After the collapse

The World Trade Center Volcano

By the end of the day the area around the World Trade Center was covered with concrete and gypsum powder up to several inches thick, as if a volcano has erupted nearby (Figure 6-1).

The significance of the thick coating of powder becomes more apparent when you look at the collapses, burnings, and bombings of other buildings. When has a building produced such large volumes of powder? This was not a typical collapse.

Forest fires produce large amounts of ash, but that ash is from the burning of wood. The streets of New York were full of powdered concrete and gypsum, not ash from burned office materials.

Only metal survived

Every photo of the rubble shows that nothing but steel remained. How can buildings fall down without at least some of the office furniture, plumbing fixtures, and concrete surviving? How is such total annihilation possible?

We are supposed to believe that the people who designed the World Trade Center never provided enough of a safety margin to handle a rise in temperature caused by a serious fire. This could be true, but that does not explain why the entire building turned into powder and small pieces of steel. Rather, it would only explain why some of the steel beams buckled under the stress, and it could explain why some of the joints broke. It would not explain why every concrete floor disintegrated into tiny particles before it hit the ground.

Figure 6-1  Is there a sensible explanation for why the towers produced as much dust as a small volcano?
Both Buildings 5 and 6 suffered from extreme fires. These were “conventional” fires; i.e.,
giant flames were visible, even through dark smoke, and windows shattered.

Figure 6-2  Both Buildings 5 and 6 suffered from extreme fires. These were “conventional” fires; i.e.,
giant flames were visible, even through dark smoke, and windows shattered.

Figure 6-3  Building 6 survived the intense fires without crumbling. The debris from the tower crushed some of this
building; the fire did not do that damage. (See Figure 6-4 to understand what this photo shows.)
Why did Buildings 4, 5 & 6 hold together?

The two buildings with the address of 4 and 6 were close to the towers, and Building 5 was a bit further away. Fires were extreme in these buildings (Figure 6-2). Buildings 4 and 6 were also bombarded with debris from the towers. However, none of these buildings shattered into dust. They were damaged, but their steel structures held together (Figure 6-3).

The steel beams in these smaller buildings were much thinner than the beams in the towers and in Building 7. However, these thin beams survived extreme fires and bombardment by debris better than the much thicker beams in the towers and Building 7. Do small buildings survive fires better than large buildings?

Incidently, Figure 6-4 shows pieces of aluminum scattered on the rooftops and the rubble, as if the area had been decorated with tinsel. The aluminum coverings of the exterior columns (Figure 3-6) were shredded into short pieces and blown as far as several hundred feet from the towers. The metal in the towers appears to have been put through a shredding device, and the concrete appears to have been put through a pulverizing device. How can a building “fall down” in such a manner?

Thermal images

As far as I know, nobody inserted probes into the rubble to determine the temperature inside. However, on September 16, five days after the buildings collapsed, NASA flew an airplane over the World Trade Center to create a thermal map. The airplane recorded the infrared radiation coming from the ground, so it gave an indication of the surface temperature of the rubble.

Figure 6-4  The blue arrow shows approximately the angle of the photo in Figure 6-3. Building 7 is the pile behind Building 6. There are two holes in Building 6, and one in Building 5. The red arrow points to a hole in Building 5.
The US Geological Survey put a report together based on NASA’s data. They analyzed the infrared data from the eight hottest locations to determine the actual temperature of the rubble at those points (Figure 6-5). This map was created after firemen and cleanup crews had spent five days spraying water on the rubble and hauling rubble away. Therefore, it is possible that the eight hottest spots would be in different locations if the thermal map had been created the day after the attack rather than five days later.

The location marked with the letter H is in the location of Building 4 but, as Figure 5-13 shows, about 20 million kilograms from the overhanging section of the South Tower fell towards this area. Therefore, the high temperature of the spot marked as H may be due to the rubble from the South Tower, not the rubble from Building 4. Also a portion of Building 4 remained standing near that location (Figure 6-6), so if there were still fires burning inside then it may be the temperature of the flames, not the rubble.

