

9/11 and the WTC Towers: Why Do Self-styled “Skeptics” Believe in Their Own Brand of Miracles?

By [Petra Liverani](#)

Global Research, March 03, 2018

[OffGuardian](#) 27 February 2018

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Media Disinformation](#),
[Terrorism](#)

I find it such an interesting phenomenon that of all the self-styled skeptics I have corresponded with or whose opinions are aired online, every single one swallows the miracles, told to us by NIST, of the three high rise steel frame building collapses on 9/11 being caused by fire when the evidence clearly shows that the collapses were caused by controlled demolition. Moreover, the [\\$5,000 10-point Occam's Razor challenge](#) on the cause of collapse of the third building, WTC-7, that I've issued personally to a significant number of these self-styled skeptics, has been very loudly ignored.

As Australian politician, Pauline Hanson, infamously said when asked if she were xenophobic, “Please explain”.

Please explain why it is that the most prolific scholar – by far – on 9/11 is a Christian and Professor Emeritus of Religious Studies, David Ray Griffin, and why this scholar, highly-esteemed within and without his own academic field, does not swallow the collapse-by-fire miracles? He has written over 10 books on the subject of 9/11, his latest being [Bush and Cheney: How They Ruined America and the World](#). He has also recently authored and co-authored two books on climate change. So he's on the same page as most of the self-styled skeptics (in no way referring to the so-called climate skeptics, of course) with climate change but not with 9/11.

As summarised by Edward Curtin in his [review of Griffin's book](#), here are the 15 miracles that Griffin identified that the self-styled skeptics have swallowed:

1. The Twin Towers and WTC 7 were the only steel-framed high-rise buildings ever to come down without explosives or incendiaries.
2. The Twin Towers, each of which had 287 steel columns, were brought down solely by a combination of airplane strikes and jet-fuel fires.
3. WTC 7 was not even hit by a plane, so it was the first steel-framed high-rise to be brought down solely by ordinary building fires.
4. These World Trade Center buildings also came down in free fall – the Twin Towers in virtual free fall, WTC 7 in absolute free fall – for over two seconds.
5. Although the collapses of the of the WTC buildings were not aided by explosives, the collapses imitated the kinds of implosions that can be induced only by demolition companies.
6. In the case of WTC 7, the structure came down symmetrically (straight down, with an almost perfectly horizontal roofline), which meant that all 82 of the steel support columns had to fall simultaneously, although the building's fires had a very asymmetrical pattern.

7. The South Tower's upper 30-floor block changed its angular momentum in midair.
8. This 30 floor block then disintegrated in midair.
9. With regard to the North Tower, some of its steel columns were ejected out horizontally for at least 500 feet.
10. The fires in the debris from the WTC buildings could not be extinguished for many months.
11. Although the WTC fires, based on ordinary building fires, could not have produced temperatures above 1,800°F, the fires inexplicably melted metals with much higher melting points, such as iron (2,800°F) and even molybdenum (4,753°F).
12. Some of the steel in the debris had been sulfidized, resulting in Swiss-cheese-appearing steel, even though ordinary building fires could not have resulted in the sulfidation.
13. As a passenger on AA Flight 77, Barbara Olson called her husband, telling him about hijackers on her plane, even though this plane had no onboard phones and its altitude was too high for a cell phone call to get through.
14. Hijacker pilot Hani Hanjour could not possibly have flown the trajectory of AA 77 to strike Wedge 1 of the Pentagon, and yet he did.
15. Besides going through an unbelievable personal transformation, ringleader Mohamed Atta also underwent an impossible physical transformation.

Now could it be that self-styled skeptics all over the Anglo world (Michael Shermer, Richard Dawkins and Richard Saunders being notable examples) are suffering from a severe case of skeptic groupthink? You'd think one of them would deviate from the flock in their concept of truth, wouldn't you?

An example of the faulty reasoning used by skeptics is displayed by Michael Shermer in this interview where he employs a common logical fallacy of 9/11 argument, argumentum ad speculum, by putting forward the seemingly great implausibility of the conspirators' ability to lay explosives in the twin towers.

This hypothesis ignores the reality of how the buildings collapsed and also displays ignorance of information indicating how the task of laying explosives could have been achieved, as in Jeremy Rys's 45 minute film, Conspiracy Solved!

There is much study in social psychology on why people believe things and what approaches to take to help them out of their entrenched beliefs (see presentation [In Denial of Democracy: Social Psychological Implications for Public Discourse on State Crimes Against Democracy Post-9/11](#), by neuroscientist, Laurie Manwell) but it truly baffles me that when you ask a self-styled skeptic to provide even just a single point to justify their belief and they fail, this stark confrontation with their inability to support their belief has no impact.

