

The 9/11 Consensus Points: The Factual Evidence Contradicts the 9/11 Story

By Consensus911.org

Global Research, October 26, 2011

consensus911.org 26 October 2011

Theme: [Terrorism](#)

Factual Evidence Contradicts the 9/11 Story

[To access the original report including References click here](#)

The official account of the events of September 11, 2001, has been used:

- to justify the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq; which have resulted in the deaths of [millions](#) of people;
- to authorize torture, military tribunals, and extraordinary rendition; and
- to suspend freedoms guaranteed by the American Constitution such as habeas corpus in the USA, and similar freedoms in Canada, the UK, and other countries.

The official claims regarding 9/11 are contradicted by facts that have been validated by a scientific consensus process, and which include the following points of “best evidence”:

Point 1: A Claim Regarding Osama Bin Laden

The Official Account

Osama bin Laden [was responsible](#) for the 9/11 attacks.

The Best Evidence

The FBI [did not list](#) 9/11 as one of the terrorist acts for which Osama bin Laden is wanted. When asked why, Rex Tomb, when he was the head of investigative publicity for the FBI, [stated](#) that the FBI had [no hard evidence](#) connecting Bin Laden to 9/11. Also, although Secretary of State Colin Powell, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, and the 9/11 Commission [promised](#) to provide evidence of Bin Laden’s responsibility for the 9/11 attacks, they also [failed](#).

Point 2: A Claim about the Destruction of the Twin Towers: Impact, Jet Fuel, and Fire Only

The Official Account

The Twin Towers were [brought down by](#) airplane impacts, jet fuel, and office fires.

The Best Evidence

Experience, based on physical observation and scientific knowledge, shows that office fires, even with the aid of jet fuel, could not have reached temperatures greater than 1,800 degrees Fahrenheit (1,000 degrees Celsius).

But multiple [scientific reports](#) show that metals in the Twin Towers melted. These metals included steel, iron, and molybdenum – which normally do not melt until they reach 2,700°F (1482°C), 2,800°F (1538°C), and 4,753°F (2,623°C), respectively.

Point 3: A Claim about the Destruction of the Twin Towers: Impact, Fire, and Gravity Only

The Official Account

The Twin Towers were destroyed by three and only three causes: the impacts of the airliners, the resulting fires, and [gravity](#).

The Best Evidence

During the destruction of the Twin Towers, huge sections of the perimeter steel columns, weighing many tons, were ejected horizontally as far as 500 to 600 feet, as seen in multiple [photographs](#) and [maps](#). These high-speed ejections of heavy structural members cannot be explained by the fires, the pull of gravity, or the airplane impacts (which had occurred about an hour earlier).

[Human bone fragments](#) approximately 1 cm long were found in abundance on the roof of the Deutsche Bank following the Towers' destruction, which further points to the use of explosives. Pancaking or tamping of floors from above would tend to trap bodies, not hurl splintered bones over 500 feet horizontally.

Point 4: A Claim Excluding Explosions in the Twin Towers

The Official Account

NIST [wrote](#) as if no one – including members of the Fire Department of New York – gave evidence of explosions in the Twin Towers.

The Best Evidence

Over 100 of the roughly 500 members of the FDNY who were at the site that day [reported](#) what they described as explosions in the Twin Towers. Similar [reports](#) were given by journalists, police officers, and WTC employees.

Point 5: A Second Claim Excluding Explosions in the Twin Towers

The Official Account

On 9/11, the Twin Towers came down because of damage produced by the impact of the planes combined with fires ignited by the jet fuel. After burning for 101 and 56 minutes, respectively, the north and south towers came down rapidly but [without the aid](#) of

explosives.

The Best Evidence

The Twin Towers were [built](#) to withstand the impacts of airliners having approximately the size and speed of those that struck them. And office fires, even if fed by jet fuel (which is essentially kerosene), [could not have weakened](#) the steel structure of these buildings sufficiently to collapse as suddenly as they did.

Only the top sections of these buildings were damaged by the impacts and the resulting fires, whereas their steel structures, much heavier towards the base, were [like pyramids](#) in terms of strength. So the official account, which ruled out explosives, cannot explain why these buildings completely collapsed.

Point 6: The Claim that WTC 7 Collapsed from Fire Alone

The Official Account

NIST [originally suggested](#) that WTC 7 was brought down by structural damage combined with a raging fire fed by diesel fuel. However, in its [Final Report](#) (of November 2008), NIST declared that neither diesel fuel nor structural damage played a role in this building's collapse, and that this building, which was not struck by a plane, was brought down by fire alone.

The Best Evidence

Before or after 9/11, [no steel-frame high-rise building](#) had ever collapsed due to fire. If fire were to cause such a building to collapse, the onset would be gradual, whereas the videos show that WTC 7, after being completely stable, suddenly came down in virtual free fall. This building's straight-down, symmetrical collapse, with the roofline remaining essentially horizontal, shows that all 82 of WTC 7's support columns had been eliminated by the time the top started down.

Point 7: The Claim in NIST's Draft Report that WTC 7 Did

Not Come Down at Free Fall Acceleration

The Official Account

Having denied for years that WTC 7 came down at free fall acceleration, NIST repeated this position in August 2008, when it issued a [report](#) on WTC 7 in the form of a *Draft for Public Comment*.

Shyam Sunder, the head of NIST's WTC project, [said](#) – speaking within the framework of its claim that the building was brought down by fire – that free fall would have been physically impossible.

