

## Foreknowledge of World Trade 7's Collapse: The Challenge to the Official Hypothesis

G. MacQueen

Text of Public Talk, University of Hartford,  
U.S.A.

March 21, 2011

Minor revisions Nov. 21, 2017

### **Introduction**

Good day. It's an honour to appear today with such distinguished speakers and to be introduced by William Pepper, whom I have long admired.

Today we are going to discuss the collapse of a building. The building is World Trade Center 7, and it came down on September 11, 2001.

The World Trade Center complex in southern Manhattan included seven buildings. The last to be built was World Trade Center 7, which was completed in 1987. The building was owned by Seven World Trade Company and Silverstein Development Corporation. It was on the north side of Vesey Street, approximately 350 feet north of the north side of World Trade Center 1 (the North Tower).

[slide]

In this photograph you can see World Trade Centre 7 encircled in red with the Twin Towers behind it. This photograph, like the diagram I just showed, is taken from the final report of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

World Trade Center 7 was a 47 storey steel-framed skyscraper. It was 610 feet tall, and "a typical floor was similar in size to a football field." (NIST, p. 5). This was, by most standards, a very large building.

WTC 7 had a number of interesting occupants, including the Secret Service and the CIA. It also housed, on the 23rd floor, the New York City

Office of Emergency Management. The OEM had been established a few years before 9/11 by Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. Mr. Giuliani was derided by critics for locating the Office in the World Trade Center, since the Center was widely considered a likely target of terrorist attack. The OEM office was sometimes disparagingly referred to as “Rudy’s Bunker.”

WTC 7 was not hit by a plane on 9/11, although there was some damage done to the building when World Trade Center 1 collapsed, and there were fires in the building during the day.

[slide]

At roughly 5:21 p.m., ten seconds after a shaking of the earth that was recorded by seismographs, WTC 7 came down suddenly, swiftly and completely. Here is the collapse.

[Play]

The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), an agency of the US Dept of Commerce, was charged with undertaking a study of WTC 7’s collapse. You will be hearing a fair bit about this study later today because each of today’s speakers rejects NIST’s conclusions. Essentially, NIST concluded that WTC 7 collapsed due to office fires. Today’s speakers do not accept this hypothesis but believe the building was deliberately taken down on 9/11—was subjected to controlled demolition.

If we are right, important questions will follow. Who took it down? Why did they take it down, and when did they prepare it for demolition? Why have we been deceived for nine and a half years? Were other buildings also subjected to controlled demolition? What are the implications of this deception for the study of 9/11 generally?

Today we will not be asking these wider questions—we will focus quite narrowly on the collapse of World Trade Seven--but I want to acknowledge these questions so that you will understand the importance of today’s topic.

### **Foreknowledge**

In order to guide you into my specific topic I want to begin by showing you the BBC's announcement of WTC 7's collapse. (Note that WTC 7 is referred to here as the Salomon Brothers Building--this company, before merging with another company, was one of the major occupants of the building.)

[play BBC clip]

Anchor:

"Now more on the latest building collapse in New York. You might have heard a few moments ago I was talking about the Salomon Brothers Building collapsing, and indeed it has. Apparently that's only a few hundred yards away from where the World Trade Center Towers were. And it seems that this was not a result of a new attack, it was because the building had been *weakened* during this morning's attacks. We'll probably find out more now about that from our correspondent, Jane Standley."

There was one very serious difficulty with the BBC's announcement. Building 7 is clearly visible behind correspondent Jane Standley. It has not collapsed at all. The BBC has announced the building's collapse over 20 minutes before it has occurred.

A controversy followed the rediscovery of this BBC footage in 2007. Defending the BBC, the head of news for BBC World said, "We're not part of a conspiracy. Nobody told us what to say or do on September 11th. We didn't get told in advance that buildings were going to fall down...If we reported the building had collapsed before it had done so, it would have been an error—no more than that." (DRG 115)

Let us think about this for a moment. Suppose one of you were to get up now and say: "We're going to have to end this talk because MacQueen, who stumbled and hurt his knee on the way over here, has just collapsed and died." You would be surprised to hear this because here I am standing at the podium. In this case we would all agree that the announcement was an error. But suppose that 20 minutes after the announcement I suddenly collapsed and died. What then? The person

announcing my death prematurely still made an error (got the timing wrong) but that person also said something true—peculiarly true, since people don't normally collapse and die after injuring their knee. It would be reasonable in that situation to suspect that the person announcing my death had foreknowledge, and it would be important to ask what kind of foreknowledge. It could be innocent foreknowledge (the speaker was an extremely skilled physician, had made a prognosis based on observation and experience, and had just jumped the gun). Or it could be criminal foreknowledge (the speaker had poisoned my coffee).

