

PS 132 9/11 Unmasked: A Conversation with Elizabeth Woodworth and Graeme McQueen

John Shuck: [00:00:00] Curious about what happened on September 11th 2001? The [9/11 Consensus Panel](#) has sifted through the official narratives and the actual evidence and has come to some sobering conclusions.

Graeme MacQueen: [00:00:11] And the only possible conclusion you come up with is that these people knew it was going to come down because the information came from people who were going to bring it down.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:00:21] The [51 points of evidence](#) that we have derived from this method fall into nine categories: the destruction of the Twin Towers; the destruction of World Trade Center Building 7; the attack on the Pentagon; the 9/11 flights; the U.S. military exercises on and before 9/11; claims about military and political leaders that the government made; claims about Osama bin Laden and the hijackers; phone calls from the 9/11 flights; and insider trading.

John Shuck: [00:00:53] Graeme MacQueen and Elizabeth Woodworth of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. Next on Progressive Spirit. Stay with us.

John Shuck: [00:01:01] Progressive Spirit is produced every week. It couldn't happen without the financial support of my congregation Southminster Presbyterian Church in Beaverton Oregon. Southminster's web site is www.southmin.org. Progressive Spirit is produced in the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon for the Pacifica Radio Network and PRX the Public Radio Exchange as well as podcast. Show KBOO some love, Won't you? KBOO.FM and click donate.

John Shuck: [00:01:37] For the Pacifica Radio Network and PRX the Public Radio Exchange and from the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon, this is Progressive Spirit. Progressive Spirit dot net. I'm John Shuck. I'm spending the next four episodes of Progressive Spirit on one book. The reason I'm taking so much time on one book is because if what the contributors to this book have presented is true, then each of us has a great responsibility. The events about which this book addresses have changed the course of history. The United States of America is not the same country that it was before these events took place. We are a nation that has now normalized endless war, torture, murder by drone, regime change, massive surveillance of our own citizens, the shredding of our constitution, and censorship. This trajectory will not change unless and until acted upon by a force. That force is you and me. The citizenry standing up to radical evil and resisting. The first act of resistance is to cultivate the beginner's mind. I wrote a column for a local newspaper where I live called the Beaverton Resource Guide. Before I introduce the book and my guests for today I want to share with you this brief reflection.

John Shuck: [00:03:21] It's September. Back to school. It is a good time to reflect on the beginner's mind. No one wants to be embarrassed about what she or he doesn't know. To avoid embarrassment we pretend to know more than we do. Similarly, we don't like to be fooled. I've heard that it is far easier to fool people than to convince them that they have been fooled. It is because we do not wish to be fooled that we are indeed fooled. This is a reason we can be manipulated and fooled again and again. Thus we remain in the illusion. What if instead we approach life with a beginner's mind? What if we were to see everything, especially those things that have become familiar and trusted, as if for the first time? This requires the humility to accept that we are always being fooled through various forms of propaganda and illusion. Rather than relying on the false comfort that I'm not fooled that I'm smarter than that, the beginner's mind asks, "How am I being fooled today? What illusion am I afraid to examine? What do I pretend to know to avoid embarrassment?" Then the mind is open for truth. It is September. Back to school. School and learning are not just for the

young. The most difficult and rewarding task of all is to cultivate the beginner's mind at any age.

John Shuck: [00:05:21] That is the little piece I wrote for The Beaverton Resource Guide. The first act of resistance to radical evil is to cultivate the beginner's mind. Here's the book: [9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation](#). And this is from the book's cover. "9/11 Unmasked is the result of a six-year investigation by an international review panel which has provided fifty one points illustrating the problematic status of all the major claims in the official account of the 9/11 attacks some of which are obviously false. Most dramatically, the official account of the destruction of the Twin Towers and World Trade Center 7 could not possibly be true unless the laws of physics were suspended that day. But other claims made by the official account including the claims that the 9/11 planes were taken over by al-Qaida hijackers, that one of those hijackers flew his plane into the Pentagon, and that passengers on the planes telephoned people on the ground are also demonstrably false. The book reports only points about which the panel reached consensus by using the best evidence consensus model employed in medical research. The panel is composed of experts about 9/11 from many disciplines including physics, chemistry, structural engineering, aeronautical engineering, and jurisprudence." That's the back cover to *9/11 Unmasked*.

If the evidence presented in this book delivers what it promises that the official story of what happened on 9/11 is indeed false then the trajectory of endless war, the stripping of civil liberties, the security state, the deaths of millions of people, and regime changes in the Middle East are acts of evil. Each of us then as a moral agent and knowing this has a responsibility. But first let's consider the evidence.

