

## PS 134 9/11 Unmasked, Part 3: David Chandler and The Day of Magical Physics

**David Chandler:** [00:00:01] What if the only thing you know about Building 7 is it was in freefall? What are the implications? The implications are huge. Let me just start you down that road. If it was at free fall, therefore there are 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 is going to happen on 9/11 and it implies 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. So just starting with the fact of freefall you can get that the hijack was a cover story.

**John Shuck:** [00:00:55] It's time for Progressive Spirit, [ProgressiveSpirit.net](http://ProgressiveSpirit.net). Stay with us.

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](http://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:** [00:01:33] For the Pacifica Radio network and PRX The Public Radio Exchange and from the studios of KBOO in Portland, Oregon. This is Progressive Spirit, [ProgressiveSpirit.net](http://ProgressiveSpirit.net). I'm John Shuck.

**David Chandler:** [00:01:43] And I tell people, you know, you can see what's happening with your own eyes. My doing the physics is just proving that you're not crazy.

**John Shuck:** [00:01:51] The book is called *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation* 23 panelists. Six years of sifting the best evidence available in regards to what happened on September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001. Today we look at the science -- the physics behind how two planes collapsed three skyscrapers; the third, World Trade Center Tower Building 7, comes down in freefall.

**David Chandler:** [00:02:25] But for it to come straight down with a level roofline with a sudden transition to complete freefall, there's no way to do that without explosives that I can see.

**John Shuck:** [00:02:37] The book is called [\*9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation\*](#) by Elizabeth Woodworth and David Ray Griffin of the Consensus 9/11 Panel, [Consensus911.org](http://Consensus911.org). And one of the panelists is David Chandler and he is from Denver. And David Chandler has a Bachelor of Science degree in physics from Harvey Mudd College, a master of arts and education and a Master of Science and Mathematics from California Polytechnic University. He recently retired from teaching physics mathematics and astronomy at the high school and college levels since 1972 and has now moved to Denver. Since about 2007 he's been active as a researcher with what he calls the science wing of the 9/11 truth movement. He is currently the coordinator of [\*Scientists for 9/11 Truth\*](#) and worked for several years with [\*Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth\*](#). David became involved with the study of the building collapses of the World Trade Center when he realized he could use frame tracking software which he used in his physics teaching to measure the various velocities and accelerations associated with the 9/11 building collapses. He's best known for his measurements demonstrating the freefall of World Trade Center Building 7 proving that the National Institute of Standards and Technology's claims were false. In its final report, The National Institute for Standards and Technology or NIST, changed its analysis of the motion of World Trade Center Building 7 admitting free fall but continued to deny its clear implications. David has

authored and coauthored a number of scientific papers including “Destruction of the World Trade Center North Tower and Fundamental Physics.” He's also created a large number of videos analyzing various aspects of the World Trade Center collapses and presented them to the public on YouTube. He maintains a website in collaboration with several other researchers featuring their collected works at [911SpeakOut.Org](http://911SpeakOut.Org) and he's with me from Denver via Skype. Welcome David to Progressive Spirit. Welcome back to Progressive Spirit.

**David Chandler:** [00:04:45] Yes, thank you for having me.

**John Shuck:** [00:04:47] David you have served on the 9/11 Consensus Panel. Can you talk a little bit about the experience of what that panel did and what you came up with?

**David Chandler:** [00:04:57] The Consensus Panel is an attempt to try to bring some order out of chaos. There is a lot of people who have done research on various bits and pieces of this whole phenomenon of what happened on 9/11 and a lot of it is good solid work from different perspectives. There's also a lot of really flaky stuff out there that some of it is just people with lesser insights I think and some of it is very potentially, you know, misleading or disinformation -- misleading information -- or disinformation intended to derail the movement. I mean that's a little paranoid to say that maybe, but in this kind of a movement it's almost a certainty that there are infiltrators involved. So one of the things is it's an attempt to sort out what is the consensus among a large group of people that Elizabeth and David Ray Griffin recognized as legitimate researchers. And even though there's a lot of diversity among this group, they try to filter out the ones that were pretty obviously disinformation agents so to try to say what is the consensus view. And there are areas of disagreement but there's large areas of agreement. And so it's trying to present that. So each of us that's on it we don't really work as a group. Each of us is, in fact, we started sort of anonymously that we didn't even know who the other members of the group were. But that's become more apparent. Various people formulate what they consider to be a potential consensus point and it's passed around for comment. And if we want to elaborate on that or something we can submit corrections or variations on the point until we come to a statement that we can come to unity on -- a good Quaker term. I'm a Quaker by the way so.

