

Apr 24, 2013

Hello Rachel,

I am on the board of Scientists for 9/11 Truth and the International Center for 9/11 Studies. I am speaking for myself, not for these organizations. I'm generally a fan of yours, but you did a disservice by painting the 9/11 Truth community with a broad brush. What if I castigated journalism that way? I, and the scientists and engineers I work with, are as far from Alex Jones as you are from Glenn Beck. (Alex Jones has never invited me onto his show. I guess I'm not sensational enough for his tastes.) I don't have a conspiracy theory about the Boston Marathon bombing or the shootings at Sandy Hook or the moon landings. I do, however, have some knowledge and insight, based on my own direct research, and that of other independent scientists, into what brought down the World Trade Center. My work, supported by the work of others, forced NIST to change their report and admit in their final report, that World Trade Center Building 7 fell at absolute freefall for over 100 feet. They had previously claimed it came down 40% slower than freefall, which is a blatantly false assertion. (See [911speakout.org](http://911speakout.org)) The clear implication is that all support over at least 7 stories was suddenly and completely removed over the 100 meter width of the building, a smoking gun for explosive demolition. This is not conspiracy theory. It is publicly visible data, easily measurable by even a competent high school physics student. The measurement has been verified by numerous others, including, now, NIST themselves (although they deny the clear implications).

The temperatures attainable from jet fuel and office fires misses the melting point of steel by over 1000 degrees F, yet physical evidence of very high temperatures and molten steel exists even in the small amount of steel that was preserved. There were also high concentrations of iron droplets littering the dust that covered lower Manhattan. The bottom line is that the event could not have happened as described in the 9/11 Commission Report and the NIST report.

There is a lot of ludicrous speculation that circulates about many aspects of 9/11 (mini-nukes in the basement, holograms instead of airplanes, space beams, antisemitic rants, etc.) that are pure bunk. We are fighting back fires all the time. Who dreams all this up? But there is ample hard evidence that proves beyond a reasonable doubt that massive amounts of explosives were involved; the freefall of Building 7 and the existence of very high temperatures, beyond normal fires, are two of the most solidly established facts. The use of explosives implies advanced planning, access to the buildings, coordination with the flights, coordination with the military not to shoot down the flights, etc. Yes, it leads to unsavory conclusions, but it is not based on "conspiracy thinking." It is based on looking long and hard at the evidence, soberly and quantitatively. And it is based on a willingness to go where the evidence leads. Please, if you are going to dig deep enough to read the 9/11 Commission Report and Popular Mechanics, balance your information. Reach out for dialog with those of us who have done the scientific research that brings those conclusions into question. You are not Glenn Beck. We are not Alex Jones.

--David Chandler

Apr 29, 2013

The Journal of 9/11 Studies has a new paper in its "Letters" section from Lance deHaven-Smith on the Media's categorical rejection of what it terms "conspiracy theories." This is an excellent short (3-page) paper accessible to anyone on any level. Lance gave an excellent presentation at the Toronto Hearings

on State Crimes against Democracy (SCADs). I think the paper is very relevant to the current discussion. I would hope Rachel, and the entire MSNBC crew, would strive to rise above this intellectually dishonest tendency. See

<http://www.journalof911studies.com/resources/2013LettersAprilde-HavenSmith.pdf>