

Consensus 9/11: New Truths Dispelling Old Lies

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, September 19, 2013

Region: [USA](#)
Theme: [Terrorism](#)

Consensus 9/11 seeks “best evidence” proof. It does so to dispel official story falsehoods. It’s founded on:

“(1) The opinions of respected authorities, based on professional experience, descriptive studies, and reports of expert committees.

(2) Physical data in the form of photographs, videotapes, court testimony, witness reports, and FOIA releases.

(3) Direct rather than circumstantial evidence.”

Determining “best evidence” depends on “integrating individual professional expertise with the best available documentary and scientific evidence.”

Simplified Delphi methodology is followed. It’s often used “where published information is inadequate or non-existent.” Experts use “best evidence” to determine truth.

Doing so is similar to how doctors diagnose illnesses. It’s like forecasts made on best judgments.

It’s based on the principle that structured groups of individuals are more accurate than unstructured ones.

It encourages revisions based on new evidence. It’s a way to determine truth. It’s done so independently and objectively. Its track record shows effectiveness.

9/11 is the Big Lie of our time. Distinguished scholars like David Ray Griffin researched it exhaustively. In 10 books, articles and lectures, he provided evidence too important to ignore.

In April 2006, he discussed “[9/11: The Myth and the Reality](#),” saying:

“It would seem, for many reasons, that the official story of 9/11, which has served as a religious Myth in the intervening years (and still does), is a myth in the pejorative sense of a story that does not correspond to reality.”

In September 2008, Griffin [headlined](#) his article “September 11, 2001: 21 Reasons to Question the Official Story about 9/11.”

The FBI admitted it “ha(d) no hard evidence connecting” 9/11 to bin Laden.

So-called devout Muslim alleged hijackers drank heavily, frequented strip clubs and paid for

sex.

Technology in 2001 made cell phone calls made from above 30,000 feet impossible.

The FBI lied claiming Mohamed Atta's left behind luggage contained "decisive evidence" about Al Qaeda responsibility for the attacks.

Passports allegedly found at United 93's crash site were fake ones.

Alleged hijackers weren't aboard the four fateful flights.

Standing operating intercept procedures weren't followed.

Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta said Dick Cheney "apparently confirmed a stand-down order" prior to an alleged plane striking the Pentagon.

The 9/11 whitewash Commission deleted Mineta's comment from its official report.

Secret Service agents let Bush remain at a Sarasota, FL school for 30 minutes after learning about the second twin tower strike.

Standard procedure calls for securing his safety immediately in case of potential danger.

Jet fuel doesn't heat high enough to melt or cause rigid steel columns to crumble.

Doing so is "scientifically impossible." Controlled demolitions destroyed both towers. Building 7 fell the same way. Griffin included other spurious lies.

He concluded saying growing numbers of "physicists, chemists, architects, engineers, pilots, former military officers, and former intelligence officers reject the official 9/11 myth."

It's a bald-faced lie. It's the Big Lie of our time. It launched 12 years of direct and proxy wars. It facilitated homeland repression.

The worst of what happened shows no signs of ending. New wars are planned. Freedom is being systematically destroyed. America more than ever is unfit to live in. Humanity's increasingly threatened.

[Consensus 9/11](#) "Factual Evidence Contradicts the 9/11 story." Its official account:

- launched multiple wars of aggression;
- "authorize(d) torture, military tribunals, and extraordinary rendition(s);" and
- replaced constitutional freedoms with tyranny.

Official 9/11 claims are refuted by "scientific consensus best evidence." Sunshine is the best disinfectant. Consensus 9/11 compiled 37 important Consensus Points.

They're compiled in 10 categories. They include:

General Consensus Points

Consensus Points about the Twin Towers

Consensus Points about the Collapse of World Trade Center 7

Consensus Points about the Pentagon

Consensus Points about the 9/11 Flights

Consensus Points about US Military Exercises On and Before 9/11

Consensus Points about the Political and Military Commands on 9/11

Consensus Points about Hijackers on 9/11

Consensus Points about the Phone Calls on 9/11 (and)

Consensus Points about Official Video Exhibits Regarding 9/11

On September 12, 23 9/11 Consensus Panel members released [five new consensus points](#).

(1) On 9/11, New York and neighboring states' seismograph stations detected seismic waves. They did so when both towers were struck.

Lamont Doherty-Earth Observatory (LDEO) scientists published seismographic wave data analysis.