**John Shuck:** [00:07:05] 50 points of consensus that the panel agreed upon that said that this is pretty clear that this is the best evidence in regards to a number of inquiry points into the whole phenomenon regarding what happened on September 11th.

**David Chandler:** [00:07:24] And that's in a variety of areas. So like for instance my particular expertise has been on looking at the dynamics of the motion of the buildings and so forth. So that one of the things is when there are consensus points that I really don't have any expertise on I'd just pass on those points and somebody else, you know, that other people who know more about it..., like I really, for instance have not researched a lot about the hijackers, okay, but some of the people have, like who are they? What happened? What are their movements? That type of thing. I just sort of steer clear of those questions and just say, “Well you guys decide on that out I'll be over here when I'm needed.”

**John Shuck:** [00:08:07] You're needed in regards to probably the most visible aspect of 9/11 that is the collapse of the Twin Towers. And then not so visible, but, there also this third tower and we're going to talk about both of both of those issues-- the twin towers and then building 7. I remember on 9/11 I was at work at my church in Billings, Montana. And my daughter from high school gave me a call and said I needed to turn on the television. I did and our staff and I we sat around in the kitchen looking at the small screen. And by the time I think we got to the TV both buildings -- both World Trade Center Towers had been hit by planes. And then we saw one collapse and then another collapse. And so the implication was: Plane hits building. Building collapses. And so that has been,

we might say, the official account. The buildings collapsed because of the impact of the plane and fire and gravity and that's been the story. In the book that has come out *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*, often it says, "official account" or "official story" which is made up of a number of different sources. Can you talk a little bit about the sources and then go ahead and ask the question whether or not gravity and fire in the planes did it?

**David Chandler:** [00:09:23] Okay, Let me first say that the story could be more accurately stated: Planes hit buildings. Buildings survived the crashes for over an hour. In one case about an hour in the other case about an hour 40 minutes and then precipitously, out of nowhere seemingly, just come down. So the effects, for instance, the jet fuel, a lot is made of that, the jet fuel burned off in the first five or 10 minutes. There was various speculation about some of the jet fuel may have gone down the elevator shafts or whatever but the amount of kerosene, which is essentially what jet fuel is, the amount of kerosene compared to the volume of those buildings is just minuscule. And the main thing that the kerosene did was start the fires. So there are fires in the building that were initially ignited by the jet fuel and the impacts and so forth. You'd have to really look at what happened then. As far as how the buildings came down, the official story, it sort of passed from hand to hand, there were a whole sequence of official stories. American Society of Civil Engineers got into the act, they had FEMA. Ultimately, a couple of years after the fact, NIST investigated but they didn't even get started until ground zero was cleaned up and there was no physical evidence really to investigate. They got rid of that stuff pretty fast. In fact, even the earliest investigators they just had like a supervised walkthrough of Ground Zero. They were pretty much roped off so people were kept away from what should have been treated as crime scene evidence. And this was hauled off. Some of it was selected out to be kept -- a relatively few pieces of steel were chosen to be preserved. The bulk of that material was literally taken to Asia and melted down. The fire department -- I don't remember exactly -- but I know there was at least one of the fire magazines, journals of the fire prevention people, that was loudly complaining about destruction of evidence because that's part of regular protocol. When you have a building burn you look for signs of arson. And so here is a major incident and they are destroying the evidence before it's even had a chance to be investigated. So the story evolved. And like early on they talked about pancake collapsing like floors detaching from the walls and coming crashing down and so forth. But that didn't really describe the events of the structure of these buildings, which by the way wasn't really well known at the beginning. It sort of emerged as things started leaking out but the structure of the buildings, you have all these perimeter columns around the outside there is extremely strong material. And then you have a cluster of core columns in the center of those 47 core columns that are massive columns in a rectangular area in the center of the building. And then there is a large area in between where the office space would be. But those core columns in the middle they were portrayed as like freestanding just strings of spaghetti or something, but no, they were massively interconnected columns that would have formed a building within a building. Had the floors just collapsed like they said at first, it would have left this core building remaining. NIST rejected the pancaking floor hypothesis. So even though that was the official story to begin with it was rejected by NIST so it did not survive as an official story to the end. And so then they adopted another story interestingly, like I believe it was like two days after the 9/11 events, this civil engineer named Bazant, he was a well-known elderly professor of engineering. I believe it was Northwestern but I'm not positive on that without looking at my notes. But he put out an explanation for why the buildings came down within two days after the events. And that was published. That became just adopted without critique as the core of NIST's explanation for why the buildings came down. So then NIST said all we have to show is that you can initiate collapse, and then this Bazant hypothesis that once the collapse starts the whole thing will just continue, they could just rely on that to finish their job. But there is really no analysis or critique that went into that decision to use his hypothesis and what he was saying was that the top section of the building would literally crash down onto the bottom section and the core columns would be impacted and caused to buckle and that those buckling core columns is how the building would fail. You do have to get rid of the core columns to bring the entire building down.

