viewers. However, from figure 1, we can see clearly that smoke [i.e. not dust] from the north tower is blowing over the south tower towards the south, so that the smoke in figure 2 only appears to be going straight up, at least to some people.*”¹⁰⁰

Pictures can be taken out of context and lead to misleading interpretations; this could be done unintentionally. In this example, Judy Wood is claiming that “*dust*” from the South Tower is going into the upper atmosphere as it is destroyed. An examination of photographs and videos from alternate angles reveals that this “*dust*” (allegedly from the South Tower) is merely smoke from the North Tower.

Example #28

[Wood/Reynolds:] “*Where is the proof that thermite has EVER been used to completely pulverize buildings in controlled demolition (not simply cleaning up debris)?*”¹⁰¹

The first part of the question was answered previously by Frank Legge.¹⁰² The second part about the possibility of thermite to clean up debris appears to be one of great concern to Wood and Reynolds. They ask this question at least six times in the referenced paper as well as elsewhere. Perhaps they are unaware that Steven Jones has answered this question repeatedly in his presentations:

*“Researcher Michael Berger checked with a number of steel-cutters and workers at Ground Zero. They reported that oxy-acetylene torches were used to cut the steel members—not thermite. Also, reacting thermite ejects globs of molten white/orange-hot iron – would cause VERY dangerous burns! Therefore, thermite was [evidently] not used in clean-up.”*¹⁰³

There are no confirmed reports of thermite being used in cleanup. Indeed, the widespread use of thermite could have endangered any attempts to save lives at ground zero as well as compromise the personal safety of first-responders. Furthermore, Jones has found traces of thermite in samples of dust taken from an apartment building about a football field away from ground zero.¹⁰⁴ This would strongly indicate that thermite was used during the destruction of the twin towers since the material was flown a far distance away from the towers to fall into the fourth floor of an apartment. There was no “clean-up” seen here aside from putting this dust in a plastic bag as a memento from the World Trade Center attacks.¹⁰⁵

Example #29

[Morgan Reynolds:] “*The Pentagon aircraft supposedly put on a stunt show... [The plane downed] a few lamp posts on the highway... [this is] physically impossible.*”¹⁰⁶

As Russell Pickering has shown, “*5 aluminum lamp poles were knocked down preceding the Pentagon wall. Through contact with the VDOT, the distributors and manufacturers of the poles used in the area I have been able to determine the following basic information...The poles were breakaway style on an 18 inch transformer style base. This means that at 23 inches off the ground the pole would be broken by a Volkswagen Rabbit traveling 20 mph.*”¹⁰⁷

Furthermore, the FAA requires “*any structure located within 250 feet of runway centerline has to be frangible, which means the structure needs to break away when hit by an aircraft to minimize damages to the aircraft and its pilot.*”¹⁰⁸

It is noteworthy that the Pentagon is located near an airport, and that the Pentagon itself has a heliport right next to the area where it was attacked. In light of this evidence, it is misleading to claim that it is “impossible” for a plane to knock over these light poles.

Jim Fetzer defined 5 levels of disinformation. I propose a sixth type:

Sixth Type of Disinformation:

The sixth level of *disinformation* is **the promotion of theories that are unable to be tested or proven false with available evidence.** Such theories are called *non-falsifiable*:

“*There is a very important characteristic of a scientific theory or hypothesis which differentiates it from, for example, an act of faith: a theory must be ‘falsifiable’. This means that there must be some experiment or possible discovery that could prove the theory untrue.*”¹⁰⁹

If a theory can not be tested or corroborated with any available evidence, it can not be proved or disproved. Therefore, *non-falsifiable* theories can only function to create a never-ending debate. **9/11 researchers are only able to prove what happened on 9/11 with the available evidence.** Although speculation is essential in any line of inquiry, *speculation alone is never enough to prove a theory*—credible evidence, validation, and/or experiments are also needed.

