

How I became a 9/11 'truther'

Eight years have now passed since the attacks of 911, and for these eight years I have steered clear from the debate about what exactly happened on 911. Mostly, I defined myself as a '911 agnostic', meaning literally that I had no knowledge of what took place that day. However, being an agnostic does not mean not thinking about a topic. I watched every single 'truther' movie out there, read quite a few books on this topic, compared and contrasted the 'truther' and 'debunker' arguments and stances. Now, eight years later, a number of aspects of this debate have become clear in my mind.

From the very beginning one thing did strike me: the systematic vilification of those who doubted the official version of the events on 911 by not only the corporate media and their talking heads, but even a lot of people in the blogosphere. '911 kooks' was the most frequently used term to refer to the 'truthers'. From the outset I was shocked by that. Why should those who ask questions be vilified in such a manner? Does the US government not have a well-known history of false flag operations (think of the US "[Operation Northwoods](#)" or the joint US-Israeli "[Operation Cyanide](#)" - on the latter an excellent source of info is the BBC report "Dead in the Water" which you can view by clicking [here](#)). Was the CIA not involved at every single step of the creation and growth of what became later known as al-Qaeda? If there any doubt at all that the folks who were in power on 911 are evil to the very core and more than capable of killing not thousands, but millions of innocent people to achieve their goals? Last, but not least, who benefited most from 911 if not the US Empire and the Israel Lobby?

The answers are rather obvious, aren't they?

But then why were 'truthers' vilified? I suppose that the fact that there are real crackpots and kooks among the 911 Truth movement did not help. Some of these guys are, indeed, raving lunatics and plainly idiots. And having the likes of Alex Jones screaming all sorts of things on the streets of NY with his megaphone did little to help the image of the 911 Truth movement (Alex Jones is the kind of guy I just love to hate. Everything about him offends me, his tone, his behavior and, worst of all, his voice). This is all true, but none of this is in any way a logical reply to the issues which were raised by the 'truthers'. I mean - if a person says 'how could WTC7 collapse at free fall accelerations?' it is just not enough to answer 'Alex Jones is a lunatic!!!!'. Even though the latter might be true, this is hardly an adequate reply. Yet this kind of 'argument' is mostly what I saw from the alternative blogosphere.

The other thing which amazed me is that from day 1, the Dubya administration did pretty much everything it could to prevent a real investigation from 911. First, they opposed it, then they wanted Henry Kissinger (!) to head it, then they refused to let Bush testify without Cheney in the same room, etc. Why would they? The logical thing to do for them would have been to make a huge and open investigation looking into every single aspect of the 911 attacks with maniacal care. After all, if a bunch of Saudis armed with cutters lead by a small group of people sitting in a cave in Afghanistan really did commit these acts, as the government says they did, why not maximize the outrage of the public opinion by keeping an endless flows of details about this operation coming in day after day after day into the public domain? Why not expose it all step by step, event by event?

But no - every single step taken to investigate these events was at best a farce and at worst a

pathetic attempt to bury the truth forever. Let's just take one simple example: there was enough debris left on 911 to send samples to every single laboratory on the planet. Yet, all of it was removed at warp speed and, of all things, sent to China! (keep in mind that legally speaking the debris from WTC1, WTC2 and WTC7 represented evidence on a crime scene). Now how can the politicians in Washington complain when the 'truthers' allege that traces of thermate were found in the 911 dust? NIST, to this day, also adamantly refuses to test the dust for explosives even though such an investigation is required by law.

Not only that, but the government's story changed time after time after time. This is as true for the list of alleged hijackers as it is in the case of the mechanisms which brought down the buildings (see below). With that type of constantly changing stories, it is no wonder that people start asking questions, I would say.