So this idea that just the gravity driving the core columns could cause them to buckle was just literally taken for granted by NIST. There're a lot of problems with that. We can continue if you want.

**John Shuck:** [00:15:07] Well let's talk about that in terms of physics. Does that make sense?

**David Chandler:** [00:15:14] No. One of the reasons it doesn't make sense is I've done a [video about it](#) and I did a paper that you mentioned about the [North Tower and Fundamental Physics](#). And then Tony Szamboti and Graeme MacQueen are another couple of researchers who did a very parallel kind of analysis of this -- the way they worded it is -- there's an early talk that I heard Graeme MacQueen give that says, "Where's the wham?" I mean if you have something falling like take a take a hammer hitting a nail. How does the hammer drive a nail into a block of wood? It seems trivial, everybody has experienced it. But notice what happens is if you set the hammer on the nail, it applies a little bit of weight to the nail, but it's not going to go anywhere, unless maybe if it's sitting on a piece of Styrofoam, than it might have enough weight to just shove it in. But if it was a normal piece of wood, bringing the hammer head down onto the nail doesn't do anything. But by bringing it with velocity, what you do is you give momentum to the hammer head, and in the process of losing its momentum, it's sort of a transfer. You transfer the momentum of the hammer head into a force that drives the nail. And so in order to have that excess force that can actually push the nail into the wood you have to give up momentum of the hammer head. In other words, the hammer head has to slow down. And as your experience is you hit the nail, it stops the hammer head, you have to pick up the hammer and do it again, right? That's typically, unless you're very strong and do it in one blow, but typically you have to hit it repeatedly. Each time the hammer head loses its momentum and that's what produces that excess force that drives the nail. So you would expect the hammer head has to lose momentum, it has to lose velocity. Well look what happens in the Twin Towers? You have a top section of the tower and my measurements showed that the top section of the North Tower -- there's a problem with the South Tower we can talk about -- but the North Tower, the top section accelerates downward and it continues to accelerate uniformly downward through the entire time it's visible. You don't see any slowing down and if it doesn't slow down it's not losing its momentum. Therefore, it's not transferring any momentum to anything. It's not producing this excess force. In other words, there's no impact. There's no connection. So it's like it's not falling and driving anything. It's simply falling into material that's already been pre-pulverized by other agencies and pretty much you have to have explosives destroying what's underneath. And this is falling into the debris. So that's how we can say that it's clearly not the top section destroying the building as it falls onto it. It's the top section falling because what was under it was knocked away. That can be seen from the physics of the way it moved. And it's interesting that such a simple measurement can establish that that's what's going on.

**John Shuck:** [00:18:48] The physics there isn't that complicated, is it?

**David Chandler:** [00:18:52] Right. No, I don't think so. I mean, it might be, the terms might be to somebody, but if you just take your ordinary experience when you drive a nail with a hammer the hammer has to have a response. The nail pushes back, in other words, and so the hammer head slows down. Well, what if the hammer head never slowed down? You would say, well, obviously the nail's being driven into something very soft that offers no resistance like a piece of Styrofoam. So that's sort of an interesting comparison I think. And, so yeah, the top section of the building was falling into basically loose debris. I computed based on the acceleration of the top, it was not in freefall but it was, you could say, it's near freefall. It's coming down at two-thirds of freefall and so if you do the computation it turns out that 90 percent, at least 90 percent, of the support has been removed. And so this is falling and just breaking up the remnants of structure underneath that is not able to support the top section.