Maybe you think I'm giving a misleading analogy by making reference to myself falling dead after my only visible injury is a damaged knee. I do not think I am. Here is a quotation from the NIST report that you are going to see more than once today:

“This was the first known instance of the total collapse of a tall building primarily due to fires.” (NIST xxxi)

I believe you get the point. How could the BBC have made a simple error given the uniqueness of this event?

If you were a police investigator investigating my fatal collapse you would have tough questions for the person who gave the premature announcement of my death. Did the FBI and the 9/11 Commission and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) have tough questions for the BBC? Not as far as we know.

As I will show, the BBC is just one among many parties that had foreknowledge of WTC 7's collapse. As far as we know, none of these parties was subjected to tough questions.

But what is foreknowledge? Let us address this before going further.

We assume in our daily lives that we have a fair bit of awareness of the future, and we make decisions based on that awareness. We recognize that there are different kinds of awareness of the future and that each has its own degree of certainty. We use an array of terms to make these distinctions. When we do not have full certainty we may speak of

prediction or forecast or prognosis. But in some cases we feel able to say that we know something about the future. An astronomer will not usually say, "I predict that there will be a lunar eclipse next week." She or he will say, "there will be a lunar eclipse next week." This is foreknowledge. In today's talk I will use a standard definition of foreknowledge, taken from Webster's 3rd New International Dictionary:

Foreknowledge is "knowledge of a thing before it happens or exists."

I want to draw attention to three criteria that I believe distinguish foreknowledge from other kinds of awareness of the future: certainty, confirmation, and detail.

1. "Certainty" has to do with the subjective state of the knower. When we speak of foreknowledge we must have certainty about what is known. We are certain when we are fully confident, free of hesitation and doubt.
2. "Confirmation" has to do with the objective event that is known by the person with foreknowledge: it has to eventually exist or come about. The advance awareness must be confirmed by unfolding events. Certainty by itself is not enough. Knowledge, including foreknowledge, requires confirmation.
3. "Detail" is required in order for us to use the term foreknowledge. If I say: "I know that I will die some day" I am speaking with a sense of certainty and, in time, my statement will be confirmed, but we do not generally use the term "foreknowledge" for this kind of knowledge. If I say, "I know that I will die in March of 2014" we have got enough detail and we may speak of foreknowledge. How much detail is required in order for us to speak of foreknowledge? There is no hard and fast rule, but the level of detail must be greater than could be predicted from general knowledge of the nature of things.

Although premature declarations are in a sense a case unto themselves, the BBC announcement seems to me to fit all three criteria of foreknowledge. It was made with certainty, it was confirmed by events, and it was staggeringly accurate. (To be off by slightly more than twenty minutes with such a rare event is to be extremely accurate.) But I do not want to linger on the BBC case because I do not want to give the impression that it is unique.

Let us be systematic. Let us go through the three criteria of foreknowledge one at a time. Once we have done this and we are sure that we are dealing with foreknowledge, I will make my argument that the foreknowledge of the collapse of WTC 7 is not innocent foreknowledge but suspect and criminal foreknowledge. That is, it was insider knowledge that derived from the people who ultimately demolished the building.

## 1. Certainty

If we study the oral histories of the members of the FDNY who were present on the scene on 9/11 we will find about 60 members who refer to the impending collapse of WTC 7. Slightly over half of these witnesses speak of the collapse with certainty: that is, they have been told, and they have accepted, that the building is *definitely* coming down. This suggests there were many people on 9/11 who were certain about WTC 7's fate.

Here is another way of approaching the issue. To return to the analogy where I am giving a talk in this room, suppose as I am giving this talk a number of people enter the room and stand around, apparently impatient, not listening to what I am saying. You approach them and ask them what they're doing. They reply: "we're just waiting."

"What are you waiting for?"