Yet another kind of response to the Truth movement was what the Papist call the 'argument of authority'. It goes something like this 'if Ron Paul does not question 911, neither will I'. Frankly, this is kind of dumb, in particular in the case of a politician who, no matter how courageous and honest, simply cannot afford to say anything and everything he thinks. Yet, a lot of people did exactly that, and not only Ron Paul supporters - exactly the same argument was made with Noam Chomsky's name. I personally have a great deal of respect for both Ron Paul and Noam Chomsky, but that respect does not translate into an automatic and unconditional support for everything they say or, in this case, do *not* say.

Another thing which got me thinking is the amazingly dishonest arguments used by 'debunkers'. Only yesterday evening I read the following thing on a debunker website: "the truthers say that a cruise missile hit the Pentagon, yet they also says that the way the light poles were cut down is suspicious - but how could a cruise missile cut down these poles? Obviously, an aircraft did this!"

This kind of "argument" is fundamentally un-scientific. The scientific method consists of making an observation, asking a question, form a hypothesis, conduct an experiment and then either accept or reject the hypothesis; in the latter case a new hypothesis has to be made taking into account the outcome of the experiment. In the case of 911, it is the government who presented us with a hypothesis (the official version) and this hypothesis did not fit the observed facts at all. What the truthers primarily did is to challenge this hypothesis. But the 'debunkers' instead of re-working their initial hypothesis immediately challenged the 'truthers' to present a more solid explanation. This is not logical or scientific at all.

Consider this: the 'debunkers' love to call the 'truthers' 'conspiracy theorists'. Yet these very same 'debunkers' fully buy into the official government version(s) which, as it happens, is nothing but a big conspiracy theory (and a utterly incredible one, I would add).

I realize that all of the above is little more than my personal, subjective, impressions and musings. True. And I don't claim to have all the answers. But one thing I do know is that 911 was never properly investigated or, even much less so, adequately explained. Therefore, ***the 911 Truth Movement demand for a new, independent, and fully transparent investigation is absolutely legitimate*** and to reject it is fundamentally un-democratic. If millions of dollars can be spend by the US taxpayer to investigate Clinton's sexual activities with Monica Lewinsky, then the death of 3000 Americans surely deserves a real and independent investigation, no?!

In reality, of course, the 'truthers' did force many revisions of the official version (see below). It's just that the government and the debunkers will never admit to it. Who are the real 'kooks' here - they folks who question the official theory or those who fully buy into it, even when *it changes over and over again*?!

For example, did you know that:

I) **That in 2006 (already four years ago!) the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) dropped the famous "pancake theory"** about how the WTC buildings fell on 9/11? Here is a quote from their final report:

NIST's findings do not support the "pancake theory" of collapse, which is premised on a progressive failure of the floor systems in the WTC towers (the composite floor system—that connected the core columns and the perimeter columns—consisted of a grid of steel "trusses" integrated with a concrete slab; see diagram below). Instead, the NIST investigation showed conclusively that the failure of the inwardly bowed perimeter columns initiated collapse and that the occurrence of this inward bowing required the sagging floors to remain connected to the columns and pull the columns inwards. Thus, the floors did not fail progressively to cause a pancaking phenomenon. (source: [NIST report FAQ](#)) .

Nevermind the part about "*the NIST investigation showed conclusively ...*". My point is not to challenge their newest theory, but to **point out that the initial "official" theory was quietly dropped and that nobody seems to be aware of that**. Ask your friends and colleagues why and how the WTC buildings fell - and I betcha that you will get the "pancake theory".

II) **That NIST also admitted that WTC7 fell in free-fall?** Check out this video showing how NIST had to cave in to "truthers" and reluctantly admit that free fall did occur. Check out this three part video:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eDvNS9iMjzA>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iXTlaqXsm4k>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v3mudruFzNw>

So, no "pancaking" and an officially free falling WTC7...

So what is the "official version" of 9/11? Does anybody even ask this question?

Still, having myself spent eight years being a "9/11 agnostic" I certainly can relate to the incredulity of those who believe that while the US government has plenty of ugly deeds on its conscience, the idea that 9/11 was some kind of "inside job" is really "too much".