**John Shuck:** [00:19:59] I'm speaking with David Chandler a member of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. The book released in September is called *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation* talking about really the physics and the science behind the collapses of the World Trade Center towers. So it looks like when I watch videos of it that it explodes coming down the building -- that looks like one explosion after another as you're going down the building. Does that make sense?

**David Chandler:** [00:20:29] Oh, it's what you see. I mean it's there. You can see not only material being blown out sideways at very high speed up near where you might think of the collapse front is occurring. There are jets of material being blown out many stories below that. So, in other words, what's going on way down there for this material to be blown out the sides? And you have some areas where it's being blown out in large sections of the walls being just blown out. In other places it's focused like point source ejections of material. And interestingly, some of those point source ejections are happening on floors where the windows have already been blown out. And so it's not like it's being compressed and pushed out like some people think, that the pancaking of the floors would cause the stuff to be blown out at high speed. But that's not what's happening because it's like a point ejection of material on a floor where the windows are already gone. So how do you get compression? It's not like a piston where you have a compressed air inside pushing something out. That can't be happening. So in order to get those kinds of things -- you can see -- you can see these. If you go to my web site [911SpeakOut.org](http://911SpeakOut.org) you'll see lots of examples of this kind -- of these kinds -- of pictures. Watching them -- watching the walls of the building as it falls that's very revealing simply to grasp -- to understand it with your own eyes. And I tell people, you know, you can see what's happening with your own eyes. My doing the physics is just proving that you're not crazy. I was basically supporting what actually you can see, very intuitively, just by watching it.

**John Shuck:** [00:22:26] The material itself. I mean it ultimately pulverized into this powder or dust. I mean if it had pancaked -- if it fell down you'd have like a stack wouldn't you? A stack of pancakes I guess one would think?

**David Chandler:** [00:22:40] Yeah, when buildings fall like in an earthquake or something and they come down you'd have slabs of concrete and so forth. It's not just pure dust. That's sort of a misconception. It's not just that, well there was a lot of it. There was a lot of very fine material and there was a lot of coarser material and so forth. You know baseball size chunks a little bit larger but you have a lot of very finely ground material there. And this did not fall to the ground and break up into little pieces. This was finely pulverized before it even got blown out of the building.

**John Shuck:** [00:23:16] One of the pieces of evidence is human bone fragments -- one centimeter long -- were found on the roof of the Deutsche Bank which is what 500 feet? I mean what does that indicate?

**David Chandler:** [00:23:27] Well, obviously if it's going to be on the roof. It's not a result of the building having collapsed and crushed these people. These bone fragments had to have been, you had to have, I mean this is gruesome to talk about it, but these people who are caught up in this event, they were pulverized along with everything else while the buildings were still in mid-air still in the process of falling, still high enough so that when they're blown out of the building they could fall on the roofs of adjacent buildings. So that, you know, that says a lot. It shows that the process of pulverizing the people and the material and everything was going on very early in this process. You know you would think that if you were caught in a collapsing building you'd be crushed, you'd be found, your body would be found down in the rubble pile. In the first place a lot of the bodies were never found at all. And why is that? Well they were blown up? They were blown up into tiny pieces way high in the building. And as the building came down they were destroyed before the building even collapsed and the parts that were found, there were parts of bodies, rather than entire

bodies on the main part. I'm really sorry to talk about all the gruesomeness of this in a public forum like this but that's the reality. It was a terrible event. But it actually contributes to the understanding of the process. How do you get bone fragments from people that were available to blow out the sides and land on the roof of an adjacent building? I mean right there it tells you something about what was happening.

**John Shuck:** [00:25:24] This is Progressive Spirit. ProgressiveSpirit.net. I'm John Shuck. I'm speaking with David Chandler of the 9/11 Consensus Panel. The book we are discussing is *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. We're looking specifically at the science behind the collapse of the three skyscrapers on September 11<sup>th</sup>. Could they have collapsed without explosives? More to come.

**John Shuck:** [00:25:48] You're listening to the podcast version of the 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 [ProgressiveSpirit.net](http://ProgressiveSpirit.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 [ProgressiveSpirit.net](http://ProgressiveSpirit.net).

**John Shuck:** [00:26:21] David Chandler's speaking with me about *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. This is Progressive Spirit, [ProgressiveSpirit.net](http://ProgressiveSpirit.net). I'm John Shuck.

