



THE FAILURE OF NEWS SOURCES TO REPRESENT THE TWIN TOWERS COLLAPSE MODES ACCURATELY

News sources formed differing opinions of the Twin Towers collapse modes from what they believed were Government and professional engineering sources. There were other news sources that opposed Government source information but to do this they needed their own technical engineering and physics sources.

All journalists needed material from technical sources to form their opinions.




A very large collection of articles on the Twin Towers collapses from the spectrum of conventional and alternative news sources is at [this link](#). Journalists roughly fall into two groups in their attitudes toward the Twin Towers collapses:




All U.S. Government source information on the Twin Tower collapse modes was gathered in the highlighted yellow quotes at [this link](#). It is easy to see that Government and professional/academic source information on the Twin Towers collapse modes was utterly generic and practically nonexistent from 2002 to 2007.

There was no U.S. Government or official source information on the Twin Towers collapse modes that contained any detail on the collapse modes from 2002 to 2007. The actual situation of all news sources on the Twin Towers collapse modes was like this but they didn't know it:



They were just a bunch of differing opinions with no technical source material on the Twin Towers collapse modes. The differing opinions may have been convinced they had technical source information (somewhere) and that they were standing on solid technical ground. The evidence presented here shows they had no source information whatsoever on the Twin Towers collapse modes from 2002 to 2007 and absurd 'block' descriptions of the Twin Towers collapse modes appeared in professional/academic publications from 2007 onward. This was true whether or not the journalist supported the NIST conclusions.



A description of the Twin Towers collapse progression modes became a new source of official information, but news sources supporting the NIST had no reaction to this from 2007 to 2021. [This link](#) provides an overview of all the professional/academic articles that were published from 2006 to the present on the Twin Tower collapse modes. The articles combined with the 2005 NIST reports were the only professional source material journalists had. It is as if they didn't know it was there.


The journalists supporting the NIST are not aware there is a connection between the NIST reports in 2005 and professional/academic articles from 2006 onward. If asked, they would not be able to say what the connection is.

They felt they were on firm ground but there was nothing at the center. They must have imagined there was something there but the news sources supporting the NIST never examined their own source material in sufficient detail to understand what it was they were supporting.

What about the journalists who didn't support the Government account of collapse events?

These journalists most probably didn't view the NIST final reports or engineering publications which support the NIST as a valid technical source on the collapse modes of the Twin Towers. What did they use instead? What were their engineering and physics technical sources used to understand the collapse modes of the Twin Towers? There are some that reference the group "Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth" but this is far from unanimous. There are some who cite 'David Ray Griffin' but he is a theologian. When they do that I assume this means they support whatever he supports.

The central characteristic in all the articles linked, whether the journalist supported the NIST conclusions or not, is that there is no mention in any article of the actual collapse modes of the Twin Towers.



This is true in all cases without exception. Not a single journalist or writer linked, whether or not they supported the NIST conclusions, demonstrated any knowledge of the actual collapse modes of the Twin Towers. They wrote around the collapse modes but never described the Twin Towers collapse modes accurately.

How did journalists not notice their technical sources were missing?

Journalist who supported the NIST obviously didn't / couldn't read the technical information available in the NIST final report on the Twin Towers in 2005 and the professional/academic material that was published since 2006. If they could they would have seen there were no Government, professional or academic sources on the Twin Towers collapse modes from 2002 to 2007 and the Twin Towers collapse modes were literally being described as a 'crush down mode' followed by a 'crush up mode' ever since.

These differing opinions basically made up their own source material because there was none. They don't notice or acknowledge what they were doing.

The case of Alexander Cockburn was like this. He used a private technical source in 2006 to describe the Twin Towers collapse modes in [this article](#). He never mentioned that there were no public sources available. He saw nothing wrong with that. He seemed to just naturally reach for his own personal private source material even if it directly contradicted public source material or if there were no public technical sources.

In the case of Robert Parry he didn't even do that. He just provided a link to the NIST website in his article. I guess he assumed there was information on the Twin Towers collapse modes there.

Neither journalist noticed there was no source material on the Twin Towers collapse modes from 2002 to 2007 even though Cockburn wrote in 2006 and Parry in 2011.

The death of independent investigative journalism toward the Twin Towers happened because few if any of these differing opinions that supported the NIST noticed the technical source material was missing or altered. Those who did not support the NIST also lacked technical sources on the collapse progression modes.