"We're waiting for MacQueen to collapse and die. We've got some tasks to do in the building but we can't do them till he dies so we're just waiting for him to do it."

Notice that they do not say, we're waiting to see *if* I collapse and die; they say they're waiting for me to collapse and die so they can get on with their tasks. This statement indicates a high degree of certainty that the event is going to occur.

But what has this anecdote got to do with WTC 7? Listen to the following statements from the oral histories of the FDNY (my emphasis throughout).

Firefighter Burke, 46, p. 17

"The rest of the day we were unloading trucks. We were just doing whatever little things we could do, but *they were waiting for 7 World Trade Center to fall.*"

Donato, 129, p. 5-8

"We came around, I think we took Murray Street down the west side, and we stopped the rig and pulled over to the side and we all got out of the rig. *We were standing, waiting for seven to come down.* We were there for quite a while, a couple hours."

Wallace, 473, p. 4

"They were saying building seven was going to collapse, so we regrouped and went back to our rig. We went to building four or three; I don't know. We were going to set up our tower ladder there. They said no good because building seven is coming down.

*We waited for building seven to come down."*

Fortis, 158, p. 13-15

"...they pulled everyone back, and everybody stood there *and we actually just waited and just waited and waited until [it?] went down...*"

Massa (V), 280, p. 16-21.

"I remember later on in the day as *we were waiting for seven to come down*, they kept backing us up Vesey, almost like a full block...[19] *The whole time while we were waiting -- there were hours that went by.*"

Pilla, 367, p. 13-14.

"We walked back. We didn't do [sic] any further because building number seven was coming down. That was another problem, *to wait for building seven to come down...*"

Stroebel, 441, p. 5

"They had figured they knew that building was going to come down. It was just a question of time, *and everybody was awaiting that.*"

Sweeney, 447, p. 14

"Once they got us back together and organized somewhat, they sent us back down to Vesey, where we stood *and waited for Seven World Trade Center to come down.*"

McCarthy (Chief), 285, 10ff

"So when I get to the command post, they just had a flood of guys standing there. *They were just waiting for 7 to come down.*

Drury (Assistant Commissioner), 133, p. 10, [12].

"I must have lingered there. There were hundreds of firefighters waiting to -- *they were waiting for 7 World Trade Center to come down...*"

The criterion of certainty is met through these references to waiting.

In case anyone still has doubts, consider this statement by Firefighter Long:

"they were just adamant about 7 coming down immediately. I think we probably got out of that rubble and 18 minutes later is when 7 came down."

Or Firefighter Kennedy: "...the only guy that really stands out in my mind that I remember being on the radio was Chief Visconti...I



remember him screaming about 7, No. 7, that they wanted everybody away from 7 because 7 was definitely going to collapse.”

Or Firefighter Cassidy:

“...building seven was in imminent collapse [edited]. They blew the horns. They said everyone clear the area...”

The criterion of certainty has been met.

## 2. Confirmation

This one is as easy as it is crucial. Yes, the building came down that afternoon. The event confirmed what people said about the collapse in advance.

## 3. Detail

Let us distinguish two kinds of detail. The first has to do with the nature of the collapse and of the collapse zone. The second has to do with time of the collapse.

A collapse zone was established around WTC 7 prior to its collapse. We find references to this collapse zone in passages like the following:

Massa (V), 280, p. 16-21.

“They were concerned about seven coming down, and they kept changing us, establishing a collapse [18] zone and backing us up...”

It seems clear that many members of the FDNY had been told to expect the *total* collapse of WTC 7. This is why most members were not surprised when total collapse took place. It also seems that total collapse was the assumption used to establish the collapse zone around the building. Note the following dialogue in the oral histories between the interviewer and the interviewee:

[check the quotation]

Q. Were you there when building 7 came down in the afternoon?

A. Yes.

Q. You were still there?

A. Yes, so basically they measured out how far the building was going to come, so we knew exactly where we could stand.

Q. So they just put you in a safe area, safe enough for when that building came down?

A. 5 blocks. 5 blocks away. We still could see. Exactly right on point, the cloud stopped right there.

The advance knowledge of total collapse and the accurate establishment of a collapse zone around the building qualify as detail.

Now let us look at detail in the time of the event. Is there evidence that people knew when the building was going to come down?