It truly astounds me. I'm not talking here about aggressive confrontation, in which case one can comprehend a psychological resistance. I'm talking about asking someone, with pretensions to operate in a realm of reason and logic, simply to provide support for their belief.

Occam's Razor is a tool of logic that can be applied in different ways. In my application I

take the approach: what hypothesis fits the piece of evidence in question with the fewest questions and assumptions. It works like magic. If a self-styled skeptic cannot use the tool to support their belief nor poke a hole [in the points provided for the opposing view](#), surely reason and logic dictate that the skeptic must change their mind. If not, their claim to skepticism is utterly fraudulent.

Interestingly, [Griffin divides the world into three types of people](#):

- Those guided by evidence
 - Those guided by their paradigms of how the world is thus if 9/11 being a false flag does not fit into their paradigms of how the world works they simply will not consider the evidence
 - Those guided by wishful-and-fearful thinking thus if the idea of their own government perpetrating an horrific crime on their own people is too awful to bear they simply will not believe the evidence
- Shouldn't self-styled skeptics, by definition, be of the first type? Apparently, not a one is. They seem to be all of the second type or possibly third.

The Australian Skeptics association defines skepticism as follows:

Skepticism is a dynamic attitude to the world around us. It is not a dogmatic approach restricted by "accepted wisdom", but a serious and sincere appraisal of claims of how the world works.

In response to my perfectly-reasoned emails, however, a leading Australian skeptic, (we'll call him "R"), simply dismissed me, without evidence or debate, as a "conspiracy theorist." Sadly, in his discourteous emails, "R" displays the opposite of genuine skepticism. He displays, only, that he could not be more indoctrinated by the most successful propaganda weapon of all time, the "conspiracy theory," meme promulgated by the CIA after the JFK assassination to silence and discredit those who questioned the lone gunman explanation.

From an [article in the Observer](#) about NYU Professor of Media Studies, Mark Crispin Miller:

The outspoken voice of public dissent considers [the term "conspiracy theory"] a "meme" used to "discredit people engaged in really necessary kinds of investigation and inquiry."

For Miller, those investigations include, among others: did the U.S. government have foreknowledge of the 9/11 terror attacks and choose to do nothing? Were Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld and others surreptitiously trying to dismantle the republic envisioned by the founding fathers? And is the CDC concealing links between the MMR vaccine and autism?

"It's one that you run into time and time again," Miller said on an October 11 episode of CounterPunch Radio. "To the point that I now believe that anyone who uses that phrase in a pejorative sense is a witting or unwitting CIA asset." [My emphasis.]

What sort of world do we live in when so many self-styled skeptics can watch the 6.5 second, beautifully symmetrical collapse of WTC-7 into its own footprint and accept the

government report stating that it was caused by fire?



The collapse of WTC7 now acknowledged by NIST to be at free-fall (Source: OffGuardian)

Unincinerated terrorist passport fluttering to the ground at the World Trade Centre and being handed in by anonymous passerby? BBC journalist stating that WTC-7 collapsed 20 minutes before it did? Owner of WTC-7, Larry Silverstein, speaking of how he suggested that perhaps the smartest thing to do was to “pull it” (term used originally for demolition by pulling a building down but now also used for controlled demolition using explosives)?

Do none of these puzzles excite even the barest curiosity in these so-called seekers after truth?

[America's "War on Terrorism"](#)

✖ by Michel Chossudovsky

ISBN Number: 9780973714715

List Price: \$24.95

[click here to order](#)

Special Price: \$18.00

In this new and expanded edition of Michel Chossudovsky's 2002 best seller, the author blows away the smokescreen put up by the mainstream media, that 9/11 was an attack on America by "Islamic terrorists". Through meticulous research, the author uncovers a military-intelligence ploy behind the September 11 attacks, and the cover-up and complicity of key members of the Bush Administration.

The expanded edition, which includes twelve new chapters focuses on the use of 9/11 as a pretext for the invasion and illegal occupation of Iraq, the militarisation of justice and law enforcement and the repeal of democracy.

According to Chossudovsky, the “war on terrorism” is a complete fabrication based on the illusion that one man, Osama bin Laden, outwitted the \$40 billion-a-year American intelligence apparatus. The “war on terrorism” is a war of conquest. Globalisation is the final march to the “New World Order”, dominated by Wall Street and the U.S. military-industrial complex.

September 11, 2001 provides a justification for waging a war without borders. Washington’s agenda consists in extending the frontiers of the American Empire to facilitate complete U.S. corporate control, while installing within America the institutions of the Homeland Security State.

The original source of this article is [OffGuardian](#)
Copyright © [Petra Liverani](#), [OffGuardian](#), 2018

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Petra Liverani](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca