

ALTERNATIVE NEWS MEDIA'S FAILURE TO APPROACH THE NIST REPORTS CRITICALLY

In retrospect there was an extreme weakness in alternative media when confronted with highly technical information. This weakness is analyzed in more detail at [this link](#). They were overwhelmed by the technical elements of the Twin Towers collapses. The most direct example of this was their inability to understand the unique nature of the Twin Towers collapse progressions, the single largest feature of the Twin Towers collapses. The single largest feature of the collapses was also the single best example of how little people actually knew about what they saw.

The most unique feature of the collapses was how the three building components (perimeter, core, flooring) moved in highly specific, distinct ways relative to each other. It was a very unique, specific type of collapse progression which was directly related to their unique structural designs. The Twin Towers collapse progression modes are [mapped here](#).

All the global features witnessed were a direct result of this uniqueness. Yet none could be recognized without understanding the specific, unique and highly distinctive collapse progression modes.

NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE TRULY UNIQUE COLLAPSE PROGRESSION MODES OF THE TWIN TOWERS

There is no evidence 20 years after the collapses that any investigative journalist knew what this highly unique collapse mode was. There can be no more extreme example of not knowing anything about the collapse processes than this, of being 'out of ones league' in a technical sense.

Yet many of the same people who knew little to nothing about the largest, grossest features of the collapses seemed to have little hesitancy defending Government claims over more minute details. This reveals a state of extreme vulnerability and dependency. A trust which seems strange and unhealthy in true investigative journalism or independent research of any kind.

The hugest, grossest features of the Twin Towers collapses were not explained to them at all. They did not know what they were. Yet within that ignorance a strange trust formed in investigative journalists of a Government account of collapse events. A faith or trust, because it could be nothing else.

Why? Because the investigative journalist was reacting to 'truthers'. It is the impetus of 'truthers' that drove the journalist to embrace Government accounts with no evidence or capacity to read the technical literature, as if taking refuge in them.

The chief characteristic in both Consortium News and Counterpunch Magazine, for example, is that their own archives document this vulnerability in real time. Both archives document that neither news source understood the specific, unique mode of collapse of the Twin Towers. The single grossest feature of both collapses, accounting for all visible, large scale, global features of the collapses seemed completely unknown to them. Yet both embraced the NIST conclusions without being able to read or understand the material on a technical level or compare NIST claims to the visual record.

How can certainty be arrived at when they were unaware of the patterns behind the grossest features of the collapses? That in itself is testimony to the deep contradiction each faced. How can those who knew little to nothing about the most visible, largest features of the collapses portend to know so much about more minute features? The only logical answer is: Trust. Faith.

This is the chief vulnerability investigative journalists faced toward information on the collapse progression processes of the Twin Towers. They were extremely vulnerable to manipulation of technical issues and seemed helpless to defend themselves from it.

To reveal ones ignorance in archives, while at the same time professing ones certainty is an odd combination indeed. It is this contrast that is captured in the archives of both news sites. It is tragic to see good independent investigative journalists defend Government accounts in this way.

TRUTHER PUNCH-DRUNK, ALTERNATIVE MEDIA ACQUIESCED TO THE NIST

It is by being trapped in and pursued by this ‘truther’ frame of reference that Robert Parry of Consortium News came to be uncritical of NIST in [this article](#) written in 2011. By ‘trapped’ I mean being unable to formulate questions about the NIST reports independently and not influenced by ‘truther’ claims. Parry’s entire critical focus was on ‘truther claims’. He seemed to spend no time on NIST claims at all despite being aware of I.F. Stone’s reminder that ‘all governments lie’. He seemed ‘spent’ on confronting ‘truthers’ before he ever turned his attention to the NIST. This may be why there is nothing at all in the archive that is critical of the NIST reports.

Parry’s lens throughout his article is only focused on what he calls ‘truthers’. He was simply unable to look at the NIST reports without addressing them through ‘truther’ talking points. He lacked the technical ability to do so. He remained trapped within a ‘truther’ frame of reference throughout the article. He knew nothing of the actual unique collapse modes of the towers.

