

## FARINGDON PEACE GROUP

### 9/11: The Tower that wasn't hit by any plane

There are many unanswered questions relating to the horrific events of 9/11. At our Faringdon Peace Group September Speaker Meeting, the focus was on Building Seven. We looked at just three pieces of information, and we concluded in each case that the official explanations as to what happened 13 years ago are impossible under the laws of basic physics. Building Seven was a modern steel-framed skyscraper. Its footprint of 100m x 43m would have filled two thirds of Tucker Park, and at 190m tall its 47 stories would have made it the tallest building in more than half the 50 states of the US. Building Seven was not hit by any plane. And yet, at 5.20pm on the afternoon of 9/11, Building Seven collapsed at freefall rate into its own footprint, and took just seconds to come down. First we looked at temperature. The official report for Building Seven was finally published in 2008, and states that "office fires" were the cause of the collapse. Numerous eye witness accounts and videos reported molten steel. Heat maps many weeks after 9/11 showed temperatures still in excess of 2000 degrees Fahrenheit. The problem? Steel melts at 2700 deg F, but office fires will only reach temperatures of 800 deg F. There's 2000 deg F of missing energy. An impossibility. Next, we looked at symmetry/synchronicity. The building fell vertically downwards through the path of greatest resistance, with the roofline staying almost horizontal. For this to happen, all 80 vertical steel columns would need to have failed catastrophically and within fractions of a second of one another. This has been likened to trying to balance 80 marbles on top of one another. Again, another impossibility. The third point that we looked at was freefall. For 2.3 seconds of its collapse, the building was in absolute freefall (accelerating at  $9.8\text{m/sec}^2$ ), and this is now also admitted in the official report. In other words, there was zero resistance from the floors below; it was as if they didn't exist. But the official story proposes a collapse model that cannot allow for any freefall. In other words, we have a third impossibility. As Sherlock Holmes memorably says on a number of occasions – "If you eliminate the impossible, then whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth". And the only explanation that does explain the observed evidence is that Building Seven was brought down by controlled demolition. But How – and Why – and Who? And surely these same three impossibilities apply equally to the twin towers? Yes – they do. The planes become an irrelevant distraction. There are now almost 2000 highly qualified architects and engineers ( see [www.ae911truth.org](http://www.ae911truth.org) ) who are demanding an independent investigation into the collapse of all three towers.

Sjoerd Vogt