FEMA and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) used it in their publications discussing what happened.

So did the 9/11 Commission. It omitted confirming LDEO analysis of plane impact times. It based its conclusions on ground radar data.

“(I)ndependent analyses have disputed LDEO’s conclusions and thereby the conclusions reached by FEMA and NIST.”

They dispute 9/11 Commission conclusions. Plane impacts caused seismic waves. They were used to determine when both plane impacts occurred and each building collapsed.

In 2006, independent Craig Furlong and Gordon Ross (CR/GR) engineering research showed “plane impacts could not have caused the seismic signals attributed to them by LDEO, because they originated several seconds before the 9/11 Commission’s radar-based times of impact.”

Most likely, seismic events followed “explosions in the basements of the Twin Towers, for which there is abundant physical and testimonial evidence.”

Other independent analysis confirms CR/GR analysis. LDEO and 9/11 Commission reports are flawed and inaccurate.

Consensus 9/11 concluded that:

“The discrepancies described above indicate that the LDEO conclusions about the

nature of the events that generated the signals recorded at Palisades cannot be correct.”

“Most strikingly, the ground radar data, which is very precise, showed WTC 1 to have been struck 15 seconds later than the Palisades-recorded seismic activity, which LDEO scientists attributed to an airplane impact.”

“The radar also shows WTC 2 to have been struck later than the seismic activity attributed to it.”

“The seismic activity, therefore, must have been produced by something other than the crashes of the airliners into the two buildings.”

(2) Physical and testimonial evidence about why both towers collapsed refute official accounts. They attribute collapse to plane impacts and resulting fires.

Independent evidence challenges both conclusions. NIST claimed no evidence of explosions “below the impact and fire floors.”

Testimonial and physical evidence shows “the official story – in any of its versions – to be false.” Controlled Demolition, Inc. head Mark Loizeaux said:

“If I were to bring the towers down, I would put explosives in the basement to get the weight of the building to help collapse the structure.”

“Many firefighters and others reported explosions below the impact and fire floors.”

According to firefighter Edward Cachi:

“As my officer and I were looking at the South Tower, it just gave. It actually gave at a lower floor, not the floor where the plane hit.”

“(I)t went in succession, boom, boom, boom, boom, and then the tower came down.”

Others experiencing what happened made similar comments. Even BBC’s New York-based correspondent, Stephen Evans, said:

“I was at the base of the second tower that was hit.”

“There was an explosion. The base of the building shook. (T)hen there was a series of explosions.”

Others explicitly reported basement explosions.

“Janitor William Rodriguez reported that he and 14 others in the North Tower heard and felt an explosion below the first sub-level office before the aircraft impact.”

Basement explosions would have caused the ground to shake. Several observers reported it.

Physical evidence confirmed testimonies. For example:

“Sudden Onset: In controlled demolition, the onset of the collapse is sudden: One

moment, the building is perfectly motionless; the next moment, it suddenly starts coming down.”

“But when steel is heated, it does not suddenly buckle or break, but bends and sags. So if heat could induce a collapse, the onset would be gradual.”

“But as videos show, the buildings were perfectly motionless up to the moment they began their collapse.”

“Straight Down: The most important thing in a controlled demolition of a tall building, which is close to other buildings, is that it comes straight down.”

“Mark Loizeaux has said that careful planning is needed in setting the charges ‘to bring (a building) down as we want, so no other structure is harmed.’ “

“If the 110-story Twin Towers had fallen over, rather than coming straight down, they would have caused an enormous amount of damage to buildings covering many city blocks; but they did not.”

“Rapid constant acceleration: Measurements show that when the North Tower collapsed, it accelerated constantly at approximately two-thirds the rate of gravity.”

“Such acceleration is incompatible with the official explanation of the building collapse.”

“The official explanation of the collapse of each of the Towers claims that the top part of the building, above where the planes struck, came down on the structure below and initiated total collapse.”

“If that were what happened, the lower stories would have provided significant resistance and a deceleration of the top section would have been observed, had there been an impact.”

“As videos show, and as careful measurements of the motion of the top section confirm, the upper stories of the building fell down through the lower stories with a high rate of constant acceleration and no associated deceleration or impact.”

“This means that the official explanation is false.” Building columns were destroyed by something other than gravity. An expertly executed explosive force is mostly likely.