Actually, I believe all the statements of foreknowledge I have quoted fit this category. To know within a few hours that such a rare event is going to occur certainly fulfils the criterion of detail.

But we can find further detail if we look.

We have seen how the BBC announced the collapse. Let us look at how CNN announced the event.

[play]

Anchor Aaron Brown says, "We are getting information now that one of the other buildings, Building 7, in the World Trade Center complex, is on fire and has either collapsed or is collapsing."

Then he looks at his monitor and pauses in confusion. Building 7 is clearly still standing. It continues to stand for an hour and 10 minutes. The CNN announcement is even more premature than that of the BBC.

But what happens next is even more odd. Do CNN spokespersons apologize for giving misinformation? No. Do they turn the cameras away from WTC 7 in embarrassment, aware that they were wrong? No. In fact, from the time of the premature announcements till the time the building collapses, CNN seldom lets WTC 7 stray from the TV screen. We are

shown WTC 7 repeatedly, sometimes by itself, sometimes in a split screen arrangement when another event is being reported. Throughout this time a caption appears at the bottom of the screen saying, "Building 7 at World Trade Center on fire, may collapse."

In other words, CNN refuses to be deterred by its earlier error. It appears to know that WTC 7 will be coming down.

4.5 minutes before WTC 7 comes down a new caption appears at the bottom of the screen. Instead of "Building 7 at World Trade Center on fire, may collapse" we now get: "Building # 7 ablaze, poised to collapse."

Then, 1.5 minutes before the building comes down, another caption appears: "Building 7 at World Trade Ctr on fire, on verge of collapse."

Then, it collapses, and this is duly noted.

CNN, after its initial error in premature announcement, appears to have refused to be discouraged from covering this building because it had been told that the collapse would definitely take place, and it appears to have been kept up to date on the timeline so that the station knew with considerable precision when the building would come down. This is *detail* in respect to time, and it means that the third criterion of foreknowledge has been met.

### **NIST's Unsatisfactory Explanation of WTC 7's Collapse**

We can now confidently say that there was foreknowledge of WTC 7's collapse. This means that we are dealing with something distinct from prediction or guess or error.

I will now argue that this foreknowledge of the collapse of WTC 7 cannot be legitimate and innocent foreknowledge but must be illegitimate and criminal foreknowledge. This foreknowledge could have been based only on insider knowledge that derived from the people who ultimately demolished the building.

Let us begin this section by asking how NIST deals with the foreknowledge of 7's collapse.

On the whole, NIST has chosen to ignore the issue of foreknowledge. For example, the draft of its final report, released to the public for comment in August, 2008 provoked a group of us (including Mr. Gage, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Szamboti, myself and several others) to write a critique and response. I wrote the part on foreknowledge. NIST, in its final draft, ignored what I had to say about foreknowledge and made no relevant changes.

On occasion, however, NIST spokespersons have attempted, indirectly, to deal with foreknowledge. Let us look at two such attempts.

The first of these statements occurs in NIST's final report on the collapse of WTC 7. This is the only section of the report in which foreknowledge is dealt with, even indirectly.

[slide]

[NIST report 1A, . 16]

“The emergency responders quickly recognized that WTC 7 had been damaged by the collapse of WTC 1...

As early as 11:30 a.m., FDNY recognized that there was no water coming out of the hydrant system to fight the fires that were visible. With the collapses of the towers fresh in their minds, there was concern that WTC 7 too might collapse...”

Notice that this statement (“with the collapses of the towers fresh in their minds, there was concern that WTC 7 too might collapse”) is ambiguous. It could mean one of two very different things:

(a) FDNY members engaged in scientific, evidence-based prediction. They observed damage to WTC 7; they realized they could not fight the fires burning in the building; they had experienced the collapses of the Twin Towers. Putting all these things together, they came to a reasonable conclusion: WTC 7 was in danger of collapse.

Or

(b) FDNY members were unduly influenced by the collapses of the Twin Towers, so, ignoring the great difference between the kind of damage done to those buildings and the damage done to WTC 7, they drew the invalid conclusion that WTC 7 was in danger of collapse.

NIST's report does not resolve this ambiguity, so we are left with two possible explanations of the early statements about WTC 7's inevitable collapse: (a) evidence-based prediction, and (b) lucky guess.