The large majority of journalists then ***substituted their own beliefs for the lack of technical source material*** and didn't notice the difference.

They also ***didn't notice when their own technical source material changed*** into an absurd model one year later. I guess they just continued to support it by default. I don't think they knew themselves.

As a result they became ***hardened in their beliefs (which lacked any source material) without being aware there was no technical source material***.

They effectively ***became defenders of the absence of historical records*** on the Twin Towers collapse modes.

The graphic below shows what the relationship between journalists and their source material on the Twin Towers collapse modes actually was, whether or not they supported the NIST conclusions..



The [written record](#) demonstrates that reporting on the Twin Towers collapses came in two main waves, one in 2006 and the other in 2011 (2021 will be a third wave).

The journalists supporting the NIST writing in 2006 had no idea they had no source material on the Twin Towers collapse modes since 2002. They should have been aware of this when the NIST released their final report on the Twin Towers collapses on 2005 without any mention of the collapse modes of the Twin Towers.

Journalists supporting the NIST writing in 2011 were in an even more contradictory situation. The Twin Towers collapse modes were being openly described as consisting of a ‘crush down phase’ followed by a ‘crush up phase’ in professional/academic journals for at least 4 years by then. Wikipedia had been describing the Twin Tower collapses the same way to the general population since 2009.


The journalists writing in 2011 not only had no source material from the NIST, but had new absurd source material they couldn’t read because it was far too technical for them and because they were probably not paying attention to what was happening in professional/academic journals (their primary source material). The primary source of the new absurd model is Dr Bazant but no journalist seemed to be aware of this.

And those who did not support the NIST conclusions had to find engineering and physics technical source material wherever they could.

The Case of New York Magazine Shows This Contradiction Perfectly

The graphic below was taken from an article in Europhysics News in 2017 by Dr Bazant in which he described the collapse modes of the Twin Towers as consisting of a ‘crush down phase’ followed by a ‘crush up phase’.

► FIG. 1: Schematic of different stages of the collapse process.



20 EPN 48/1

Dr Bazant has been using the exact same model to describe the collapse modes of the Twin Towers since 2007. It began in professional/academic ASCE publications. This is the single most authoritative source material that journalists have been using since 2007.

Most all of the linked journalists didn't seem to know this.


Of all the articles linked above there is only one that used this same idea of ‘blocks’ and ‘crush up, then crush down’ openly in 2011.

This is the image that led the article when it was published in 2011:

T3

ANATOMY OF A FALL

The first plane hit at 8:46 a.m. By 10:29 a.m., the Twin Towers had collapsed. What happened next:



1. The planes hit the North Tower between the 93rd and 99th floors, the South Tower between the 77th and 85th, at speeds of up to 550 mph.

2. The impact blasted fireproofing off the buildings' steel core columns.

3. Fires reached temperatures of up to 1,500 degrees Fahrenheit, compromising the integrity of the steel.


4. The core columns began to buckle, and floors sagged. The pressure of holding up the top floors caused the floors below to give way.

5. The top floors collapsed into the rubble and were destroyed by the fall.

6. Some 1.8 million tons of debris were later hauled away to the Fresh Kills landfill.

This image emerged from an ASCE publication as can be seen in the comparison of graphics [linked here](#) and with Bazant's 2017 graphic. It is the same idea, using the same graphics, as can be seen in JEM from 2007 onward. Dr Bazant is the original source of the graphic.

If a person returns to the same article in 2021 the image has been altered to this:



The ‘crush up’ part of the ASCE journal articles was removed (the last 2 graphics) and the descriptions at the bottom of each graphic is being censored from current readers (without informing them).

The irony in this example couldn’t be more stark. It was an article from 2011 that claimed to “explain, precisely, how the towers fell”. They later had to censor their own graphic from their own readers in 2021 to cover up their own contradictions and the obvious absurdity of ‘crush-down’, then ‘crush-up’. ASCE professional publications, on the other hand, were the main source of these misrepresentations from 2007 to the present. That is where the journalist was copying his work from. And the article still claims to ‘explain, precisely how the towers fell’ 10 years later.

Special note: Since this information first appeared on this website at the end of July, 2021, the article has been further edited to remove the comment that claimed to “explain, precisely, how the towers fell”. It disappeared between August 1 and August 24, 2021. The editor of that article is clearly aware of what is being written here.