**John Shuck:** [00:26:36] Now there's also claims that the fires were very hot and melted everything -- infernos in the towers. Can you talk about the fires?

**David Chandler:** [00:26:49] Yeah. Well the temperatures in the buildings. There's two sides to this story. On the one hand, the fires were not that hot. If you look at the smoke cloud it's black smoke typically, and black smoke indicates incomplete burning. So these fires were not at the maximum temperature you would even get in some building fires. There are many building fires where you can see the entire building looks like it's a torch burning really with a roaring flame. The North Tower, actually both towers. They were not smoldering, they were burning but they were fairly ordinary temperatures. The maximum temperature you can get from these fires misses the melting point of iron by a thousand degrees Fahrenheit. So it's a thousand degrees cooler in those flames than it takes to melt iron. So you're not going to get these things coming down because of the fire. The other thing is there are pictures of a woman who is seen in the North Tower in the opening where the plane went in. She's standing in that opening waving, trying to get attention. And she was standing there for quite a while. She was one of the victims of this but she was standing there. How could she stand there at the level where the impact occurred if there were these exceptionally hot fires everybody's talking about -- here leaning on the steel? So the steel could not have been so overwhelmingly hot that she couldn't touch it. And there's a number of people that were seen moving around in this area where the impacts actually occurred. And that's evidence that the fires were not these super-hot fires. The only reason they talk about super-hot fires is they need that in order to come up with some explanation for how the buildings collapsed. If you want to say they collapsed due to fire well it must have been very hot fire. So they say well, therefore, there were very hot fires. The evidence doesn't back that up. The evidence is these were fairly ordinary temperature office fires. I said there's two sides to this. The other side is there were extremely high temperatures because there was molten steel and there was molten iron also. And so on the one hand the fires weren't so hot. But there's something else going on that was very hot and that's where there's evidence that there were incendiaries that were planted in the building. You look at the South Tower just before it collapsed for several minutes. There is molten either iron or steel pouring out of a window. Not even a window, it is right at the corner of the building. It's pouring out for a period of time. And just shortly before it collapsed. How do you get molten iron? Now NIST said, "Oh that

was molten aluminum from the airplane.” No. Because aluminum melts at a low temperature. However, the color that you see is an indication of the temperature. So you can talk about sometimes, say, the color temperature. You can tell if the temperature -- put a nail in a flame -- take some pliers and put a nail in a flame. It changes color as the temperature rises and so it goes sort of orange and red and so forth. The color can tell you how hot it is. And so whatever was pouring out of the South Tower was at the temperature of molten iron and that's what the color tells you.

**John Shuck:** [00:30:30] And NIST said that there was there was no evidence that any molten steel or iron was found in any of the buildings?

**David Chandler:** [00:30:36] Well you can look at it with your own eyes right there. And then there's a lot of testimony down in the rubble piles quite deep because there are several layers of basement. There was all full of this rubble but the firemen that were down there talked about flowing -- said it's like lava from a volcano -- flowing down the channel rails. In terms of expert eyewitness testimony, there was a lot of it from first responders. And you realize the rubble heat was hot like the temperature of glowing iron and so forth. Weeks after the event. I mean how do you maintain those temperatures that long? And, especially, they're pouring water on this the whole time. They were spraying water continually for days and days and days. And they said it pretty much like filled up that whole basement area but it still stayed hot. There are satellite pictures NASA, I think it was NASA, but they took infrared photographs of Ground Zero days after and then continuing on weeks after the events that showed that the temperatures were still high that long after the event. And so that's not from just a cooling off period that's from ongoing reactions generating this excess heat. So it's a sign that there is something in there that is creating these high temperatures.

**John Shuck:** [00:32:08] Now you did some measurements of the objects being really expelled away from the World Trade Center Towers at really high speeds. Can you talk about what you did and what that indicates?