For the next four episodes of Progressive Spirit I'm going to interview some of the members of this international review panel. It is called the 9/11 Consensus Panel and the Web site is consensus 9 1 1 dot o r g in this first episode. You'll hear from Elizabeth Woodworth who along with Dr. David Ray Griffin convened the panel and coauthored this book.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:08:18] So the crime of 9/11 which was never properly investigated by any official body required an approach like the one employed in medicine to be used in an open investigation at some point.

John Shuck: [00:08:31] In this first episode you will also hear from Dr. Graeme MacQueen who has been a co-editor of [The Journal of 9/11 Studies](#) and an organizer of the [2011 Toronto Hearings on 9/11](#).

Graeme MacQueen: [00:08:44] This enormous crime in the 21st century that has happened isn't being investigated. What do you do? Do you do let them get away with the lie? Do you let your democracy be hijacked? I hope not. So the 9/11 Consensus Panel is a model for more than just investigating 9/11. It can be used for investigating any number of things that are currently not being researched and looked into the way they should be.

John Shuck: [00:09:09] In subsequent episodes you'll hear from Dwain Deets, former director for research engineering and aerospace projects at NASA Dryden Flight Research Center.

Dwain Deets: [00:09:21] I certainly have the idea that it's possible that Mohammed Atta was being protected in order to be may be a patsy. Maybe something else actually was going to come down but the people in charge of that whole event wanted to have someone to point to as the person who was at fault and carried the whole thing out.

John Shuck: [00:09:46] David Chandler who's been active as a researcher with what he calls the science wing of the 9/11 truth movement. He's currently the coordinator of [Scientists for 9/11 Truth](#)

and worked for several years with [Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth](#).

David Chandler: [00:10:02] What if the only thing you know about Building 7 is it was in freefall? What are the implications? If it was in freefall therefore there were explosives. If there are explosives they had to be pre-planted. And as soon as you have anything happening before the day of 9/11, it involves foreknowledge that something's going to happen on 9/11 and it implies that there is coordination between what you're doing -- planting explosives there -- and this hijacker thing. So the hijacker thing is not a surprise attack by a bunch of outside people. It's something that's a coordinated part of all of this.

John Shuck: [00:10:42] And Frances Shure, psychotherapist and author of "Why Do Good People Become Silent or Worse About 9/11?" Her latest article is about the role of the media, "Whatever Happened to Investigative Journalists?"

Frances Shure: [00:10:57] We look to the media to tell us what is discussable. What is discussable in polite company is the way I put it. And if the media totally ignores an event, totally ignores the evidence that shows that 9/11 was a false flag operation, then we don't take it seriously and we're afraid to discuss it. So the media becomes an extremely crucial-- becomes a critical part of carrying off a PSYOP.

John Shuck: [00:11:30] The book is called *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. Elizabeth Woodworth is a researcher and writer on both 9/11 and climate change science and activism. She cofounded the 9/11 Consensus Panel in 2011 with Dr. David Ray Griffin with whom she has coauthored two books: [Unprecedented Climate Mobilization](#) and *9/11 Unmasked*. Elizabeth was head librarian for the British Columbia Ministry of Health from 1978 to 2002. She also cowrote with Peter Carter, [Unprecedented Crime: Climate Science Denial and Game Changers for Survival](#). Dr. Carter was on Progressive Spirit a few weeks ago. Welcome Elizabeth Woodworth.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:12:16] Thank you John.

John Shuck: [00:12:17] Dr. Graeme MacQueen received his Ph.D. in Buddhist Studies from Harvard University and became founding director of the Center for Peace Studies at McMaster University in Canada. Since his retirement he has carried out research on the war on terror. In addition to his work on the 9/11 Consensus Panel he has been a co-editor of *The Journal of 9/11 Studies* and an organizer of the [2011 Toronto Hearings on 9/11](#). Welcome Graeme MacQueen.

Graeme MacQueen: [00:12:46] Thank you, John.

John Shuck: [00:12:48] Elizabeth, let's start with you. You really put this panel together with David Ray Griffin. Give an overview of the Consensus Panel and when and why it was formed.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:13:00] We formed it because the public debates about the credibility of the 9/11 truth movement have been mostly superficial and dismissive and there has been a lack of any basis for saying what the movement's beliefs are as a whole. Reporters have often portrayed people who question 9/11 as ignorant and irrational and this has blocked public access to solid investigative research into the defining political event of this century. So David and I decided to offer the media and the public a body of scientific information constituting the best evidence that contradicts the official position about 9/11 and we decided the best way to do that would be to form a consensus panel. We had input from Dr. Tim Johnston who was the former provincial epidemiologist for B.C. and he recommended a method to do this and that was the Delphi method that is used in medicine to establish best evidence. And so we invited 23 people with varying

professional backgrounds to come together and applied disciplined analysis to the verifiable evidence about the 9/11 attacks. And these people are from the fields of physics, chemistry, structural engineering, aeronautical engineering, piloting, airplane crash investigation, medicine, journalism, psychology, and religion. So it's really a broad spectrum.