This example shows that a Twin Towers collapse progression model that has been accepted in professional/academic publications since 2007 couldn’t appear in New York Magazine without causing embarrassment so it was censored (without informing their readers).

A closer look at the case of New York Magazine

The New York Magazine article of 2011 is the only example where the current concept of the Twin Towers collapse modes in professional/academic publications appeared in a news article which ordinary people could read.

There is no evidence that any other journalist writing in 2011 was aware of this description of the Twin Towers collapse mode at all ***even though that was their key and only professional source since 2007.***

It is highly immoral for New York Magazine to edit their article multiple times secretly. But at least by editing they are admitting their original representation of the Twin Towers collapse modes is wrong. They wouldn’t be secretly editing their article in 2021 if they were not aware that they have been misrepresenting the Twin Towers for the last decade. Their active editing is a clear confession of guilt. But the way they edit is to continue the misrepresentation in an even trickier form.

As for the other journalists supporting the NIST conclusions linked [here](#)? They did not experience this type of crisis because they appear completely unaware of (oblivious to) their own source material since


at least 2007. The journalists writing in 2006 just included their own private source material on the Twin Towers collapse modes (Cockburn) or nothing at all (Taibbi).

When we look at the written history of the Twin Towers collapse modes from a 20 year perspective there is ample evidence to show that independent investigative journalism was dying on this issue in 2005 and 2006.

By 2011, with respect to the Twin Towers collapse modes, independent investigative journalism in the U.S. was completely dead. There has been no sign of intellectual life ever since.

In the case of New York Magazine, they are the only news source linked that actually tried to use the most current professional/academic sources available to describe the collapse modes of the Twin Towers. They have been secretly editing it out ever since. The irony couldn't be greater.


Looking back at the 2006 articles



The 2006 articles were written before it was possible to independently verify what the NIST claimed because there was no access to the visual record the NIST used until 2009. It was only possible to verify NIST claims by reconstructing the visual record in the green region. That is when the [Twin Towers collapse mode mappings](#) were assembled. Parry would have had access to the visual record when he wrote if he was interested.

The Cockburn and Taibbi articles were written 1 year after the NIST final reports on the Twin Towers were released. Neither journalist had access to the visual evidence the NIST used to formulate their conclusions. Neither seemed to care. The NIST refused to comment on the Twin Towers collapse modes since 2002 yet none of the 3 articles took note of this. The Cockburn and Taibbi articles were written one year before Dr Bazant began to describe the Twin Towers collapse modes as a 'crush down phase' followed by a 'crush up phase'. None of the news sources mentioned that from 2007 to 2021. These are professional/academic papers written around the time the 2006 and 2011 articles were written.

THE CENTRAL SOURCES OF TWO TYPES OF 'BLOCK' MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE TWIN TOWER COLLAPSE MODES FROM 2007 TO 2021



A more detailed version with links to all the papers can be found [here](#). Neither Cockburn, Parry, nor Taibbi seemed to notice what was going on in any of these papers. After Cockburn and Taibbi wrote in 2006 a number of papers were published that they apparently didn't recognize as relevant. Each of the three wrote as if in a different world from any of this source material. As if the source material just didn't matter.

Cockburn and Taibbi considered the matter of the Twin Towers collapse modes settled in 2006 even though the NIST wrote nothing on the subject the year before in their final reports and Dr Bazant's first claim of a 2 stage 'crush down, then crush up' collapse mode of the Twin Towers wouldn't appear until the next year.

They wrote in 2006 just before Dr Bazant openly misrepresented the Twin Towers collapse modes in ASCE publications and elsewhere from 2007 to 2017. None of this would be considered important from their points of view because the issue was 'settled' for each news source since 2006.

Parry wrote his article in 2011. Articles in ASCE professional/academic journals had been misrepresenting the Twin Towers collapse modes for 4 years by then and Wikipedia had been describing the collapse modes as a 'crush up phase' followed by a 'crush down phase' for 2 years.


But none of this was noticed or considered of any value because only 'truthers' claims seemed to capture Parry's attention. He didn't seem to notice much beyond what 'truthers' had to say on the subject.

These articles were the last by all three investigative news sources to ever address the collapse modes of the Twin Towers. These viewpoints still remain unrevised in any alternative news source.