**David Chandler:** [00:32:22] Yeah. I just use my frame tracking software that you can track the motion of an object. And what I did was I picked out things that appeared to be free thrown objects. So there were, for instance, sections of the wall that sort of like, that peeled outward, and so forth. So I didn't measure those. I looked at objects that were simply thrown outward from fairly high in the building, and these could have been like individual wall units and things like that. Some of these that I measure were up in the range of 50, 60 miles an hour. I found one that was over 70 miles an hour -- horizontal velocities for these big multi-ton wall units. How do you get that kind of horizontal velocity on a 4 or 5 ton object? You know that's a big puzzle. Now for me that's not completely definitive of what happened but it certainly is suggestive that there's something going on that's launching this material horizontally at these high speeds. There's a lot of other stuff going on by the way in the falling debris. Besides those high speed large chunks, I did some careful observation, of some of the debris that was being thrown out of the South Tower. And what I saw was a chunk of material which then mid-air split into two -- like a little puff and an explosion pushing the single thing into a pair of objects and each of those pair split in two. So it was like a double instance there, and there's another one, there was a piece that was going along in one direction emitting a lot of smoke along the way and then it suddenly does a right angle turn. Now the only way that you can do that, that's going to be a change in the momentum of the object. The only way that you can change the momentum is to have an impact of some kind. But I think from the video, I saw it from several different angles, and I believe what happened was it was like a composite fragment that blew apart and one part carried a lot of the forward momentum. The other part just dropped. So you have all this smoke generating material going along and then does a right angle turn and generates smoke all the way to the ground. So you see active processes happening in the debris as it is freely falling through the air. And there's other things going on there. You have

things that are falling like there's a rain of material. You can see sort of the front edge of that the wall of stuff that's falling down. And then you see pieces that shoot ahead of all of the falling debris. I mean it is just like little rockets. I basically use the term metaphorically, but I made a [video about rockets at the World Trade Center](#). It's not necessarily a rocket process. It could have been other things. I think basically it's things that are launched by explosions that are in the debris and pieces get thrown down faster than they could fall naturally. They zoom ahead trailing huge amounts of smoke as they go and you see a number of these examples like that.

**John Shuck:** [00:35:57] So David Chandler. Bottom line here. What's the best explanation of that? I mean is that -- is it that explosives were planted in there -- very high energy types of explosives, I mean? There is also evidence, or is there evidence of thermic material or some kind of incendiaries planted in the building? Can you talk about that?

**David Chandler:** [00:36:19] OK. The material that was pouring out of the South Tower as I mentioned is most likely, you know that's a process of gradual heating and that's what an incendiary would do. And so thermite could have been acting there melting the steel. Thermite, actually, is made of iron oxide and aluminum and when that reacts the iron from the thermite itself is molten iron. So you have a source of molten iron. Steel has iron with other stuff mixed in. But whether it's the steel or whether it's the iron from the thermite itself you had this material pouring out. So there's indication of this. The thermite typically would have been used for pre weakening. You could have had thermite cutting various things throughout the building maybe minutes or even hours before the building came down. In the final bringing down of the building it's very likely that there were other kinds of explosives used as well. So it's not that there's just thermite it's just that thermite has a signature that you can find in the debris and so you can say yes there was thermite. We're not saying, no, there was nothing but thermite. And so these events where you see the debris fragmenting mid-air appear to be some kind of explosive material that is continuing to act even after these pieces were launched away from the building.

**John Shuck:** [00:37:51] We want to move on to the World Trade Center Building 7. But before we do that is there anything else that needs to be said about these two towers?

**David Chandler:** [00:37:59] Well I just want to say the reason I focused my motion analysis on the North Tower is the North Tower came relatively speaking straight down initially. It eventually tipped a bit but the South Tower from the very outset, it was hit lower and so there was a larger top section. It rotated at the very beginning and it essentially fell off. And so it was not a clean straight down process. However, in spite of the fact that this chunk that you would think would be what's driving the collapse of everything under it, it fell off and the rest of the stuff came down anyway. So the lower part of the South Tower came down very rapidly as though it were being driven, if you're going to accept that kind of a theory, but the driver was gone. It had fallen off of the building. If you look at the [video of the South Tower](#), of the lower floors, of the South Tower, the rapid-fire sequential ejections all the way to the ground way ahead of where the major destruction is occurring. So here you are basically watching the explosions occurring. There is a tab on my Web site. There's a guy that contributes a lot in terms of videos named [Nathan](#). He says his name Flach F L A C H but he's done a lot of work taking these videos, many of them with hand-held cameras and stabilizing the video so the building is held fixed. You can see what's happening on the building very clearly. And just watching the sequence of explosions there. He has a very good collection of that process you can see.

**John Shuck:** [00:39:45] It seems like the best evidence would seem to indicate, at least the hypothesis, that the airplanes crashing into the buildings were really a diversion to disguise what really happened -- that incendiaries and explosive devices brought the buildings down. Is that fair?