John Shuck: [00:14:38] So this panel then is made up of experts in their various fields coming together. And so how does this Delphi method work? What's the structure and how you came to decide on evidence regarding the points?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:14:52] The whole panel approved the purpose and goal of the panel and the purpose is to provide the world with a clear statement based on expert independent opinion of some of the best evidence opposing the official account of 9/11. And the goal is to provide a ready-source of evidence-based research to any investigation that may be undertaken by the public or the media, academia, or any other investigative body or institution. For the procedure we used a standard best evidence consensus model employed in science and medicine to examine the official account. Each chapter in this book *9/11 Unmasked* -- each chapter examines an official claim. Each chapter is divided into two or three sections. You see an introduction about the importance of the official claim and then there's a section that gives the official account, and then the best evidence about some aspect of the 9/11 attacks. The official account includes statements from the White House or the FBI, the Pentagon, the 9/11 Commission Report, or the National Institute of Standards and Technology, FEMA, and the FAA. So all of those bodies are the ones that we took the official account -- chapters -- from. 51 chapters. So David and I would send out a statement, a consensus statement, with the official account and the best evidence in it. And each of these points would receive three rounds of review and feedback during which the panelists remain blind to one another. So this would take -- say we did five of these at a time. The cycle of review and feedback would take four to six months while we incorporated this feedback and then sent it out to the 23 panelists to review it again and submit their feedback again. At the end of this process if we had received 85 percent approval by the twenty three panelists we would consider the consensus point to have passed and we'd put it up on the website and add it to the list.

John Shuck: [00:17:15] Eighty five percent. Now is that pretty standard then for consensus panels of this kind in other fields like the medical field?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:17:24] Well actually it's high. Dr. Johnstone told me 85 is higher than they usually get in medicine. In medicine the model carries so much weight that medical consensus statements are often reported in the news. And malpractice lawsuits can result if doctors don't follow them because everybody's informed about this very high level of evidence, -- say in medicine -- it might be about childhood earache or any, any problem in medicine. So the crime of 9/11, which was never properly investigated by any official body, required an approach like the one employed in medicine to be used in an open investigation at some point.

John Shuck: [00:18:07] So this type of panel discussion is really in a sense the first real scientific investigation into 9/11?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:18:15] You could say that John. And it's important for me also to say that the 51 points of evidence that we have derived from this method fall into nine categories: the destruction of the Twin Towers; the destruction of World Trade Center Building 7; the attack on the Pentagon; the 9/11 flights; the U.S. military exercises on and before 9/11; claims about military and political leaders that the government made; claims about Osama bin Laden and the hijackers; phone calls from the 9/11 flights; and insider trading.

John Shuck: [00:18:58] And as I remember in reading the book it stuck out to me -- it said that if

any one of these just one, one of these categories had been shown that the evidence wasn't correct that the official story had, the story would be not true. I mean but it isn't just one, it's nine different categories and over 50 points.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:19:20] That's right. And David Griffin has made that point quite often that for something to fall apart scientifically only one part of the hypothesis has to fail.

John Shuck: [00:19:30] Graeme MacQueen is a panel member of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. As a panel member what did you do and how did you experience this process?