It is therefore *misleading* to promote *non-falsifiable* hypotheses as if they could explain the events of 9/11 for the simple reason that they can not be validated. If something can not be proved, it will not convince a skeptic. Therefore, *non-falsifiable* theories will never be compelling enough to help force another 9/11 investigation. Steven Jones asks:

“*Is the directed-beams hypothesis a SCIENTIFIC hypothesis? Let the proponents delineate crucial experiments which will permit testing the hypothesis, and which have*

the potential of proving the hypothesis wrong. If an hypothesis is not falsifiable by experiments, it is not scientific.”¹¹⁰

Examples #30-33:

Non-falsifiable theories include:

30. Directed energy weapons were used to destroy or partially destroy the World Trade Center Buildings.
31. Aliens destroyed the Twin Towers with their directed energy weapons.
32. Holograms were used on 9/11.
33. God destroyed the World Trade Center Towers with his foot.¹¹¹

Those who promote *non-falsifiable* theories should support the most credible evidence to get another 9/11 investigation.¹¹² This is the only conceivable way to get definitive answers to unanswerable questions. It is possible to imagine a scenario in which all of the documents in the world involving directed energy weapons were turned over and the theorists could still say: “*you haven’t found them yet—they are still hiding the real ones somewhere!*” After all, these top secret documents could be hiding right beside the “missing” weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

This hypothetical example clearly shows that *non-falsifiable* theories will never lead us to the truth about 9/11. This means that they should be rejected until they are shown to be *falsifiable* with experiments or can be validated in some other way. Indeed, most *non-falsifiable* speculation will never be answered until another 9/11 investigation takes place or new evidence becomes available. It is simply not enough to expect new evidence to become available since this in itself is non-falsifiable speculation.

A *non-falsifiable* theory can be “supported” with *misinformation* and *disinformation*. In place of real evidence, *non-falsifiable theories* are given false credibility with *misinformation* and *disinformation*. Of course, if a theory is supported with false evidence (i.e. *misinformation* or *disinformation*) it does not count as legitimate observations, data, or evidence. However, it is usually tenable to prove that any *disinformation* illegitimately supporting a *non-falsifiable* theory is false (i.e. *it is falsifiable*)—but the theory itself preserves its *non-falsifiable* status if it is unsubstantiated with experiments or validation. As soon as a theory can be validated to explain legitimate evidence it becomes *falsifiable*.

This sixth type of *disinformation* is one of the strongest kinds. Defenders of *non-falsifiable* theories will believe what they want to believe, and they will never be proved wrong to their satisfaction. This is worsened when their beliefs are supported by *disinformation* and *misinformation*.

Conclusions

“If they can get you asking the wrong questions, they don't have to worry about answers.”¹¹³ Thomas Pynchon, Jr.

Those who care about the truth about 9/11 should also care about *disinformation* and *misinformation*. All 9/11 “official story” skeptics agree that the 9/11 commission report consists of substantial *disinformation*.

9/11 *disinformation* and *misinformation* have been used to support the ‘official story’, create misleading accounts for what happened, ‘discredit’ alternative accounts, ‘turn-off’ potential ‘official story’ skeptics through “guilt by association”, create never ending debates, discredit honest and credible researchers, and as Thomas Pynchon suggests; to leave us asking the wrong questions in an attempt to distract attention away from getting the important answers.

The truth about 9/11 is of primary importance. If we accept this to be true, then it is also true that all misleading arguments are harmful to this cause. **Therefore, the intent involved in promoting misleading arguments is irrelevant.** Arguments based on *disinformation* and *misinformation* will almost always result in false, incomplete, inaccurate, and misleading conclusions. As Jim Fetzer suggests in relation to JFK, *disinformation* is the “major obstacle” in discovering and disseminating the truth about 9/11—the key to unraveling the ‘myth of the 21st century.’¹¹⁴

¹ [Arabesque](http://arabesque911.blogspot.com), Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice Member and 9/11 researcher: <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com>.

² Jim Fetzer, *Disinformation, the Use of False Information*, *Minds and Machines*, 14: 231–240, 2004.

³ Jim Fetzer, *Signs of Disinformation*, <http://www.assassinationscience.com>

⁴ “[Disinformation](http://www.dictionary.com)” definition taken from www.dictionary.com

⁵ Fetzer, *Disinformation, the Use of False Information*.

⁶ Definition of “[Misinformation](http://stj911.org)” taken from [Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice](http://stj911.org) website. <http://stj911.org>.

⁷ Jim Fetzer, (2003), *Information: Does It Have To Be True?* *Minds and Machines*, 14, pp. 223–229.

⁸ *9/11 Commission Report*: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/911/index.html>

⁹ For discussion of the facts omitted and distorted by the 9/11 commission see David Ray Griffin's [*9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*](#). Here is a list of the omissions and distortions by the 9/11 commission:
<http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20050523112738404>.