Looking back at the 2011 articles

There is a uniformity of thought expressed by those who support the NIST conclusions in the 2011 articles that was not seen in 2006. The polarization forming in 2006 became fixed by 2011. In these series of articles a true conformity is taking place. There is an underlying logic throughout the articles of journalists in support of the NIST conclusions that can be recognized since it is very repetitive. All these journalists seemed to be in agreement on some fundamental points like the ones shown here:

DEFAULT LOGIC OF CORPORATE NEWS, ALTERNATIVE NEWS,
INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM ON TWIN TOWERS COLLAPSE MODES, 2005-2021




This simple, default logic seems to be at the heart of every article in support of the NIST [linked here](#) but it is most obvious in the collection of 2011 articles. It is the underlying logic of Cockburn, Parry and Taibbi on the Twin Towers collapse modes even though not one of the three journalists knew what the collapse modes were. Each seemed absolutely convinced that ‘experts’ have already resolved these things though not one could name an ‘expert’ that did. They seemed so thoroughly convinced of this illusion that not one seemed able to question it.

Since none of the 4 statements are true, as has been demonstrated repeatedly for well over a decade on this website, they obviously cannot be seen as scientifically valid.

They are not scientifically valid, and they aren’t true. Yet they form the base logic of this whole system of beliefs expressed in the 2011 articles. What are they?

A clear black vs white certainty was expressed through all the 2011 articles in support of the NIST. There is a type of paternal relationship between the journalist and what they perceive as ‘scientific authority’. Each journalist casts **anyone** who would question such authority as uneducated intellectual primitives.

MANICHEAN WORLD OF POLARITIES: GOOD VS EVIL




To each of these journalists the world with respect to the Twin Tower collapses was extremely simple. There are those who see the wisdom and oversight of the NIST as supreme and those who still live in the Dark Ages. To them there is no other choice. You either get it or you don't. You are with the educated and enlightened or you are against us. (Sound familiar?)

The default logic is **simple, paternal, authoritarian, and Manichean** in nature. Not one of the fundamental beliefs are scientific or even true.

In its most reduced form, the logic seems to be: "My daddy is bigger, stronger, and more successful than your daddy" ('your daddy' in this case meaning anyone not in agreement with NIST conclusions).

The child (journalist) feels the authority of their father to be a 'settled' matter. It isn't something the child would need to verify or fact-check. In this case the comparison is apt because in reality the journalist has no idea who his actual technical source (father) is. Does the journalist believe in 'blocks' as the way the Twin Towers fell as described in [this source material](#)? They honestly do not know. Does the journalist support NIST silence on the Twin Towers collapse modes since 2002? They honestly do not know. Does the journalist support the minimal way the NIST described the Twin Towers collapse modes at the top of [this link](#)? They do not know.

They do not know what or who they support but it doesn't matter because they all somehow seem to collectively feel they are safe and cared for in the presence of scientific authority. They are all in the same shared presence: The presence of truth and certainty, the presence of science and reason. This is how they seem to feel as they collectively gather in a self-supporting group, unanimous in their views, locked together in self-certainty against anyone who doesn't feel their truth.




Something authoritative must be at the center or what could explain all the consensus and certainty expressed in the 2011 series of articles? How often do we see FOX news and CNN join hands with alternative independent journalism in consensual and unequivocal support for anything the way they did for the NIST? None seem to know what the authority actually is but they are quite certain it is there. It is a shared group presence.

Or it is like a group of chicks who feel safe and protected under their mother's wings. Not one of their four assumptions has the slightest bit of scientific validity yet their collective confidence is unshakable as long as they remain together.

What to expect in 2021

This base logic has become the heart of the written history of the Twin Towers collapse modes for the last 20 years. None of the 4 beliefs are true. They aren't even very original. They are childlike in some ways. They are based on a complete technical illiteracy of the Twin Tower collapse modes. Yet they have had amazing success in journalism.

It can be expected that a new wave of articles deeply committed to and rooted in these 4 beliefs will emerge again over the next few weeks. It will be similar to 2011. It is all pretty predictable. One could expect a strong group cohesion among a wide variety of journalists based on these qualities:



To be reduced to such a childlike world-view toward Government authority is obviously the opposite of what good independent investigative journalism should be. This is why this underlying attitude is a type of mental death and why investigative journalism on the issue of the Twin Towers collapse modes demonstrates this atrophy in a way that can be watched over time.