The second statement I am aware of by NIST that bears on this issue is one made by the lead investigator in the NIST study of WTC 7's collapse, Dr. Shyam Sunder.

In 2008, shortly after the public appearance of NIST's report on WTC 7, I debated Dr. Sunder on the radio (CKNX Radio Wingham, Ontario). I raised the issue of foreknowledge and here is what Dr. Sunder said:

["The July 6 BBC program also explained some of the other aspects about the advanced knowledge. The only issue about the advanced knowledge was the fact that] there was a technical advisor or an engineer who was called by, who was providing advice to, city agencies on 9/11 about the condition of buildings, in particular Building 7, and it was his or her judgment—I believe it was him—it was his judgment that he was hearing creaking sounds which was entirely appropriate and consistent with fires causing damage to connections and members, and he was hearing such sounds that would suggest that the building may come down and he, of course, was observing the fires in the building as well so it was based on that advice that the fire department decided around mid-afternoon—it was around 2:30 in the afternoon—to decide to abandon fighting the fires in that building. So it is something that people were expecting could happen based on what they were seeing and hearing.”

So, according to this second explanation of foreknowledge, an engineer on the scene perceived (saw and heard) the damage to WTC 7 and made a collapse prediction. And, it seems Dr. Sunder is saying, this was the basis of the foreknowledge evident during the rest of the day. Other sources also mentioned this unnamed engineer.

But for our purposes today it does not matter whether prediction of WTC 7's collapse is said to have derived from FDNY members or from this engineer on site or from both. It also does not matter whether the conclusion drawn (that WTC 7 would collapse) was the result of observation and reason, as Dr. Sunder implies, or of a lucky guess. None of these arguments, separately or in combination, accounts for the evidence we have.

As we enter into this next stage of argument it is important to understand the relationship of foreknowledge to the nature of the event known about.

### 1. Uniqueness

If the event in question is the kind of event that has occurred often in the past, it may be possible to know a great deal about the conditions that precede or cause it and to have foreknowledge of its next occurrence. This is the basis of medical prognosis. But if the event has never occurred before it will generally be very difficult or impossible to have foreknowledge of it.

### 2. Randomness

If the event depends on the reliable behaviour of a small number of entities, we may achieve foreknowledge with a high degree of certainty and accuracy. This is why we can have foreknowledge of a solar eclipse—the movements of the heavenly bodies are regular. But if the event depends on a multitude of events with a high degree of randomness, foreknowledge will be difficult or impossible. Moreover, when the foreknowledge is possible it will generally be possible only very close in time to the occurrence of the event. As the time interval grows the degree of randomness and unpredictability will generally

grow and will rule out foreknowledge. Weather forecasting is an example of this.

Coming to the case at hand, if NIST's current collapse hypothesis is correct, then according to both of these criteria (uniqueness and randomness) this collapse would have been impossible to know about in advance.

## 1. Uniqueness

To repeat what has been said before the NIST final report says:

"This was the first known instance of the total collapse of a tall building primarily due to fires." (NIST final, Exec. Summary, xxxv.)

But in this case, how could anyone, whether firefighter or engineer, have known in advance that Building 7 would undergo complete collapse? What basis is there for this prognosis? Vague predictions and lucky guesses will not do: we have already established that there was advance *knowledge* of the building's collapse, and that this knowledge was much too certain and detailed to have been derived either from early predictions or from lucky guesses.

## 2. Randomness

Some people who discuss the collapse of WTC 7 do not seem to have grasped how the discussion changed after NIST issued its final report in 2008. After my discussion with him on the radio, I am not sure even Dr. Sunder, NIST's lead investigator, grasps this point. Before the report came out, there were people who claimed that structural damage from the WTC 1 collapse might have done the building in, or that structural damage might have joined with huge and very hot fires fueled by diesel fuel stored in the building to cause the steel structure to lose strength. Although there was never any serious evidence for these hypothesis, they were popular all the same, and I believe part of the reason for their popularity was that they helped to explain foreknowledge of the collapse. That is, people could in this case have predicted, on the basis of damage they observed, that the building might come down.

But the NIST report had little time for the structural damage caused by WTC 1. NIST says losing seven exterior columns was too minor to have played a significant role in the collapse. NIST also dismissed as fictional the raging fires caused by stored diesel oil, and it asserted that the fires were not hot enough to cause significant loss of strength in the steel. In ruling out these previously discussed causes of collapse, NIST pulled the rug out from under those who had tried to explain foreknowledge of the collapse as legitimate and innocent.