Graeme MacQueen: [00:19:39] OK well I think I'd begin by saying this wasn't panel discussion or group discussion. Well part of what's unique about this method is that the panel members don't talk to each other at all. That's what Elizabeth means when she said we're blind to each other. That means we're not allowed to communicate about these points. Now initially that feels really weird and sometimes a bit lonely. You're stuck off in your little house wrestling with this set of points. But what it means is first of all -- it's hard -- at least what it meant to me was it's very hard work, but very rewarding work at the end of it. I think you end up with something very strong. So for example, there's no point in my trying to persuade the other panel members that they're wrong because I'm not talking to them. There's no point using rhetoric. There's no point getting angry or bullying. Nobody can do any of that stuff. We all have to sit there with these points. So here's what it would look like. I would get--let's just simplify and say--one point for the moment, say Elizabeth would send me one point by e-mail. It could be very brief half a page it could be several pages. There's quite a variation in length. I get it. I read it and now you see I'm stuck with trying to rank this from "one" which means strongly agree all the way down to "five" strongly disagree. And there's also a category of uncertain though I didn't use that very often. So how do I do that? Well I'll tell you how I did it. First of all most of us on the consensus panel already know quite a bit about 9/11. So usually the point isn't completely unfamiliar to us but we often didn't know it in detail. So I've got to read it and I've got to first of all make sure I understand it is it clear. And then I've got to make sure that it's well written and it's clear for everybody because this shouldn't just be for experts. As Elizabeth said journalists, students, anybody should be able to use this. So is it clear? That's the first thing. Secondly, is the argument strong? Because in each case we're given what is the official account and then we're refuting that. We're saying what does the best evidence suggest? The best evidence in every case suggests that the official count is wrong. So is our argument good? And then finally, is our evidence good? Because of course we have footnotes. Everything's documented. It's not just a claim that we're making. So I have to look at all that and if I don't like something I'll have to say why I don't like it. I quickly learned that it wouldn't go over too well if I just wrote to Elizabeth and said, "No I don't like this point." That's a way to get out of it easily. She would say, "Well why don't you like it?" OK. Then you have to go through and you have to make detailed annotations. And finally, you have to judge. You have to make a judgment. Here's the point, the ranking I'm going to give this, and you send it back and then you wait. Because as Elizabeth said she and David would have to wait till everybody on the panel -- we would be given a time limit of course -- everybody had given their judgment, then they would read it and they would send it back to us. Usually, we would get you know the full three rounds, and occasionally a point would be weak and it would never get added to our list. Other times it would get added to the list only after many serious revisions. And I was impressed frankly. I mean I thought Elizabeth and David were very prompt in getting back to us. I don't remember them ever arguing or getting defensive. I mean they may have felt defensive but they never expressed it to us. They just said okay you didn't like that. All right. We'll change it and so at the end of that as I said it's hard, lonely work. But at the end you come up with a group of points that you feel pretty confident in because every one of the twenty-three of us had to go through that, right? So that makes for some pretty strong points.

John Shuck: [00:23:35] So there were points that were rejected.

Graeme MacQueen: [00:23:38] Yes.

John Shuck: [00:23:39] And so that means of course that these are the strongest. What of course we mean by consensus of the panel, that these points go back to the evidence. Now I'm going to push back on the both of you because someone might say, "Well all the panel members are 9/11 people."

Graeme MacQueen: [00:23:53] Go ahead Elizabeth.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:23:55] That's true. I think of the 9/11 research community as -- there are a lot of academic people who have looked into this -- as professional people. Most of the people I know in my own life who've looked into this are very well-educated people who have a kind of an academic objectivity and they see problems in the official story. Right from the beginning. So when you say "9/11 people" I would prefer to say that these are people from the 9/11 research community. There are certain important areas that we can't actually approach through the panel for consensus because there isn't consensus within the community and one of them is what hit the Pentagon if anything, like what happened to the Pentagon. There is no agreement across the board. Even among the people who have been researching this for 16 years there are people on both sides of that issue. And we have people on both sides of that issue sitting on the panel. So we can't possibly get a consensus on that.

John Shuck: [00:24:58] So that point wasn't one of the consensus points in terms of what hit the Pentagon. That was one that didn't make consensus, which makes sense.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:25:06] We wouldn't even attempt to because the views on both sides of the issue are held very strongly. People look at different kinds of evidence. And David even in his books. I think he and I both lean the same way. We don't state it usually publicly. But there isn't really consensus on the issue. So we're careful about that.

John Shuck: [00:25:29] All right Graeme another question for you. What do you think of the broad significance of the panel and its work?

Graeme MacQueen: [00:25:35] I think there are two different kinds of significance, John. One is within the rather narrow study of 9/11. As Elizabeth said there's been so much work over the years. Since the attacks in 2001, there've been thousands of people around the world involved in not just discussing it but doing research and putting videos online. Some of it's good some of it's bad but the upshot of it is that this is one of the most impressive citizen research projects I think in modern history which means in history period. By citizen research project I mean people may or may not have an advanced degree; they may or may not be doing this research as part of their job or their program; they're doing it as concerned citizens who see that the police and the investigative agencies and intelligence agencies and so on are not doing their job, in fact they're collaborating. And so they get together and they do this now. This is really important both narrowly and broadly. First, narrowly: If we're going to present a solid kind of foundation and a rational face to the world as Elizabeth said earlier, we need to sift through all the stuff that's been done on 9/11 for years and we have to chuck out the bad stuff and keep the good stuff. And that's part of what I did in the Toronto Hearings which celebrated the 10th anniversary of 9/11. But the 9/11 consensus panel is another way of doing it. A more ambitious way, ultimately, of doing it and inevitably some people will criticize you for what you leave out and what you include. But I think this had to be done. And I think it really tidies up what was starting to be a very messy field of investigation and it gives a solid body of evidence that journalists and others can come to. So that's why it's significant within the study of 9/11. More broadly though if we look at the terrible challenges that humanity faces