¹⁰ David Ray Griffin, [*The 9/11 Commission Report: A 571-Page Lie*](#), May 22, 2005,
<http://www.911truth.org>

*"In discussing my second 9/11 book, [*The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*](#), I have often said, only half in jest, that a better title might have been "a 571-page lie." (Actually, I was saying "a 567-page lie," because I was forgetting to count the four pages of the Preface.) In making this statement, one of my points has been that the entire Report is constructed in support of one big lie: that the official story about 9/11 is true.*

*Another point, however, is that in the process of telling this overall lie, [*The 9/11 Commission Report*](#) tells many lies about particular issues. This point is implied by my critique's subtitle, "Omissions and Distortions." It might be thought, to be sure, that of the two types of problems signaled by those two terms, only those designated "distortions" can be considered lies."*

¹¹ Read some of the unanswered questions from the [*9/11 Family Steering Committee*](#) here: <http://911independentcommission.org/questions.html>

From www.911truth.org: "[*911truth.org*](#) is a coalition of researchers, journalists and victim family members working to expose and resolve the hundreds of critical questions still swirling around 9/11, **especially the nearly 400 questions that the Family Steering Committee filed with the 9/11 Commission** which they fought to create."

Monisha Bansal, [*9/11 Families Want New Probe, Questions Answered*](#), www.CNSNews.com, September 12, 2006. "According to the group, **70 percent of their questions were either not adequately addressed by the commission or not addressed at all.**"

¹² Definition of [*Straw-man Fallacy*](#) taken from www.nizkor.org:

Person A has position X.

Person B presents position Y (which is a distorted version of X).

Person B attacks position Y.

Therefore X is false/incorrect/flawed.

*“This sort of “reasoning” is fallacious because **attacking a distorted version of a position simply does not constitute an attack on the position itself.** One might as well expect an attack on a poor drawing of a person to hurt the person.”*

¹³ ‘Arabesque’, [The World Trade Center Building Designers: Pre-9/11 claims strongly implicate that the Towers should have remained standing on 9/11](http://arabesque911.blogspot.com), <http://arabesque911.blogspot.com>.

¹⁴ James Glanz, and Eric Lipton, [Towers Withstood Impact, but Fell to Fire, Report Says](#), Fri March 29, 2002, *New York Times*.

“Experts said no building like it [WTC7], a modern, steel-reinforced high-rise, had ever collapsed because of an uncontrolled fire.”

Norman Glover, Fire Engineering, [Fire Engineering journal](#), October 2002. ***“Almost all large buildings will be the location for a major fire in their useful life. No major high-rise building has ever collapsed from fire...”***

¹⁵ ***“The maximum flame temperature increase for burning hydrocarbons (jet fuel) in air is, thus, about 1000 °C -- hardly sufficient to melt steel at 1500 °C.”*** Taken from: Eagar, T. W. and Musso, C. (2001). “Why Did the World Trade Center Collapse?” Science, Engineering, and Speculation”, *Journal of the Minerals, Metals and Materials Society*, 53/12:8-11 (2001).

¹⁶ FEMA Report: [Appendix C of the WTC Building Performance Study](#). See also:

‘George Washington,’ [Why was there Molten Metal Under Ground Zero for Months after 9/11?](#) December 06, 2005. <http://georgewashington.blogspot.com/>. See also other sources mentioned below.

¹⁷ Steven Jones, [Revisiting 9/11/2001—Applying the Scientific Method](#), *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, <http://www.journalof911studies.com/>

¹⁸ NIST calls molten steel “irrelevant” to their investigation. See here:

Jim Hoffman, [NIST's World Trade Center FAQ A Reply to the National Institute for Standards and Technology's ‘Answers to Frequently Asked Questions’](#). August 30, 2006.

¹⁹ [John Gross of NIST confronted over 9/11 WTC demolitions](#), Youtube video. www.youtube.com

²⁰ David Ray Griffin, [The Destruction of the World Trade Center: Why the Official Account Cannot Be True](#). Authorized Version (with references & notes). See also:

Steven Jones, [Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Buildings Completely Collapse?, Word Document](http://www.journalof911studies.com), <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

²¹ Jim Hoffman, [ScholarsFor911Truth.org: Muddling the Evidence](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/st911/index.html), February 19, 2006. <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/st911/index.html>.