From this perspective journalism on this subject since at least 2011 has become nothing more than a **recommitment to these 4 principles** on every anniversary of the collapses and a collective purging of all who are not among the angels. It is utterly childlike and Manichean. It doesn't matter that the 4 principles are not true. Just reaffirm a commitment to these 4 principles periodically as if part of a large group ritual.

In this way the journalist periodically recommits to being 'responsible', legitimate, and 'neutral'. A reaffirmation of these principles is to commit oneself to 'science' and 'reason'. One is deemed to be a responsible and reasonable member of the collective group by recommitting oneself to these 4 untrue statements periodically.

But of course the group does not have the power to wish away the underlying reality. That puts this group of journalists in a real contradiction which can be tested, probed, studied and verified in real time by anyone with the knowledge to do so and who isn't trapped in the same illusions.

On why independent investigative journalism is the canary in the coal mine on the Twin Tower collapse modes

It is not possible to be ignorant of the Twin Towers collapse modes in the post 9/11 world and at the same time consider yourself knowledgeable about the post 9/11 world. After all, weren't the collapses of the Twin Towers the very events that ushered in a thing that can be called a 'post 9/11 world'?

It is here that an independent journalist worth his salt is put in a contradiction that all the denial in the world cannot wish away. It is a very real contradiction. As mentioned earlier, possibly the worst outcome of all is that:

Journalists effectively ***became defenders of the absence of historical records*** on the Twin Towers collapse modes.

I hope the reader can see just how strange this is. It isn't only that this type of journalism isn't aware the NIST provided no information on the collapse modes other than what is shown at the top of [this link](#). It isn't only that this journalism is completely ignorant of its own professional/academic source material (gathered at [this link](#)) on the collapse modes.

What they are doing here is much worse. They are essentially involved in the **permanent exclusion from the historic record of sources such as this website**, for example.

This is essentially what the large majority of the journalists [linked here](#) have been doing from 2005 onward:


EFFECTIVE BEHAVIOR OF JOURNALISM
2005 to the present



In a nutshell they unwittingly but actively assist in the removal of any knowledge of the Twin Towers collapse modes from the public domain. They are also actively defending the removal of any knowledge of the Twin Towers collapse modes from the post 9/11 world. This is also true of many journalists that do not support the NIST conclusions.

This is directly related to what happened to the NIST in 2002 as was shown in [this link](#). They stripped the **NIST Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers** of any mention of the collapse modes of the Twin Towers as demonstrated at the top of [this link](#). The paper thin excuse given to the public for doing so is reproduced in the same link.

This is what happened with the NIST in 2002:



The journalists since 2005 have simply been continuing the same treatment of the Twin Towers collapse modes that the NIST began in 2002. What the large majority of journalists have been doing since 2005 is exactly what the NIST began in 2002. Both parties are splitting knowledge of the Twin Towers collapse modes from the written records of the collapse events. Their misrepresentations are directly related to each other. One is a continuation of the other.

This website contains the only accurate and detailed description of the Twin Towers collapse modes available anywhere and the most accurate records of early movements of all 3 buildings available anywhere among many other things. But none of this can be perceived by any of these journalists.

Their world with respect to the Twin Towers collapse modes is very, very simple. A website like this has no place in their world. Through a Manichean lens this means the website must contain evil and disinformation. The website must be isolated from their whole system of education and communication for the larger good. Their children must be protected from it. Search engines should derank it.

As a reminder, as written on the home page, this website contains:

- The only visual reconstruction of the collapses of WTC1 and 2, identifying the collapse progression mechanisms of each tower.
- The only accurate, detailed mapping of the earliest movements of each building available. The detailed reconstruction of the moments leading up to and of collapse initiation of each building is used to fact-check claims made by the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST) within their official reports on the collapses and claims made by other organizations and individuals.
- Detailed criticism of the official reports on WTC1, 2 and WTC7 by the NIST, showing that claims made within the reports on all 3 buildings directly contradict what can be verified through the visual record.
- Links to libraries of the largest and most complete collections of video and photographic evidence of the attacks, collapses and resulting debris available to the public.
- The most accurate review of academic papers on the collapses available.
- Detailed critique of how professional/academic publications have misrepresented the collapse modes of the Twin Towers from 2001 to 2021
- An identification of the 3 original sources of all professional/academic misrepresentations of the Twin Tower collapse modes
- Detailed critique of how Wikipedia has misrepresented the collapse modes of the Twin Towers from 2004 to 2021

Each of these claims is written in a way that can be directly cross-checked and verified by any active reader. If these claims are true this website is a valuable and unique historic resource on the Twin Towers collapses.