right now including things like - well a lot of them are ecological -- climate change, species extinction, and so we're really at a crossroads and I don't think we're going to make it if we continue to have the kind of blockheaded, exploitive elites governing us and leading us in the wrong direction. We need to find a way to make our democracies viable, to make them really work so that we are utilizing the intelligence of all citizens instead of a few people, and 9/11 Consensus Panel is a model of how to start doing that. It's not perfect. It doesn't solve everything. As you said some people will say, "Oh you're you know, you picked your experts too narrowly. Sure we'll work on that. Everything has to be worked on but you know what? It's a really, really interesting model when your police have failed at their duty, and your intelligence agencies have failed you, and the executive branch has failed, and the legislative branch has failed, and this -- as Elizabeth said -- this enormous crime in the 21st century has happened and isn't being investigated. What do you do? Do you let them get away with the lie? Do you let your democracy be hijacked? I hope not. So 9/11 Consensus Panel is a model for more than just investigating 9/11. It can be used for investigating any number of things that are currently not being researched and looked into the way they should be.

John Shuck: [00:29:19] This is Progressive Spirit. Progressive Spirit dot net. I'm John Shuck. I'm speaking with Elizabeth Woodworth and Graeme MacQueen of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. The book we are discussing is *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. Fasten your seatbelts. More to come.

John Shuck: [00:29:39] You're listening to the podcast version of Progressive Spirit. If you enjoy the show please go to iTunes, Stitcher, Google Play, Podomatic, Tune In, or whatever podcast app you use to listen, and give Progressive Spirit 5 stars. Won't you? Contact me through Progressive Spirit dot net with your thoughts and ideas about the show and be sure to share this podcast on your social media follow on Facebook and Twitter. The Web site again is Progressive Spirit dot net.

John Shuck: [00:30:10] Graeme MacQueen and Elizabeth Woodworth speaking with me about *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. This is Progressive Spirit Progressive Spirit dot net.

John Shuck: [00:30:25] One of the big surprises for many people is that there were three skyscrapers that came down on September 11th and one was Building 7 -- a 47-story skyscraper -- that collapsed around five o'clock and the official account claimed that there was no steel that was recovered from building 7. The steel would have shown why it would have collapsed. Is it true, Elizabeth, that they didn't recover any steel?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:30:52] No that's not true. The fact that it wasn't true didn't come out until fairly recently. Well, there were several indications that it wasn't true buried in media reports and so on. But the most striking piece of evidence came out of the NIST -- you know the National Institute of Standards and Technology -- FOIA request in February 2012 showing a photograph of NIST engineer Dr. John Gross standing on a pile a World Trade Center Seven steel in a scrap yard. Ten years earlier -- and a New York Times story had noted -- perhaps the deepest mystery uncovered in the investigation involves extremely thin bits of steel collected from the Trade Towers and from 7 World Trade Center, a 47-story high rise that also collapsed for unknown reasons. The steel apparently melted away but no fire in any of the buildings was believed to be hot enough to melt steel outright. So there's quite a lot of evidence that there was steel collected from the World Trade Center 7. The condition of that steel points to controlled demolition. What NIST released instead was a computer simulation that it just made up and it could fit different variables into this computer simulation to try to figure out. This was its sort of façade, cover story for trying to figure out what happened to this building, the structural steel building that had collapsed totally, symmetrically, in eleven seconds or so. Seven seconds I think it was. They produced this computer

simulation model as an alternative to admitting that they had the steel there full of evidence of controlled demolition. And they tried to make the assertion that the building had burned down. And that's never happened before.

John Shuck: [00:32:54] Yeah, of course Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth is doing a lot of work on that. Are people from that organization also connected with the 9/11 Consensus Panel?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:33:04] Some people overlap. We don't have any members—like Richard Gage who runs AE911truth; he is not on it. We did invite him but he wanted to keep himself with his own project. And I think it's stronger that way that these two separate projects are coming up with the same information about the buildings.

John Shuck: [00:33:24] Yeah of course that's one of the big ones, Building 7. One of the major odd events of a building that wasn't hit by a plane and yet came down. Let's continue on with Building 7 and I want to go to Graeme here because there was another point about foreknowledge that people claiming that “Hey this building is coming down.” Can you talk about foreknowledge of Building 7's collapse and why this is a big deal?