The two highest temperatures at locations A and G are beyond the melting point of aluminum. The firemen sprayed water on much (maybe all) of the rubble for an unspecified number of days. The firemen sprayed so much water that shallow pools can be seen in some photographs of the rubble. This means that even after five days of being cooled by water the rubble was still hot enough in some locations to melt aluminum.

The high temperature of the rubble explains why smoke and steam seeped out of the rubble for months. Furthermore, if the surface of the rubble was capable of melting aluminum after five days, what was the interior of this rubble capable of doing immediately after the collapse? Was it capable of melting copper?

Photographs of the rubble show only steel and dust. NASA’s thermal map could explain this odd situation. Specifically, only steel and a few other materials could survive such extreme temperatures. The flammable office materials and people would become ash in such an inferno.

Why was the rubble so hot? The fire was confined to small areas of the tower, so it is unlikely that the fire could have created so much hot rubble. Was the heat created when the rubble hit the ground (which converts potential energy into thermal energy)?

### The World Trade Center odor

Further evidence of the rubble’s high temperature comes from the people in Manhattan who complained about the peculiar, unpleasant odor in the area.

If the rubble had been cool, not much smoke or steam would have come from the rubble. The paper, plastic, and carpeting trapped in the dust and steel would have remained unburned. The dead people trapped in the rubble would have slowly decayed, creating bad smells. However, if the rubble was hot, the 2000 to 3000 people trapped in the rubble would cook, sizzle, and burn. Their muscles would produce familiar meat-like odors, but the contents of their intestines would not produce such pleasant odors, nor would their fat or hair.

If there had been only two bodies in the rubble, their odor would have been dominated by the smoke from burning paper and plastic, but there were 130,000 kilograms of body parts in that rubble. There would have been a large volume of unpleasant odors coming from those bodies for many days.

---

**The Eight Hot Spots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Temperature (°F)</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:</td>
<td>1,341°F</td>
<td>727°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:</td>
<td>1,034°F</td>
<td>557°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:</td>
<td>1,161°F</td>
<td>627°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>963°F</td>
<td>517°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E:</td>
<td>801°F</td>
<td>427°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F:</td>
<td>1,377°F</td>
<td>747°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:</td>
<td>1,377°F</td>
<td>747°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicinity of the towers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E:</td>
<td>819°F</td>
<td>437°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:</td>
<td>1,017°F</td>
<td>547°C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Melting points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Melting Point (°F)</th>
<th>Melting Point (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tin</td>
<td>449°F</td>
<td>232°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>621°F</td>
<td>327°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>787°F</td>
<td>419°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluminum</td>
<td>1,218°F</td>
<td>659°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper</td>
<td>1,981°F</td>
<td>1,083°C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 6-5  Surface temperatures of the rubble five days after the collapse*
We are blind without data

Because NASA collected data on the temperatures of the rubble, including the longitude and latitude of the points they collected the data for, we can make specific, detailed statements such as:

*The temperature at the surface of the rubble of the North Tower at 40°42-39.94" N latitude, 74°00'45.37" W was 747°C five days after the collapse.*

If nobody had bothered to collect thermal data, we would have to observe photographs of the rubble and guess at the temperature based on the production of smoke and steam. We could deduce that the rubble is “hot” because steam came out for weeks, but we would not know the actual temperature. Without data to work with, we are blind.

Now imagine the other extreme in which NASA did more than fly over the site five days later. Imagine that on September 12th scientists inserted temperature probes into the rubble. This would allow them to determine the temperatures at different depths within the rubble. This in turn would allow them to estimate the total energy content of the rubble. Once they know the energy in the rubble they can make a good guess as to whether explosives were used to bring the buildings down because they would know whether there was more energy in the rubble than the building had in potential energy.

The point is that if we do not collect evidence in crimes or fires, we cannot be sure exactly what happened. To rephrase that, when you want to avoid getting caught for a crime, destroy all evidence before it is inspected.

Increasing the rate at which evidence is destroyed.