The article is tragic in retrospect in that Parry seemed so dazed chasing truther windmills, almost ‘punch-drunk’ swinging at truthers, that he’d hardly had energy left to look at the visual record, look at the NIST reports, and compare the two. It is as if he *collapsed* into the NIST world-view by default without resistance or suspended judgement. He seemed absolutely helpless to examine NIST claims *critically*, as if he couldn’t see the NIST claims or the visual record at all.

In this dazed vulnerability the NIST was off by more than 800% in their description of the North Tower tilting movement of the upper portion but Parry didn’t notice. Such a massive discrepancy is visible to any teenager that knows what to look for just by looking at video with no visual aids. Yet independent investigative journalism allowed and still allow such massive discrepancies to go unchallenged 16 years after the NIST reports on the Twin Towers first appeared. Why?

When examining the Consortium News archive I couldn’t find any direct criticism or examination of the NIST reports at all. He didn’t have the technical skill to examine NIST claims directly. Unfortunately, Parry seemed to have little patience for those who did. Spent and dizzied by truther claims, not a single article in the archive tackled the NIST directly. Parry took refuge in the NIST without resistance and seemed not to understand why others might remain more skeptical.

Alexander Cockburn in [this article](#) was even more certain in his knowledge of the Twin Towers, even though Counterpunch archives stand as evidence to the contrary. To Cockburn, anyone who remained skeptical of NIST claims were losers pure and simple. Moon hoaxers all! They are also somehow connected with flying saucers. Yet, like everyone else, he was unaware of the distinctive and unique modes of the collapses of the Twin Towers. The contrast between what in reality he didn't know at the time and his certainty in the correctness of Government accounts couldn't possibly be more stark.

The Counterpunch article and archive examined [here](#) demonstrates the same tendencies as Consortium News. They were incapable of looking at the NIST **critically**. The seeming impetus (reaction to truthers) and resultant attitudes (hardened faith in NIST claims) were basically the same in both cases.

WAS THE NIST EMBRACED BECAUSE OF THE TRUTH MOVEMENT?

Were both Cockburn and Parry being unduly influenced by truther talking points without being aware of it? Was the way they saw the Twin Towers collapses influenced by Truthers? (Yes) Even though opposing truthers, did each, as a result, take on absurd 'truther-debunker' talking points essentially trapping themselves in a truther frame of reference unwittingly? Did truthers, strangely, play a role in both reporters embracing all things NIST? Would they have done the same without the truther influence?

These are very important questions for alternative media and independent investigative journalists to ask themselves 20 years after the collapses. It is interesting to see how other independently minded investigative journalists reacted to the 'truther-debunker' circus atmosphere. Did it influence them into passive acceptance of NIST claims? Did they 'collapse' into being firm supporters of the NIST reports and conclusions without being able to recognize even the largest, most massive features of the Twin Towers collapse processes? (Yes, they did)

A VERY NEGATIVE OUTCOME

All this must leave long term effects on the capacity for critical thought and efforts to document historic facts. Attitudes hardened. This is why both Consortium News and Counterpunch editorial staff will probably still have a knee-jerk tendency to censor anything critical of the NIST reports in the future. Even a detailed description of the distinct, unique collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers complete with visual mappings could evoke fear of 'truthers', and 'debunker' reactions in turn.

In short, they still can't allow open critique of the NIST to appear on their news sites even 20 years after the collapse events for the same reasons they couldn't do it earlier..

It has been 2 decades. Is it too late to recover the capacity to think critically about the Twin Towers collapses?

Are the truly unique collapse modes of the Twin Towers just more 'lost history', ironically even in Consortium News?

Will Consortium News serve as yet another conduit by means of which this history is 'buried'? Indirect spokesmen for the correctness of NIST findings? Among the intellectual Praetorian Guard of Government accounts of the Twin Towers collapses?

Unfortunately, this information will probably remain locked outside a false but firmly established image of the collapse modes that will be maintained and defended if challenged. A kind of a preference for permanent amnesia to a more uncertain alternative (called fact-checking and critique).

[Back to website](#)