Graeme MacQueen: [00:33:47] Yes, John so there's all kinds of things that indicate that there's something wrong about the collapse of World Trade Seven. Don't forget there were two planes but three skyscrapers that came down. So there's a big job there in explaining why the third one came down when it was not hit by anything. And initially people were saying, “Oh well, there were terrible fires and you know it was a raging inferno. It was badly damaged by debris from world trade one when that came down.” Eventually NIST, National Institute of Standards and Technology, had to admit those were wrong and they came up with a rather baroque explanation as to why it came down. Now that allows me to go onto this topic of foreknowledge that you asked about. To have foreknowledge of an event means to know before it happens that something is going to happen. And that's kind of a big deal to know about something before it happens. Strange kind of knowledge but we're familiar with it. In some cases it's not fishy at all. It's perfectly reasonable. So for example, we're well aware of the motions of the planets and satellites that go around the planets and so on. Somebody says it's going to be a lunar eclipse and in four days or I should say if a scientific body tells us and even if they time it quite carefully we usually say okay that's fine. That's foreknowledge. They are able to know that with considerable detail in advance and that's because we've seen these heavenly bodies, you know going around each other for a long time and they're very predictable regular motions. There are other cases where foreknowledge is really fishy. And the collapse of World Trade Seven is one of those cases. You have to bear in mind here that no steel sky scraper in history has ever come down from fire alone prior to World Trade Seven and the National Institute of Standards and Technology acknowledges that. This is not in dispute. So this was the first time in history that a steel frame skyscraper came down because of fire. Well that is the opposite of the regular motion of the heavenly bodies, right? This is completely unprecedented. Never seen it folks. Ain't never happened before. So how could it be that dozens, if not hundreds, of people on the day knew that it was going to come down and we know that. We have the records. And I don't mean they had a hunch and I don't mean they just made scientific prediction or said there is a high risk. I mean they knew that it was coming down and they expressed that -- probably hundreds of people. We have reports that said that there were literally hundreds of firefighters who were standing around sometimes for hours and as they put it, “We were waiting for Building 7 to come down.” Well what does that mean? This never happened before in history. What do you mean you're waiting for it to happen? So this obviously is a very strange event and we find the BBC announcing that World Trade Center 7 has come down. They announced that 23 minutes before it actually comes down. Whoa big mistake. CNN also announces it prematurely. I think about an hour before it comes down. This together with many, many reports from individual firefighters and police and so on leads us to finally the only possible conclusion. You know I've written about this

and been giving talks on this and the only possible conclusion you come up with is that these people knew it was going to come down because the information came from people who were going to bring it down. Now it was demolished and it was known that it was going to be demolished by people and this information got out. And so all these firefighters are told to stand around. This building is going to be coming down. It's going to be coming down at this time. It's going to be coming down this way. This is where you should stand. It's amazing. So this is a dead giveaway that this was a controlled demolition.

John Shuck: [00:37:51] And wasn't it the BBC, the reporter is actually, the camera has Building 7 behind her while she says it already had collapsed?

Graeme MacQueen: [00:38:00] Yes that happens to her and it happens also to Aaron Brown the anchor at CNN. They both announced the collapse of the building and then it's right behind them. OK. Aaron Brown is so freaked out by that, he turns around, he turns his back to the camera because he's in New York. He's in New York and he looks at the actual building and he's standing there and he's flummoxed, right? He's flummoxed. So yeah, in both cases the building can be seen as its demise is being announced.

John Shuck: [00:38:30] You know I often wonder about people flummoxed, like Aaron Brown but then they stop being flummoxed, I guess. I don't know. I never hear from them again. It's like these events happen and then they're...and nobody ever we never hear from them again.

Graeme MacQueen: [00:38:44] There are quite a few journalists like that if you research video footage from 9/11 who have said all kinds of things. They said this looks like a demolition. This is clearly a demolition. These are explosive charges. I was on the site I heard three massive explosions on and on and on. Now we've collected all of this of course. I don't mean the consensus panel, but researchers in general have collected all these. And as you say most of these journalists just hide under the rug after that.