The Best Evidence

[Scientific analysis](#) by mathematician David Chandler shows that WTC 7 came down in absolute free fall for a period of about 2.25 seconds. NIST's *Draft for Public Comment* had been challenged by Chandler and Dr. Steven Jones in a public review, and NIST then re-analyzed the fall of WTC 7.

In its [Final Report](#), NIST provided a detailed analysis and graph that conceded that WTC 7 came down at free-fall acceleration for over 100 feet, or about 2.25 seconds, consistent with the findings of Chandler and Jones.

Point 8: The Claim in NIST's Final Report that WTC 7 Came Down in Free Fall Without Explosives

The Official Account

In its [Final Report](#) on WTC 7, issued in November 2008, NIST finally acknowledged that WTC 7 had entered into free fall for more than two seconds. NIST continued to say, however, that WTC 7 was brought down by fire, with no aid from explosives.

The Best Evidence

[Scientific analysis](#) shows that a free-fall collapse of a steel-framed building could not be produced by fire, that is, without explosives (a fact that NIST's lead investigator, Shyam Sunder [acknowledged](#) in his discussions of NIST's Draft Report for Public Comment in August 2008).

Point 9: The Claim that the World Trade Center Dust Contained no Thermitic Materials

The Official Account

Although NIST [did not perform](#) any tests to determine whether there were incendiaries (such as thermite) or explosives (such as RDX and nanothermite) in the WTC dust, it [claimed](#) that such materials were not present.

The Best Evidence

Unreacted nanothermitic material, "which can be [tailored](#) to behave as an incendiary (like ordinary thermite), or as an [explosive](#)," was found in four [independently collected](#) samples of the WTC dust (as [reported](#) in a multi-author paper in a peer-reviewed journal).

Point 10: A Claim Regarding Hijacked Passenger Jets

The Official Account

The *9/11 Commission Report* [holds](#) that four airplanes (American Airlines flights 11 and 77, and United Airlines flights 93 and 175) were hijacked on 9/11.

The Best Evidence

Pilots are trained to "squawk" the universal [hijack code \(7500\)](#) on a transponder if they receive evidence of an attempted hijacking, thereby notifying FAA controllers on the ground.

But [leading newspapers](#) and the [9/11 Commission](#) pointed out that FAA controllers were not notified.

A [CNN story](#) said that pilots are trained to send the hijack code “if possible.” But entering the code takes only two or three seconds, whereas it took hijackers, according to the official story, [more than 30 seconds](#) to break into the pilots’ cabin of Flight 93.

The fact that [not one](#) of the eight pilots performed this required action casts serious doubt on the hijacker story.

Point 11: The Claim that Flight 93 Crashed Near Shanksville, Pennsylvania

The Official Account

The 9/11 Commission [reported](#) that United Flight 93, having been taken over by an al-Qaeda pilot, was flown at a high speed and steep angle into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

In response to claims that United Airlines Flight 93 was shot down, the US military and the FBI said that United 93 was *not* shot down.

The Best Evidence

Residents, the mayor, and journalists near Shanksville reported that [no airliner was visible](#) at the designated crash site; that contents were found as far as [eight miles](#) from the designated crash site; and that parts – including a [thousand-pound engine piece](#) – were found over a mile away.

Point 12: The Claim Regarding Hani Hanjour as Flight 77 Pilot

The Official Account

The *9/11 Commission Report* [holds](#) that American Flight 77, a Boeing 757, was flown by al-Qaeda pilot Hani Hanjour into the Pentagon. After disengaging the autopilot, he executed a 330-degree downward spiral through 7000 feet in about three minutes, then flew into Wedge 1 of the Pentagon between the first and second floors at 530 mph.

The Best Evidence

Several former airliner pilots have [stated](#) that Hanjour could not possibly have maneuvered a large airliner through the trajectory allegedly taken by Flight 77 and then hit the Pentagon between the first and second floors without touching the lawn.

Point 13: The Claim About the Time of Dick Cheney’s Entry into the White House Bunker

The Official Account

Vice President Dick Cheney took charge of the government’s response to the 9/11 attacks after he entered the PEOC (the Presidential Emergency Operations Center), a.k.a. “the bunker”.

The *9/11 Commission Report* [said](#) that Cheney did not enter the PEOC until almost 10:00 AM, which was at least 20 minutes after the violent event at the Pentagon that killed more than 100 people.

The Best Evidence

Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta [told](#) the 9/11 Commission that, after he joined Cheney and others in the bunker at approximately 9:20 AM, he listened to an ongoing conversation between Cheney and a young man, which took place when “the airplane was coming into the Pentagon.”

After the young man, having reported for the third time that the plane was coming closer, asked whether “the orders still stand,” Cheney emphatically said they did. The *9/11 Commission Report*, by claiming that Cheney did not enter the PEOC until long after the Pentagon was damaged, implies that this exchange between Cheney and the young man – which can most naturally be understood as Cheney’s confirmation of a stand-down order – could not have occurred.

However, testimony that Cheney was in the PEOC by 9:20 was reported not only by Mineta but also by [Richard Clarke](#) and White House photographer [David Bohrer](#). [Cheney himself](#), speaking on “Meet the Press” five days after 9/11, reported that he had entered the PEOC before the Pentagon was damaged.

The 9/11 Commission’s attempt to bury the exchange between Cheney and the young man confirms the importance of Mineta’s report of this conversation.

Click link to access original document which includes detailed references

[References](#)

The original source of this article is [consensus911.org](#)

Copyright © [Consensus911.org](#), [consensus911.org](#), 2011

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Consensus911.org](#)

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