I would like to spell out here what exactly brought me around and made me into a committed "truthers". The second thing I would like to do, is to give some "shortcuts" to those who are "on the fence" or confused about this entire topic.

Let's begin by the one thing which really opened my eyes. For this, I need to first identify the reasons for my previous 9/11 agnosticism. Basically - I believed that the US government could not have pulled off such a major operation as the covert installation of many tons of

explosives inside WTC1, WTC2 and WTC7 without this somehow becoming public. Likewise, I did not believe that having used at least three planes (2 in NY and the one which crashed in Shanksville) the putative "conspirators" would have chosen a rather convoluted "no plane" option to strike the Pentagon. Finally, I did believe very strongly that the USA "had it coming" for decades already and that an organization like al-Qaeda had clearly warned the USA that it would retaliate for the perceived occupation of Saudi Arabia by "infidels" and for the US support Israel. So I applied [Occam's Razor](#) and decided that there is no need to seek some really complex and convoluted solution when the simple and straightforward explanation made sense and seemed to be supported by all the facts: 9/11 was a case of 'blowback' for US imperial polices.

This reasoning looked all fine and dandy to me until I came to a truly momentous realization: the "official theory" did not explain one major fact: there is absolutely no way that 2 planes could have brought down the 3 buildings in New York. Not only that, but the way the buildings fell simply cannot be explained by a gravitational collapse induced by fire.

Let me stress something crucial here: one need not have an explanation for HOW something happened if this something is observed and irrefutably established. Or, put in another way - the fact that somebody cannot explain a phenomenon is not a logical basis to dismiss or deny the phenomenon itself.

Bottom line: the [US government - through NIST - officially recognized the fact that the WTC7 building fell at a free-fall acceleration for 2,25 seconds](#). Do those 2,25 seconds really matter? Hell yes!! What this means is that ***the US government admits that for 2,25 seconds WTC7 fell without any kind of resistance to slow it down*** and this, therefore, means that there was nothing under the collapsing section. So this begs an obvious question: since we now know that there was nothing under the collapsing section and since we also know that there was a steel frame building there seconds before the collapse - what happened in between those two events? There is only one possible answer to this question: the steel-framed section of the building which would have normally slowed down the collapsing section of the building was removed a) extremely rapidly b) symmetrically. There is only one phenomenon which can explain that: explosives.

The above is simply not a matter of opinion. This is a fact. Likewise, it is a fact that fires could not have removed a section of WTC7 the way it was observed. At this point, we are faced with two basic and mutually exclusive options:

- a) to deny the reality of indisputably established facts
- b) to accept the compelling logic of Conan Dolye's Sherlock Holmes who said: "When you have eliminated the impossible (*in this case - fires causing the observed collapse*), whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth."

Furthermore, we also know that WTC1 and WTC2 could not have collapsed as a result of the combined effects of the impact of the planes and the subsequent fires (anyone doubting that should watch [9/11 Blueprint for Truth](#) - a presentation by Richard Gage of [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#), an organization which now counts [over 1000 members](#)).

Unlike the case of WTC7 for which we do have a de-facto government admission that only explosives could have cause the observed collapse, the case of WTC1 and WTC2 not yet

elicited any kind of oblique admission by the US government. What Uncle Sam did was even more basic: its latest report officially analyzes the events leading up to the collapse, but does not look at anything which happened once the collapse was initiated.

The extent of NIST's explanation for the totality of the collapses and their many [demolition-like features](#) is simply that the total collapse was "inevitable" once a collapse event was "initiated". A footnote in the Executive Summary reads:

*The focus of the Investigation was on the sequence of events from the instant of aircraft impact to the initiation of collapse for each tower. For brevity in this report, this sequence is referred to as the "probable collapse sequence," although **it includes little analysis of the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached and collapse became inevitable.*** (p xxxviii/39)

[emphasis added]

The footnote is a re-worded version of a paragraph in the text of the Report's Draft, which read:

*... although **it does not actually include the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached and collapse became inevitable.*** (p xxxviii/39 of Draft)

[emphasis added]

In other words - the government does not even have an explanation, theory or even hypothesis of what could have triggered the type of collapse which was actually observed by millions, if not billions, of people.