John Shuck: [00:39:11] Speaking with Graeme MacQueen and Elizabeth Woodworth. They are members of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. Elizabeth Woodworth and David Ray Griffin putting this panel together in 2011. Their final report is coming out in book form on September 11th, I believe is the release date. *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. One of the points is chapter twenty-seven, point twenty-seven the government claiming that five hijackers boarded Flight 77, the one that allegedly hit the Pentagon, at Dulles Airport near Washington D.C. So is there photographic evidence of these hijackers?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:39:47] There were only two videos presented by the government to show that there were hijackers in airports and this was one of them. And it was the five hijackers at Dulles Airport and they didn't release this video material until July 2004 the day before the 9/11 Commission Report was released. And it wasn't actually released by the government. It was released through Associated Press. But the 9/11 Commission did verify that they supported it. It shows the five hijackers coming through security at Dulles Airport just before the plane is going to take off and crashed -- allegedly crashed -- into the Pentagon. There were 300 security cameras at Dulles International Airport on September 11th. And of these 300 cameras, the images were painstakingly examined by Information Systems technicians who were monitored by federal agents. And from those three hundred cameras, the U.S. government did not release a single time-stamped video or any of the images from the 300 security cameras. The video released in 2004 was made by a much faster consumer video camera than closed circuit TV cameras use. This was at 30 frames per second, which one of our panelists Massimo Mazzucco, who makes films, he said that's a standard video camera. It's you know, it's in the consumer market. It's not a security camera. And then I found information from a man called [Dave Brent. It's online right now](#). Who was one of the

technical engineers who went through these 300 cameras. And he said, “I was part of a team that had the laborious task of reviewing all the video from Dulles Airport with several federal agents looking over our shoulders. That's every frame from over 300 cameras with 30 days of retention time. The task took three weeks at 15-hour days. And the government never released an image from that material nor did the Dulles Airport staff make any positive identification of the hijackers.” This is pretty conclusive evidence that they just don't have any evidence that the hijackers were in the airports.

John Shuck: [00:42:18] Are there any photographs or a camera evidence of any of the hijackers of any of the flights?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:42:24] There was another piece of video evidence presented by the government of Mohammad Atta and another one of the hijackers at the airport in Portland Maine. And that was flashed all over the place right after 9/11. That was sort of a sub story to how they got onto the planes and so on. But both videos-- and we have this is one of the other consensus points about the videos -- they don't conform to ordinary standards of videos. They look to be contrived.

John Shuck: [00:42:56] On another topic one of the questions that I run into every now and then and I've had it myself is, where was the military involved in all of this? All these planes are flying around and there were some military drills going on -- scheduled for September 11th. The government says that there were four of these drills but they did not interfere with the military response to the hijacked planes. What does the evidence show Elizabeth?

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:43:21] Oh that is one of [my favorite consensus points](#) because we have solid evidence that these drills were moved. Normally the big NORAD military drills are held in April, October, and November and there's four really major ones: Vigilant Guardian, Global Guardian, Crown Vigilance, and Amalgam Warrior. These were all moved to the morning of September the 11th. We know that one of them was moved. The Global Guardian was moved because there's a newsletter online it's called *Space Observer Newsletter* -- March 23, 2001. The exercise had been scheduled for late October and it was reported to the community. These exercises involve a major part the Air Force. It was actually moved from a date that had been given to everybody to September the 11th -- moved after March. Not only were there four massive military drills rescheduled for September 11th, the official claims said that they did not interfere with the military response to the hijacked planes. The 9/11 Commission didn't mention the drills. They didn't even mention that they were happening and they covered them up. They did mention in one footnote that I think it was Vigilant Guardian. They said something in the footnote, but that was it. Technically they did mention it once, but there were actually twelve drills running that morning. Some of them involved hijacked simulations. So controllers were asking -- the FAA people were saying -- to each other -- when these odd things were being reported, “Is this real world or exercise?” Radar screens were showing emergencies all over the place even though there were only four hijacked planes. By the end of the day, there were 21 reports of hijacked planes and the fighters who were out doing their drills -- which actually they did call the drills off after the start of the attacks -- but the fighters were unable to respond because there was so much confusion. And so the air defenses of America appeared to break down. The question is: Who moved those drills to September the 11th? The answer to that would give us an insight into how this was all carried off.

John Shuck: [00:45:53] Elizabeth Woodworth and Graeme MacQueen are my guests on Progressive Spirit. The book that is being released September 11th *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. These are fifty points we're talking about just a few of them on Consensus 9/11 dot org the website of the Consensus 9/11 panel. Graeme MacQueen, we talked a little bit about eyewitnesses -- er -- foreknowledge regarding Building 7. I also want to talk about the World Trade Center towers because I think it was the NIST report that said that there

were no eyewitnesses of explosions. Can you talk about eyewitness evidence in regards to the Twin Towers?