²² Popular Mechanics published an article that discusses 9/11 “conspiracy theories”. See a response to it here:

Jim Hoffman, [Popular Mechanics Attacks Its ‘9/11 LIES’ Straw Man](http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pm/), February 9, 2005. <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pm/>

David Ray Griffin, [*Debunking 9/11 Debunking, An Answer to Popular Mechanics and other Defenders of the Official Conspiracy Theory*](#)

²³ Victoria Ashley, [Steven E. Jones, A Physics Professor Speaks Out on 9-11: Reason, Publicity, and Reaction](http://911research.wtc7.net), January 14, 2006. <http://911research.wtc7.net>.

²⁴ Jim Hoffman, [Hoax Promoting Videos](http://911review.com), [http://911review.com/](http://911review.com)

²⁵ [Conspiracy](http://www.dictionary.com): Definition from www.dictionary.com

The act of conspiring.

*An evil, unlawful, treacherous, or surreptitious plan formulated in secret by **two or more persons**; plot.*

*A **combination of persons** for a secret, unlawful, or evil purpose: He joined the conspiracy to overthrow the government.*

*Law: **an agreement by two or more persons** to commit a crime, fraud, or other wrongful act.*

[Theory](http://www.dictionary.com): Definition from www.dictionary.com.

²⁶ [Dr. Frank Legge, Kevin Ryan, Victoria Ashley, and other scholars joint statement.](#)

²⁷ Gregory S. Jenkins, [The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center](http://www.journalof911studies.com), February 2007. <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

²⁸ Ibid. See title of Dr. Jenkin’s paper

²⁹ Taken from: [Dr. Greg Jenkins, PhD physicist, Interviews Dr. Judy Wood](#). Published on www.911blogger.com by Greg Jenkins. See also:

Gregory S. Jenkins, *Introduction to and Interview with Dr. Judy Wood conducted at the National Press Club in Washington D.C. regarding the use of Directed Energy Beams in the Demolition of the World Trade Center Towers*, February 9, 2007. <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

³⁰ Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds, *The Star Wars Beam Weapons*, December 15, 2006. <http://janedoe0911.tripod.com>.

³¹ James Gourley *Scientific Critique of Judy Wood's Paper 'The Star Wars Beam Weapon'*, January 9, 2007. <http://www.journalof911studies.com>

³² Tony Szamboti, *The Damage to WTC Bldg's 3 and 6, the debate between the controlled demolition and beam weapons...*, January 26, 2007. <http://www.journalof911studies.com>

³³ For further discussion, see Journal of 9/11 Studies and Letters section. <http://www.journalof911studies.com>

³⁴ Paul Watson, *Scientific Analysis Proves Towers Brought Down By Incendiaries*, June 20, 2006. www.prisonplanet.com “using advanced techniques we're finding out what's in these samples [of iron taken from Ground Zero]—we're finding iron, sulphur, potassium and manganese—**these are characteristic of a variation of thermite which is used to cut through steel very rapidly, it's called thermate.**” See also:

Griffin, *The Destruction of the World Trade Center* and Jones, *Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Buildings Completely Collapse?*

³⁵ Paul Watson, *9/11 Debunkers Hide From Slam Dunk Evidence Of Controlled Demolition*, May 22, 2007. www.prisonplanet.com

³⁶ Fetzer, *Signs of Disinformation*.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Brian Vasquez, *Glowing Aluminum Disinformation?* February 6, 2007. Page 2. <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

³⁹ Vasquez, *Glowing Aluminum Disinformation?*

⁴⁰ Read a response to *The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis* by Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds here:

Frank Legge, *A study of some issues raised in a paper by Wood & Reynolds*, January 11, 2007.

Arabesque, ['Thermite Hypothesis' versus 'Controlled Demolition Hypothesis': a response to 'The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis'](#)

⁴¹ Vasquez, [Glowing Aluminum Disinformation?](#)

⁴² Wood and Reynolds, [The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis.](#)

⁴³ Vasquez, [Glowing Aluminum Disinformation?](#)

⁴⁴ David Dunbar, executive editor of Popular Mechanics, Debate between editors of Popular Mechanics and the makers of the film Loose Change, Democracy Now, September 11, 2006 <http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=06/09/11/1345203>

⁴⁵ NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Federal Building and Fire Safety Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster, [Answers to Frequently Asked Questions](#), http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm

⁴⁶ David Ray Griffin, [Debunking 9/11 Debunking, An Answer to Popular Mechanics and other Defenders of the Official Conspiracy Theory](#), 160-162.