So let's now put it the simple and direct way: the ONLY explanation for the collapse of WTC1, WTC2 and WTC7 is a controlled demolition by pre-planted explosives. This is not "one of the" theories - it is the ONLY theory (a theory is an explanation which makes it possible to explain that which is observed). I need to repeat this again:

The US government has already admitted that WTC7 did collapse at free fall speed for 2,25 seconds and the US government has simply no explanation at all for the any of the building collapses which happened on 9/11.

Since all the WTC center building were highly secure (especially WTC7 which had all the following organizations as tenants: [DoD, CIA, FBI, IRS, USSS and many others](#)) is unthinkable that any entity not affiliated with the US government could have covertly introduced hundreds of tons of high-explosives in these buildings, and most definitely not "al-Qaeda". Again, we need to turn to the compelling logic of Sherlock Holmes: "When you have eliminated the impossible (*in this case - a non-US government entity bringing in tons of explosives into WTC1/WTC2/WTC7 without being caught*), whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth."

That's it.

That is all it takes to establish beyond reasonable doubt that 9/11 was an "inside job".

There is no need to explain all the seemingly unexplainable events which happened on that day, nor is there any need to explain HOW what we know happened was actually organized and executed. When a crime is committed, the forensic experts can establish that, say a

murder was committed with a knife before the police investigators establish who did it, why or how. Put it differently, the fact that the police cannot establish motive, means and opportunity or charge a suspect beyond reasonable doubt does not mean that no murder happened.

This is why the all the numerous members of the 9/11 Truth movement all agree on one key demand: a new, independent and free, investigation into the events of 9/11 (conversely, those who oppose such an investigation are accessories to a clear case of obstruction of justice!).

What about the Pentagon?!

Here I need to caution any newcomers to the 9/11 Truth movement: the fact is that the 9/11 Truth movement is deeply divided on this issue. Many "truthers" are absolutely convinced that no plane ever hit the Pentagon, while many others are equally sure that only a plane could have caused the damage which was observed. The debate on this topic is so heated that both sides sometimes resort to exactly the same tactics as the other: dismissing eyewitnesses are "notorious unreliable" and accusing each other of being government plants, disinformation agents.

Let me candidly share my own view on this with you: I have seen many pictures of the damage on the Pentagon and I cannot imagine that an aircraft would simply vanish the way this one seemed to have vaporized itself. Not only that, but I think that a plane hitting a building at full speed would cause much more structural damage than what is actually seen on the photos. However, and this is a big however, I am not an expert on air crashes. Not only that, but the idea that whoever would have used 3 planes in NY would suddenly decide not to use one at the Pentagon makes no sense to me whatsoever. Nor do the "alternative" theories such as a cruise missile strike or a "bombing flyover" of the Pentagon by a mysteriously disappearing aircraft. On this issue I personally still remain a total 'agnostic' and I am quite willing to be convinced either way.

I am aware of the fact that some 9/11 truthers are constantly warning the rest of us that there is a real risk that the US government is deliberately muddying up the waters around the Pentagon attack to commit as many truthers as possible to a "no-plane" theory only to better ridicule us all by eventually releasing an indisputable video showing a plane hitting the Pentagon (and we know that they have many such unreleased videos). I think that this warning should be taken very seriously by all.