Graeme MacQueen: [00:46:32] Yes. When it comes to the Twin Towers. First the NIST investigation doesn't mention eyewitnesses at all to explosions which is quite astonishing given the fact that there were so many as I'll mention in a moment. The 9/11 Commission report has a very brief mention on one page of the fact that some firefighters had an impeded view of the tower. I forget which one World Trade one or something -- you couldn't see it properly in other words. So when they heard the sounds of it collapsing they mistakenly thought it was explosions. So in other words, the 9/11 Commission dismisses eyewitnesses to explosions in about one line and NIST doesn't even mention it. So what is the reality then? Well the reality is that there were well over a hundred people, in fact there were well over a hundred members of the fire department of New York. Never mind other people who clearly perceived explosions at the time of the collapse of the buildings. And there was a whole other set of witnesses to explosions in the basements and subbasements -- many of them very early on. But ignoring those for a moment and just sticking with the ones that happened during the collapse--as you know -- many of us think that those twin towers did not come down because they were hit by planes. They came down because they were wired to come down in a controlled demolition. So you would naturally ask yourself if that's the case, how could they have gotten away with it? Surely somebody would have seen that, they would have heard the explosions, they would have seen them, maybe even felt them. The answer to that is they did. Actually, it was over 150. What I want to say about this right now -- I could go on at length because I spent a long time studying this and writing about this myself. But what I want to say briefly here, there is still the notion going around, because I just heard it the other day, that this isn't serious evidence. "So what? People heard a few booms when the towers were coming down. Just one floor hitting another, kind of pancake collapse, or maybe it was a steel beam breaking, or maybe it was the elevators crashing, or even bodies hitting the ground." Well, what I want to say is we're not stupid. OK? We looked into that. I personally looked into all of those possibilities years ago. And as far as I'm concerned, I have successfully refuted them. And I would just say if anyone is interested in this topic to read not only the 9/11 Consensus Panel's book that we're talking about here, but also the [9/11 Toronto Report](#) which is a fairly lengthy book that we came up with after the [Toronto Hearings on 9/11](#), because I have an article in there in which I go through all these claims about it could have been this and it could have been that. And the answer is: No it couldn't. There were only a limited number of things that could have convinced people that there were explosions. And believe me a lot of very experienced firefighters and police officers not only saw them and heard them but were thrown as much as 40 feet through the air by these explosions. So the eyewitness evidence that these buildings were demolished through explosives and incendiaries is very strong -- very strong. I mean people get convicted all the time in courts on the basis of two or three eyewitnesses. Here we've got 150. So yeah, it's a very important piece of evidence.

John Shuck: [00:50:13] What is -- what do you think -- the broader significance here? We're just about wrapping up our time -- political, perhaps even spiritual? Graeme, your emphasis was in spirituality, Buddhist Studies. Well, what is it about this eyewitness evidence and the way it's been treated by our government?

Graeme MacQueen: [00:50:32] I think it goes to the question, what is a citizen, and ultimately what is a person. I would like to think that at least in a democracy, as a citizen, as a whole person who is able to perceive the world around them and also to use their intelligence to make sense of it. And that's what people did on 9/11 at the scene. They perceived explosions and clearly called them explosions. They made conclusions with their minds. They said, "Wow, this looks like a building being demolished purposely." And when a government does what the United States government and frankly almost every government in the world is doing, and dismisses over 100 ordinary citizens standing there perceiving this, they are showing not only disrespect, they're really showing a very

degraded notion of what a citizen is. They're treating us like rabble, who are, you know, who can be easily dismissed. So people are supposed to listen to say, U.S. elites, who were not even there that day, when they say there were no explosions? Instead of listening to their fellow human beings who were there and who clearly perceived it. This is a democracy in trouble. This is a democracy that's in danger and unfortunately, it's not just the U.S. My own country, Canada our government, buys all this nonsense as well. And so it's the job of citizens to stand up and say, "We are whole persons. And our perception, and our sense of smell, sense of hearing and sight and touch, they are valid. And we know how to use our intelligence. And we're going to insist on that. We're going to speak out loudly for what we believe is the truth."

John Shuck: [00:52:17] My guests have been Graeme MacQueen and Elizabeth Woodworth. The book coming out in early September is *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation* based on the Consensus 9/11 Panel. Consensus 9/11 dot org. Elizabeth and Graeme thank you so much for your work and for being with me today.

Elizabeth Woodworth: [00:52:38] Thank you very much for having us on John.

Graeme MacQueen: [00:52:41] Thank you John.

John Shuck: [00:52:42] Next week in my series on the 9/11 Consensus Panel, I speak with former NASA engineer Dwain Deets about Able Danger. Progressive Spirit is produced in the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon. I'm John Shuck. Be Well.