I will not describe here NIST's eventual collapse hypothesis--the one to which the final report of 2008 is dedicated. I will leave that for my colleagues who will speak later. But I want to point to three crucial claims in this collapse hypothesis:

### 1. Randomness of events

The NIST hypothesis assumes that the movement of the fires within the building, which could not have been predicted early in the day, combined with facts about the building's structure—the long span beam here, a connection to a girder there, a further relationship to a particular column over here--to bring about a chain of events never witnessed before in a steel high-rise. There is a high degree of randomness and unpredictability in this entire series of events. No one, engineer or otherwise, could have predicted this convergence of factors.

### 2. Invisibility of events

The NIST hypothesis has these events coming together within the structure of the building. No one standing outside the building (or inside the building for that matter) could have observed these events. There is no point, therefore, in emphasizing the observations of witnesses, because the crucial factors were unobservable. Saying people observed fires does not do the job: there have been many high rises with fires; the high rises have not come down. Dr. Sunder tries to get around this invisibility problem by saying that the engineer heard "creaking," but although creaking may be consistent with NIST's hypothesis it is also consistent with other hypotheses and could not have been used to predict the building's complete collapse.

### 3. Last minute convergence of events



Although NIST does not give us a precise time when this convergence of random events took place and sealed the fate of the building, it appears that it took place less than 20 seconds before collapse. But if this is the case, what is the point of talking about what the firefighters saw at 11:30 a.m. or what an engineer discovered early in the day (other sources have the engineer's prediction taking place at noon)?

Here is how things stand. If anyone, firefighter or engineer, had foreknowledge of the collapse, as this collapse sequence is described by NIST, that person would have had to possess two forms of extrasensory perception. Clairvoyance, the ability to see what is unobservable by the five senses, would have been needed for the observation of hidden events in the building's structure. Precognition, the ability to know things in advance without the usual powers of observation and reason, would have been needed to perceive this convergence of events hours before they happened.

But if NIST's hypothesis does not explain the foreknowledge we have found, how do we explain this foreknowledge? As far as I can see, the only adequate hypothesis proposed to date is that knowledge that this building would come down came ultimately from those who intended to bring it down and did bring it down.

### **Evidence of Controlled Demolition: Witnesses**

Some of you may agree that the foreknowledge I have referred to is very odd and is not compatible with the official collapse hypothesis, but you may feel I am moving too quickly to the hypothesis of controlled demolition. Later speakers will have a lot to say that relates to this concern, but in the remaining minutes of my talk I will briefly sketch the sorts of witness evidence (just one type of evidence) we possess that supports what I have concluded from the study of foreknowledge.

We can approach this evidence by asking three questions:

1. Did authorities on the scene discuss, prior to WTC 7's collapse, the possibility that they might deliberately bring down the building?
2. Did any insider say *after* 9/11 that building 7 had been deliberately brought down?

3. Did any eyewitnesses claim to have witnessed explosions in the building?

The answer to all three questions is, yes. Let us go briefly through each.

1. Indira Singh, a senior consultant for JP Morgan Chase, was working as a voluntary emergency medical worker on 9/11. In 2005 she was interviewed by Bonnie Faulkner on the show "Guns and Butter". [DRG, 117]

Here is what she said: [play]

"Pretty soon after midday on 9/11 we had to evacuate [the site where we had been working] because they told us Building 7 was coming down...I do believe that they brought Building 7 down because I heard that they were going to bring it down because it was unstable because of the collateral damage. That I don't know; I can't attest to the validity of that. **All I can attest to is that by noon or one o'clock, they told us we had to move from that triage site up to Pace University, a little further away, because Building 7 was gonna come down or being brought down.**"

**Faulker: "Did they actually use the word 'brought down' and who was it that was telling you this?"**

**"The fire department. The fire department. And they did us the word 'we're gonna have to bring it down.'"**

Is there corroboration for Singh's remarkable statement? There is. Lieutenant David Rastuccio of the FDNY was interviewed live on MSNBC directly after the collapse of Building 7. Here's how that interview went:

[play]

Immediately after WTC 7 comes down the reporter says to Rastuccio: "You guys knew this was comin' all day." [after saying a couple of times that they've been watching that building all day] Rastuccio replies: "We had heard reports that the building was unstable and that eventually it

would either come down on its own or it would be taken down. I would imagine it came down on its own.”