But let's come back here to Occam's Razor. Here is how [Wikipedia](#) sums it up: "*When competing hypotheses are equal in other respects, the principle recommends selection of the hypothesis that introduces the fewest assumptions and postulates the fewest entities while still sufficiently answering the question*". In practical terms for the 9/11 Truth movement this translates into a fundamental principle: **we do not need to refer to whatever happened at the Pentagon to prove that 9/11 was an inside job.**

The official narrative (it does not even deserve to be called a "theory") so full of holes that even a fully empowered independent investigation would have a very hard time making sense of it all. There are literally dozens of issues which should be investigated: the damage to the Pentagon, of course, but also the real fate of United 93 (was it shot down?), the impossible phone calls made from the aircraft, the lack of debris in Shanksville, the close connections of the supposed hijackers to the CIA and FBI, the role of "high-fiving" Israelis and the so-called

"Israeli students" spy network, the financing of the alleged hijackers by the Pakistani ISI (whose head was in DC on 9/11), etc. These are all valid topics worthy of careful analysis, but they are not needed to establish that 9/11 was an inside job.

The big news of 2009 was the publication by a group of prestigious scientists in the [Open Chemical Physics Journal](#) of a peer-reviewed article entitled "[Active Thermite Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe](#)" which established that the dust from the WTC buildings which was collected in NY is full of not only of residue of explosives, but even from unexploded materials (see also Jim Hoffman's paper "[Explosives Found in World Trade Center Dust](#)"). Not only had a "smoking gun" been found, a "loaded gun" had been found too. This was, of course, terrific news for the 9/11 Truth movement, a monumental achievement for the scientists involved in the research and publication of this seminal paper. But establishing that explosives have now been found is not needed to make the case that 9/11 was an inside job.

Why is this so important? Because any discussion about HOW 9/11 was done can turn into a refutation of WHAT was done that day. For example, the explosives expert Ron Craig has regularly attacked Richard Gage with the following logical fallacy: since he - Ron Craig - would not have been able to bring down the WTC buildings with regular explosives without a number of phenomena which were not observed on 9/11 and since he - Ron Craig - knows of no other explosives which could have brought these buildings down the way they were seen to collapse, it follows therefore that explosives could not have been used and the cause of the collapse itself and all the phenomena seen and heard that day could only have been a gravity induced collapse. Ron Craig is basically saying this: "since I cannot explain it - it did not happen".

So here is what is so crucial: the 9/11 Truth movement should never accept to be placed in the position of having to explain what kind of explosives were used, how they were placed, how they were detonated, how they were brought into the buildings, or how they were manufactured. Our position should be crystal clear: we *know* that the buildings were brought down with explosives, we think that we have some [solid evidence about at least some of explosives which were used](#), we even have a [very good idea of how they might have been brought in](#), but none of that is central to our thesis: that 9/11 was an inside job. What the 9/11 Truth movement needs to reply to the Ron Craigs out there is: we have proven that the buildings were brought down with explosives and since you claim to be an explosives expert we don't you find out *how exactly* this was done instead of denying the facts?!

The main point is this: the way those who are still 9/11 "agnostics" must focus their internal debate about what happened on 9/11 is exactly the same as those who have joined the ranks of the "truthers" must focus the debate when talking to sceptics: First, only stick to those few but crucial facts which are sufficient to prove that the WTC buildings were brought down by explosives as demonstrating this is enough to prove the fundamental thesis of the entire 9/11 Truth movement that 9/11 was an "inside job". Second - refer all other outstanding issues to a future independent 9/11 investigation. This way, we can transform each challenging question thrown at us into yet another reason for a new investigation.

This pretty much sums up the conclusions to which I have come. I am open to other opinions and to criticisms, and I am not in any way claiming that what I wrote above is THE truth about 9/11. It is simply an outline of where I am at this moment in time. My goal in writing all this is

to "compare notes" with others in a similar situation and to encourage the doubting agnostics to take a second, hard, look at the facts. Lastly, my hope is that some newcomers (such as myself) might steer clear of some of the logical traps and pitfalls which are placed ahead of them by the proponents of the official narrative.