⁴⁷ Kevin Ryan, [Propping Up the War on Terror: Lies about the WTC by NIST and Underwriters Laboratories](#), <http://physics911.net>

⁴⁸ NIST, [Answers to Frequently Asked Questions](#)

⁴⁹ Jones, [Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Buildings Completely Collapse?](#)

⁵⁰ Jones, [Revisiting 9/11/2001—Applying the Scientific Method](#)

⁵¹ Gordon Ross, [Momentum Transfer Analysis of the Collapse of the Upper Storeys of WTC I](#), <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

⁵² “A previously published study of the WTC dust noted: ‘The environmental science community has been slow to understand that the acute health effects were attributable to a complex mixture of gases and particles and that **the particles in greatest abundance (mass) in the dust were the unregulated supercoarse (>10- μ m diam) particles, not the fine (<2.5- μ m-diam) or coarse (2.5–10- μ m diam) particles** that are typically measured.’ http://pubs.acs.org/subscribe/journals/esthag/40/i22/html/111506feature_lioy.html.”

Taken from: Steven Jones, [Hard Evidence Repudiates the Hypothesis that Mini-Nukes Were Used on the WTC Towers](#). <http://www.journalof911studies.com>.

⁵³ Greg Jenkins, [Jim Fetzer and his “Lying Eyes”](#), February 27, 2007. Published on www.911blogger.com.

<http://911scholars.org/> YouTube link, and http://janedoe0911.tripod.com/why_indeed.html, Figures 15, 16, 17a and 17b

Run time is 3.5 minutes:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=7937273264329816394>

Paper Link: <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200702/Implausibility-Directed...>

Google video compression makes the images slightly obscure, so make sure to check out the original video links from reference #41 in the above article:

http://st12.startlogic.com/~xenonpup/video%20archive/collapse%2001_spire...

And <http://public.gregjenkins.promessage.com/911.wtc.1.spire.close.up.avi>”

⁵⁴ Wood and Reynolds, [*The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis.*](#)

⁵⁵ Arabesque, [*'Thermite Hypothesis' versus 'Controlled Demolition Hypothesis': a response to 'The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis'*](#)

⁵⁶ “In combustion science, there are three basic types of flames, namely, a jet burner, a premixed flame, and a diffuse flame.... A fireplace is a diffuse flame burning in air, as was the WTC fire. Diffuse flames generate the lowest heat intensities of the three flame types... **The maximum flame temperature increase for burning hydrocarbons (jet fuel) in air is, thus, about 1000 °C -- hardly sufficient to melt steel at 1500 °C.**” Taken from: Eagar, T. W. and Musso, C. (2001). “Why Did the World Trade Center Collapse?” Science, Engineering, and Speculation”, Journal of the Minerals, Metals and Materials Society, 53/12:8-11 (2001).

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Jim Hoffman, [*Review of 'A New Standard for Deception' A Presentation by Kevin Ryan*](#), October 15, 2006. The NIST reports low fire temperatures.

“Paint tests indicated low steel temps (480 F [or 280 C]) "despite pre-collapse exposure to fire"

“Microstructure tests showed no steel reached critical (half-strength) values (600 C)”
http://911research.wtc7.net/reviews/kevin_ryan/newstandard.html

However, these recorded observations by NIST ignore the fact that there was molten steel as reported by the FEMA report:

<http://www.911research.wtc7.net/wtc/evidence/metallurgy/index.html>

*“Although virtually all of the structural steel from the Twin Towers and Building 7 was [removed and destroyed](#), preventing forensic analysis, FEMA’s volunteer investigators did manage to perform “limited metallurgical examination” of some of the steel before it was recycled. **Their observations, including numerous micrographs, are recorded in [Appendix C of the WTC Building Performance Study](#).**” see also:*

*“Engineers have been trying to figure out exactly what happened... ‘**Fire and the structural damage... would not explain steel members in the debris pile that appear to have been partly evaporated**” from:*

James Glanz, [Engineers are baffled over the collapse of 7 WTC; Steel members have been partly evaporated](#), New York Times, November 29, 2001.

