

AN EXAMPLE OF A MAJOR BLUNDER

Even an ordinary, non-technical person can recognize some rather extreme mistakes and omissions within the NIST reports on the Twin Towers if shown what to look for.

Let us start simple with a claim by the NIST that anyone who can watch a video can verify or refute. The NIST claimed multiple times that the top portion of WTC1 tilted as a unit 8 degrees before falling. The actual tilt was less than 1 degree. This claim is incorrect by more than 800%. A mistake of this magnitude, because it is so huge, is visible for anyone to see just by watching a video of WTC1 from the west side.

You do not need to be an engineer to spot this contradiction. You don't even need to be an adult. You just have to know where to look. Yet it stands in the written record 20 years after the event. It is also not some minor mistake because the entire collapse initiation model for WTC1 is based on a perimeter-led collapse as anyone can verify for themselves.

This means any teenager who can read NIST descriptions of WTC1 tilting and can watch video has the ability to refute the NIST report on the WTC1 collapse. They just have to know where to look. And this will remain true in the future. Yet all mainstream or alternative news sources couldn't spot the mistake. They still can't. Why?

Here's another way that any ordinary teenager can refute the WTC1 NIST report if shown what to look for. Watch a video of WTC1 from the east and compare it to the tilt motion of WTC2. Can you spot the massive difference in tilt angle? Of course since it is so obvious. But the NIST claimed repeatedly within their reports on the Twin Towers that WTC1 and 2 upper portions tilted to about the same angle before falling. In fact, that is their official and only explanation for the tilt angle of both upper portions (which includes using the same perimeter-led collapse initiation model for both towers.) Anyone who can watch some videos can see this is not true. In this case the difference in tilts is well in excess of 800%. Even a young child can easily spot such a massive difference.

_____ lost something in this process because, like I mentioned, an average teenager won't have a problem spotting key mistakes with the NIST findings if they know where to look. Nor should a reader of this article. It does seem odd when outlets of investigative journalism can't seem to do the same (for 15 years).

CONSEQUENCES OF EXAGGERATING THE TILT ANGLE BY MORE THAN 800%

This allowed the NIST to misrepresent the initial failure of the North Tower as due to failure of the south perimeter wall. A much more detailed analysis of the visible portions of the collapse initiation sequence reveals at least 5 different visible features which the NIST completely ignored. All of these are consistent with collective core failure, which is completely different from the NIST failure theory.

It is the extreme exaggeration of the tilt angle that allowed the NIST to support their theory for the North Tower.

CONSEQUENCES OF PRETENDING CONTRADICTIONS DON'T EXIST

I don't know. This open contradiction has existed for more than 15 years and I am aware of no effort to acknowledge it or to correct it.

I am not aware of any professional journal or organization addressing the issue. A discrepancy of over 800% was clearly pointed out on the internet for free over one decade ago. The NIST claim remains there for any non-technical person to see who knows what to look for. It just sits there like an open wound.

[Overview of mistakes](#)

[Back to website](#)