“Total Collapse: These 110-story buildings collapsed into piles of rubble only a few stories high, even though the buildings contained a remarkable 283 columns supporting each story, with 236 closely spaced large steel box columns as part of a robust Vierendeel truss network on the exterior, and in the core of each tower 47 steel box columns, the bases of which were massive.”

“Pulverization and Dust Clouds: ‘At the World Trade Center sites,’ said Colonel John O’Dowd of the US Army Corps of Engineers, ‘it seemed like everything (except the steel) was pulverized.’ “

“Although this was an exaggeration, much of the non-metallic contents of the buildings was indeed pulverized into tiny particles of dust, giving rise to enormous dust clouds,

which impeded visibility for a half hour after each collapse – even though, according to the official theory, the only physical agencies involved, after the impact of the airplanes, were gravitational acceleration and fire.”

Credible testimonial and physical evidence refutes official accounts. Controlled demolitions collapsed both towers. Nothing else explains what happened.

(3) Molten metal remained below both towers’ debris weeks after 9/11. Burning jet fuel doesn’t reach temperatures high enough to cause it.

Melted building steel was caused by something other than plane impacts or resulting fires. Claims otherwise were false.

Official reports indicated no molten steel or iron. Silence about it implies its absence. According to NIST:

Its “investigators and experts from the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and the Structural Engineers Association of New York (SEONY) – who inspected the WTC steel at the WTC site and the salvage yards -found no evidence that would support the melting of steel in a jet-fuel ignited fire in the towers prior to collapse.”

“Any molten steel in the wreckage was more likely due to the high temperature resulting from long exposure to combustion within the pile than to short exposure to fires or explosions while the buildings were standing.”

Best evidence suggests NIST and similar claims have no basis in fact. Their analysis is faulty. It’s unscientific. It reflects coverup and denial.

According to physicist Steven Jones:

“Are there any examples of buildings toppled by fires or any reason other than deliberate demolition that show large pools of molten metal in the rubble?”

“I have posed this question to numerous engineers and scientists, but so far no examples have emerged.”

“Strange then that three buildings in Manhattan, supposedly brought down finally by fires, all show these large pools of molten metal in their basements post-collapse on 9-11-2001.”

“It would be interesting if underground fires could somehow produce large pools of molten steel, for example, but then there should be historical examples of this effect since there have been many large fires in numerous buildings.”

“It is not enough to argue hypothetically that fires could possibly cause all three pools of orange-hot molten metal.”

Physical and testimonial evidence refute official accounts. None of them hold up to scrutiny.

According to Consensus 9/11:

“The fact that the rubble contained steel or iron that had been melted shows that the buildings were destroyed by something other than fire and airplane impact.”

“When all of this physical evidence is combined with the testimony about explosions from many types of professionals, the claim that the Twin Towers were brought down by nothing other than the airplane impacts and resulting fires is simply not credible.”

(4) Years post-9/11, NIST failed to produce a computer simulation of what happened. Buildings “undergoing progressive collapse would come down in a sequential manner. Sections would be expected to fail as they lost support.”

Collapse measurements showed they didn’t come down this way.

Freefalling buildings “in the absence of explosives to remove the steel supports is inherently implausible.”

NIST can’t justify its claim that freefall was consistent with sequential collapse. Its explanation doesn’t “pass scrutiny.”

Computer simulations don’t correlate with key building collapse features. “NIST’s position appears to be no more than an attempt to evade legitimate questions.”

Its conclusion is scientifically impossible. It can’t be replicated experimentally.

(5) Flight 93’s “Let’s Roll” call reveals a serious timeline problem. It was “used as a call to war.”

Two official timelines are “glaringly at odds with” each other. They “differ(ed) by more than 20 minutes.”

Why was one call describing an event that occurred 20 minutes earlier? Why did it claim it was happening in real time?

Why did it say what was patently untrue? The entire “Let’s Roll” scenario” glorif(ied) the heroism of” UA Flight 93 passengers.

It facilitated launching multiple wars of aggression. It aided and abetted homeland repression.

It headed America down a slippery slope to tyranny and ruin. Obama exceeded the worst practices Bush initiated. He risks humanity’s survival in the process.

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net.

His new book is titled “Banker Occupation: Waging Financial War on Humanity.”

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network.

It airs Fridays at 10AM US Central time and Saturdays and Sundays at noon. All programs are archived for easy listening.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2013

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

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