This is serious evidence that bringing down WTC 7, through some form of controlled demolition, was discussed as an option on 9/11 prior to WTC 7’s collapse. This evidence forces us to put the controlled demolition hypothesis on the table.

2. Now to the question as to whether insiders have ever made reference after 9/11 to the fact that the building was deliberately taken down.

Larry Silverstein of Silverstein Properties, one of the owners of Building 7, was interviewed in 2002 for the PBS documentary, “America Rebuilds”. He said the following:

[play]

“I remember getting a call from the fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, ‘We’ve had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it.’ And they made that decision to pull and then we watched the building collapse.”

When he spoke of “pulling” it, Silverstein seemed to many people to be referring to deliberately demolishing the building. Silverstein himself later claimed that he simply meant that the firefighters should be pulled from the building.

Much ink has been spilled on this issue, and we do not have time to go through all the arguments. But it is surely clear that any serious investigation of the collapse of Building 7, in which the controlled demolition hypothesis was not ruled out of bounds from the beginning, would have to include tough questions for Mr. Silverstein. Yet NIST has simply accepted his explanation and has admitted that it never pursued the issue or interviewed Silverstein about his statement. So much for the tough questions.

3. And now on to our third and final question: Did any eyewitnesses actually claim to have observed explosions in the building?

There are several such witnesses, but the best known is Barry Jennings. Mr. Jennings was deputy director of the Emergency Services Department of the New York City Housing Authority. He was interviewed several times, beginning on the day of 9/11 about his experience on that day in WTC 7. Here is a brief clip of an interview he gave on 9/11:

[play]

Subsequently, Jennings was interviewed by several people and groups, including NIST. For a careful and detailed account of his story, please consult Professor David Ray Griffin's book, *The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center 7*. Since I have time restrictions I will simply give what I consider to be the gist of the situation.

(a) Jennings claimed to have experienced a major explosion inside WTC 7 before either of the Twin Towers came down. This explosion, he said, blew out the stairs and made it impossible for him and Michael Hess, who accompanied him, to get out of the building. They were therefore trapped in the building for some time, being finally rescued by firefighters well after the collapses of WTC 1 and WTC 2.

(b) NIST and the BBC made two changes in Jennings' story to make it fit with the NIST hypothesis. First, they said that Jennings had not actually witnessed an explosion. He had mistaken falling debris from the North Tower for an explosion. Second, in order to make the claim about the North Tower debris they changed Jennings' time estimations by about one hour.

What shall we say about these changes? As far as I can see they are not based on evidence and are not based on inconsistencies in Jennings' story. The changes were introduced simply to save NIST's hypothesis. Is this how we do research? I thought we modified our hypothesis to fit evidence rather than modifying evidence to fit our hypothesis.

This dismissal of eyewitnesses who claim to have experienced explosions on 9/11 is typical of NIST's approach and of the 9/11 Commission's approach. I have catalogued 155 witnesses who perceived

explosions at the time the Twin Towers came down (and I've published 118 of these). Both the 9/11 Commission and NIST have ruled all of these witnesses irrelevant. It seems we are to believe that there was some kind of mass hallucination on 9/11, according to which people thought they were perceiving explosions when they were not.. Barry Jennings has become just one more eyewitness to be dismissed.

Mr. Jennings cannot be here today to speak for himself because he died on August 19, 2008, two days before NIST presented the Draft version of its report on WTC 7. (DRG wording, 98). Until someone is able to give a good reason why his testimony is false, I intend to accept it.

To sum up my main points:

1. There was widespread foreknowledge of Building 7's collapse on 9/11.
2. This foreknowledge is incompatible with evidence-based prediction, as well as with error and lucky guesses.
3. NIST's collapse hypothesis relies on claims of evidence-based prediction, error and lucky guesses, and is, therefore, wrong.
4. The controlled demolition hypothesis is compatible with the foreknowledge evidence we possess.
5. The controlled demolition hypothesis is further supported by witness evidence.
6. The new investigation which we so urgently need must, therefore, seriously address the controlled demolition hypothesis.

Thank you for your patience.