On September 23, the government agency NOAA sent an airplane over the World Trade Center for several hours to create three-dimensional elevation maps of the area (Figure 6-6 is one of them). The darkest green spots are below the ground level. Christopher Bollyn of *The American Free Press* points out that the hole in Building 6 is one of those deep holes; i.e., the dark green color inside the hole is not a “shadow.” There are no shadows in an elevation map. This means the hole in Building 6 is below ground level.

Furthermore, the hole in Building 6 was full of the rubble from the 8 floors above the hole, which means that if the
rubble had been removed from the hole before the elevation map had been made, the hole would be even deeper. Did pieces of the North Tower crush only the center of Building 6? If so, it crushed it so deeply that it was below ground level after the rubble from eight floors fell into it. Or did something in Building 6 explode, in which case we could explain the smoke in Figure 1-1? Building 6 was the US Customs building. What was inside that building?

Getting back to Figure 6-6, NOAA said the purpose of the elevation maps was to help crews identify the original foundation structures, basement areas, underground utility connections, and elevator shafts. Was NOAA helping the investigators understand what happened? Or were they helping clean-up crews to remove the rubble?

No photos! Get out or be arrested!

There is a site on the Internet (cryptome.org) that contains photographs that were taken on October 3, 2001 (Figure 3-6 is one of them). According to the story of how these pictures were taken, the photographer went to the World Trade Center to take pictures. He found barricades and security guards surrounding the area (except for one location where the guard may have been busy somewhere else). He walked around the site, stopping every so often to take a photo.

After taking dozens of pictures he encountered a police officer who asked him if he had authorization to take photographs of the area. When he told the officer he did not, other officers came over and told him he was in a crime scene and was not allowed to take photographs. An officer asked to see his digital camera and the photographs he had taken. After briefly looking at his camera the officer gave it back and told him to stay away from the site or he would be arrested. When the photographer got home and tried to view his photographs he discovered that they had been deleted from the camera’s flash memory by the officer.

The officer who deleted the photos may not have understood that when a computer deletes a file, it does not actually delete the file. Rather, it deletes the entry for the file in what could be called its “table of contents.” Since the photographer understood this, he restored his camera’s table of contents with some software specifically designed to restore deleted files. He then posted the forbidden photos on the Internet, and I put one of them in Figure 3-6.

The point of this story is that the police blocked off the World Trade Center on the same day the attack occurred. They stopped people from taking photographs of the area, and they interfered with the engineers who were trying to investigate. However, they did not stop the crews from destroying the rubble, selling the rubble as scrap metal, or tossing the rubble into garbage dumps. They only stopped people from collecting information about the collapse.

Of course, I suspect that most of the individual police officers were simply following orders. People further up in the government hierarchy certainly made the decision to destroy the rubble and block investigations.

The area where Flight 93 crashed was also off-limits to photographs. According to a Pittsburgh television news report:

> Also on Thursday, the Pennsylvania State Police arrested two photographers for breach of security. A police officer said that two stringers from New York City were given permission to take pictures of one portion of the crash scene, but they went into a restricted area and immediately were arrested.

What was in the restricted area that nobody was allowed to see? What portion of any airplane crash could possibly need such secrecy that tax money needs to be spent on the arrest of photographers? Were the photographers trying to get photos of the dead bodies for some idiotic purpose? Or were they merely trying to document the plane crash?

Destroying evidence is an admission of guilt

Destroying evidence, hiding evidence, and preventing the gathering of evidence should be considered an admission of guilt. Nobody destroys evidence if it shows their innocence. The FBI, CIA, police, FEMA, and other agencies knew they should investigate the World Trade Center collapse. The police and FBI routinely block off crime scenes, guard the evidence, and refuse to let people into the area until it is inspected and photographed. The FBI would never allow crews into a “real” crime scene with torches to cut up and sell the evidence. The FBI deliberately allowed that rubble to be destroyed.

The police helped destroy the evidence

Police are supposed to keep people away from crime scenes to protect the evidence so that it can be inspected. In the case of the 9-11 attacks the police did the exact opposite; i.e., they kept people away so that the evidence could be destroyed before anybody could inspect it. If this is not a sign that something is seriously wrong with our government’s behavior in regards to this 9-11 attack, what would be?