Can any of this be understood from a world-view as shown below?



There are no valid questions about the Twin Towers collapse modes

The scientific/engineering community has reached consensus on the Twin Towers collapse modes long ago

The NIST is the central repository of information on the Twin Towers collapses



Only 'truthers' remain ignorant about the Twin Towers collapse modes

There is a direct and open contrast between information on this website and the simple, Manichean view of this issue shown above. This polarized, artificially simple way of seeing things stands in direct opposition to what this website is all about. It is not possible to see how any website of this nature could have any purpose or validity from this point of view.


The contrasts between us couldn't be greater. We stand in natural opposition to one another. Information on this website directly proves that all 4 of the core Manichean beliefs are untrue. Any reader can easily verify this.

But overwhelming evidence alone will not make this world-view go away. It serves as a default logic deeply embedded in a wide spectrum of journalism for at least 15 years. This mentality is what is now called 'history'. The black/white nature of the mentality means that anything that contradicts what they call 'history' should be eliminated or clearly labeled "disinformation". In a simple world that includes this website.

In a way that is beyond Orwellian it is through this black/white viewpoint that journalists effectively **became defenders of the absence of historical records** on the Twin Towers collapse modes. As shown, journalists have become so utterly screwed up at understanding or reading (or locating) their own source material of the Twin Towers collapse modes that they unwittingly but actively seek this same technical illiteracy for everyone else. Weird but true, journalists have become the active defenders of no collapse records at all. And they will actively try to block anyone else (like me) from presenting collapse records to a larger public.

The relationship between the U.S. Government, academic journals, and journalists revisited

Using the information already presented, the way the collapse modes of the Twin Towers were presented to the general public becomes pretty clear.




- 1) The lead U.S Government investigating agency (NIST) defers all comment on the collapse modes of the Twin Towers to private sources from 2002. By default this means all comments were deferred to professional and academic sources. (This was probably the true legal intention of the move.)
- 2) Professional and academic sources offer nothing useful or detailed about the Twin Towers collapse modes. From 2007 onward they describe the collapse modes literally as 'blocks'. This is also true of technical sources of 'truthers'. The whole block exchange is [mapped here](#).
- 3) Journalists had no idea that any of this is happening. Note how in the diagram journalists seem to float on air in a world without sources. Those supporting the NIST conclusions drift into a type of Manichean world-view from 2005 onward with no technical source material at all on the collapse modes. Their world becomes simple and childlike. All the 'good guys' in this world wear white hats

and are easily recognized. Anyone who disagrees with this world-view is wearing a black hat. They are easy to spot, too.

In this very simple world the author of this website and all participating researchers must be wearing 'black hats'. It is easy to spot because this website is not simple. It is not authoritarian or paternal. It is not black/white. It preserves visual and technical records of the collapse events and fact-checks claims.

Why would anyone do that? In the black/white world there is no need for that.

The way the linked journalists that supported the NIST conclusions reacted to the NIST report with respect to the Twin Towers collapse modes also becomes clear in this logic sequence:



The logical sequence shows that there is a 'parent-child' relationship between the NIST and the linked journalists. There was no instinct for journalists to question or fact-check how the NIST stripped all information about the Twin Towers collapse progression modes out of their final report.

The journalists, including many of those who did not support the NIST conclusions, continued what the NIST began in 2002 and effectively stripped the post 9/11 historic record of the actual collapse modes of the Twin Towers permanently.

The logic used to justify this (in the red squares) is absurd. It is not logic at all if we think of logic as thinking in a consistent and rational way. It is a set of fixed beliefs contrary to fact. The beliefs on the right are contrary to how the NIST actually treated the Twin Towers collapse modes on the left.

The result, as can be seen in the sequence, is that the large majority of the linked journalists have become the passionate ***defenders of the absence of historic records***. The collective group effectively acts in a way to guard the post 9/11 world from any trace of accurate collapse records of the Twin Towers.

Since the behavior is permanent, fixed, and illogical, we are witnessing a type of group dementia: The permanent and irreversible destruction of memory of the Twin Towers collapse modes.

[Back to website](#)