More evidence of molten steel listed here:

‘George Washington,’ [Why was there Molten Metal Under Ground Zero for Months after 9/11?](#) December 06, 2005. <http://georgewashington.blogspot.com/>

⁵⁹ Jones, [Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Buildings Completely Collapse?](#) Pages 12-16.

⁶⁰ Fetzer, [Signs of Disinformation](#).

⁶¹ Wood and Reynolds, [The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis](#).

⁶² Legge, [A study of some issues raised in a paper by Wood & Reynolds](#).

⁶³ Jones, [Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Buildings Completely Collapse?](#) page 6.

⁶⁴ [Interview of Steven Jones by Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo show](#) on [genlive](#), January 17, 2007. http://www.911podcasts.com/files/audio/JimFetzer-StevenJones_20070117.mp3 Listen to about the 83:00 mark and forward for comment about other explosives in combination with thermite/superthermite.

⁶⁵ www.Explosionworld.com, [Did you know?](#) “**CONCRETE VS. STEEL: In the United States and Europe, support columns in most buildings are constructed of either steel ‘H-beams’ or concrete (with steel reinforcing bars). Some buildings actually have both. DID YOU KNOW that these two types of support columns require two completely different types of explosives to cause their ‘failure’?**”

⁶⁶ Fetzer, [Signs of Disinformation](#).

⁶⁷ Hoffman, [ScholarsFor911Truth.org: Muddling the Evidence](#).

⁶⁸ Ashley, [Steven E. Jones, A Physics Professor Speaks Out on 9-11: Reason, Publicity, and Reaction.](#)

⁶⁹ Definition of [Ad-hominem fallacy](#) taken from www.nizkor.org:

Person A makes claim X.

Person B makes an attack on person A.

Therefore A's claim is false.

*The reason why an Ad Hominem (of any kind) is a fallacy is that **the character, circumstances, or actions of a person do not (in most cases) have a bearing on the truth or falsity of the claim being made (or the quality of the argument being made).***

⁷⁰ Reynolds and Wood, [Reynolds and Wood try to help Steven E. Jones](#), August 27, 2006. It is unclear who said this statement (Wood or Reynolds). However, as co-authors, they both ultimately take responsibility for it. <http://nomoregames.net/>.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Reynolds and Wood, [Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Disintegrate?](#) October 2006. <http://nomoregames.net>.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Transcript: [The Dynamic Duo with Jim Fetzer](#), January 2, 2007. http://www.911scholars.org/070102_transcript.html.

⁷⁶ Reynolds and Wood, [Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Disintegrate?](#)

⁷⁷ Frank Legge, [A Response to Reynolds and Wood.](#) <http://stj911.org/>

⁷⁸ For discussion of Steven Jones' position on the alternative theories supported by Jim Fetzer: [Interview of Steven Jones by Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo show](#) on [gcnlive](#), January 17, 2007. http://www.911podcasts.com/files/audio/JimFetzer-StevenJones_20070117.mp3

⁷⁹ Steven E. Jones, [My Response to 'An Open Letter'](#), November 20, 2006.

⁸⁰ Jim Fetzer, [Why I am now convinced that Steve Jones is untrustworthy](#), February 3, 2007. Published on <http://www.911researchers.com/>

⁸¹ Definition of *poisoning the well* taken from www.nizkor.org

Unfavorable information (be it true or false) about person A is presented.

Therefore any claims person A makes will be false.

“This sort of “reasoning” is obviously fallacious... merely presenting unfavorable information about a person (even if it is true) hardly counts as evidence against the claims he/she might make.”

⁸² Fetzer, [Disinformation, the Use of False Information](#).

⁸³ Definition of *Appeal to authority* taken from www.nizkor.org:

Person A is (claimed to be) an authority on subject S.

Person A makes claim C about subject S.

Therefore, C is true.

“If an expert is significantly biased then the claims he makes within his area of bias will be less reliable. Since a biased expert will not be reliable, an Argument from Authority based on a biased expert will be fallacious. This is because the evidence will not justify accepting the claim... even a good Appeal to Authority is not an exceptionally strong argument. After all, in such cases a claim is being accepted as true simply because a person is asserting that it is true. The person may be an expert, but her expertise does not really bear on the truth of the claim. This is because the expertise of a person does not actually determine whether the claim is true or false.”

⁸⁴ The Galileo Project, [Galileo and the Inquisition](http://galileo.rice.edu/index.html). <http://galileo.rice.edu/index.html>

⁸⁵ Fetzer, [Signs of Disinformation](#).

⁸⁶ Wood and Reynolds, [The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis](#).

⁸⁷ Legge, [A study of some issues raised in a paper by Wood & Reynolds](#)

⁸⁸ Wood and Reynolds, [The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis](#).

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Jim Fetzer, [Thinking about ‘Conspiracy Theories’: 9/11 and JFK](#), 2005.

⁹¹ Jim Hoffman, [A Critical Review of James Fetzer's Thinking about "Conspiracy Theories": 9/11 and JFK](#), February 6, 2006. <http://911research.wtc7.net>.

⁹² Fetzer, [*Signs of Disinformation*](#).

⁹³ Gourley, [*Scientific Critique of Judy Wood's Paper "The Star Wars Beam Weapon"*](#).

“Judy Wood stated this during a discussion of the WR paper on Jim Fetzer’s radio show ‘Non-Random Thoughts’”

http://mp3.rbnlive.com/Fetzer/0611/20061111_Sat_Fetzer2.mp3.

⁹⁴ Gourley, [*Scientific Critique of Judy Wood's Paper "The Star Wars Beam Weapon"*](#).

Page 11. See also:

‘[*Thermite Experiments*](#)’, Google Video.

⁹⁵ Debbie Lewis, [*The BBC Joins The Ranks Of The Untrustworthy United States Media*](#), February 24, 2007.

⁹⁶ Wood and Reynolds, [*The Star Wars Beam Weapons*](#). Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds call their paper: “*The Star Wars Beam Weapons*”.

⁹⁷ Jim Hoffman, [*The Pentagon Attack: What the Physical Evidence Shows*](#), March 28, 2006. <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/pentagon/index.html>

⁹⁸ Greg Jenkins, [*Dr. Greg Jenkins interviews Dr. Judy Wood*](#), February 1, 2007. www.video.google.com 15 minute mark.

⁹⁹ Ibid. Watch Introduction.

¹⁰⁰ Jenkins, [*Introduction to and Interview with Dr. Judy Wood conducted at the National Press Club in Washington D.C. regarding the use of Directed Energy Beams in the Demolition of the World Trade Center Towers*](#). See also:

Greg Jenkins and Arabesque, [*INTERVIEW WITH DR. JUDY WOOD AND DR. GREG JENKINS*](#), Journal of 9/11 Studies, <http://www.journalof911studies.com>

¹⁰¹ Wood and Reynolds, [*The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis*](#).

¹⁰² Legge, [*A study of some issues raised in a paper by Wood & Reynolds*](#) “*thermite does not explode*’. *Jones has never said that it did.*”

¹⁰³ Steven Jones, [*Answers to Objections and Questions*](#), pages 75-76.

¹⁰⁴ Steven Jones, [*Revisiting 9/11/2001—Applying the Scientific Method*](#)

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Morgan Reynolds, [*We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories*](#), March 5, 2006.

¹⁰⁷ Pentagon Research, [*Lamp poles*](http://www.pentagonresearch.com/lamps.html). <http://www.pentagonresearch.com/lamps.html>

¹⁰⁸ http://www.dodsbir.net/sitis/archives_display_topic.asp?Bookmark=28508

¹⁰⁹ Jose Wudka, [*What is the 'scientific method'?*](http://physics.ucr.edu/~wudka/Physics7/Notes_www/node6.html)
http://physics.ucr.edu/~wudka/Physics7/Notes_www/node6.html

¹¹⁰ Steven Jones, [*My Response to 'An Open Letter'*](#).

¹¹¹ Rob Rice, [*NIST and 'The Foot Of God' Hypothesis*](http://www.911scholars.org/NISTandThe%20FootOfGod.html).
<http://www.911scholars.org/NISTandThe%20FootOfGod.html>

¹¹² Steven Jones, [*What is the Goal in the 9/11 Truth Community? Debates, or Justice?*](#)
January 9, 2007.

*“As identified in my talk at the University of California at Berkeley, **there are four areas of 9/11 research that are so compelling that they may quickly lead to the goal of a solid investigation of 9/11 as an un-solved crime scene.**”*

¹¹³ Thomas Pynchon, [*Gravity's Rainbow*](#), page 251.

¹¹⁴ Phrase taken from Webster Tarpley's book, [*9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA*](#).