**David Chandler:** [00:40:02] That is exactly right. That's exactly right. The airplane started the fires but apart from that they had very little to do, probably nothing to do, with the way the buildings collapsed.

**John Shuck:** [00:40:14] Well, let's move to the third one. Then we have three skyscrapers collapsing and two planes. There is an issue of math. But talk about World Trade Center Building Seven for folks who still may not have even heard of Building 7. Tell us about that, introduce that for us.

**David Chandler:** [00:40:31] Well the very first video I put on my Web site [911SpeakOut.org](http://911SpeakOut.org), if you go there, the very first video is a compilation of views of Building 7 coming down. And the reason I put it right up front is, just as you said, a lot of people have not even seen this or they've heard of it and don't know what we're talking about, or whatever. Watch it. If you watch it, the first thing that will come to your mind is, "This looks like a demolition." And that's exactly what it is. I'm just saying it *looks* like a demolition. OK. But Building 7 was not hit by a plane. Now some people make a big deal of the fact that it was hit by debris from the North Tower when it fell. And that's true. But I've done some computations on that. If you take that chunk of material which I said flying out of the North Tower horizontally it was probably several wall units a few tons and moving over 70 miles an hour. But think about it. That's like a truck at highway speeds hitting the building. If you have this building which is the size -- it would cover a football field. It's 100 meters from side to side. And if you set it on top of a football field it would come very close to covering the whole thing. That's how massive a building this is and say that you had a freeway overpass and a truck went off the side and crashed into the building at 70 miles an hour. You're going to see a hole in the building and that's all you're going to see. It's not going to be a traumatic thing beyond that. So the twin towers were hit by planes that are flying at excessive speeds way over 500 miles an hour. And so if you say something at 100 miles an hour -- if you're going 500 miles an hour -- the energy is proportional to the square. So if it's five times as fast you have 25 times the energy. Plus the fact these were big massive airplanes. So here's a less massive object moving at much, much, much slower speeds. It's just like getting hit by a truck. It's not going to destroy the building at all. Maybe that process caused some fires. That's the official story, that is the North Tower debris that started the fires in Building 7. There's some debate even about that because most of the fires seemed to have started even later. But I won't go into that. So anyway, you have a building that was not hit by a plane, that was hit by much more minor impacts of debris and at 5:20 in the evening it came down. The thing that's different about Building 7, the way it came down, is from the time it started down, it made a sudden transition from being at rest to transitioning to absolute freefall. The way NIST when they analyzed it, they did a graph then it shows a gradual transition into freefall. That's a very deceptive graph and it's actually a dishonest graph, because they're using a camera angle from the ground looking at an angle up at the roofline. And what's happening at the roofline is the building is folding laterally and so there's some motion of the building that's actually sideways motion which is ambiguous as seen from that angle. They take that as the beginning of downward motion. It doesn't begin downward motion for over a second later. And so they basically extend this time of downward motion. They tried to make it look like it was a transition. But if you take the camera views that are horizontal that are elevated cameras that are looking horizontally at the roofline, the same level as the roofline you see a sudden transition with level roofline, the entire roof comes straight down through the structure of the building with a sudden transition from full support to full freefall. And there's no way you can do that. I mean you don't even need the equations that you need with the North Tower to show that that implies this or that, you know that to go into freefall it simply means zero resistance and it falls for a distance that would be the equivalent of about eight floors. So low in the building, below the level you can see there had to have been a section about eight floors tall that was essentially demolished suddenly within a fraction of a second. Because if you'd done one part and then a little later down another part or if it was a progressive collapse as NIST claims you would have seen this building tumbling down or

coming down asymmetrically in some way. But for it to come straight down with a level roofline with a sudden transition to complete freefall. There's no way to do that without explosives that I can see.

**John Shuck:** [00:45:52] And that's generally how skyscrapers are intentionally demolished.

**David Chandler:** [00:45:57] That's right.

**John Shuck:** [00:45:58] Seems to me that that would be the first obvious explanation just to explore but NIST didn't even explore that.

**David Chandler:** [00:46:06] That's right. And so to not explore the most obvious explanation is clearly an attempt to avoid the conclusions that lie down that alley. They didn't want to go down that path. By the way, I want to mention -- I was trying to reach out beyond just preaching to the choir on this kind of thing. [I published an article, a series of six articles actually, in medium.com](#), or if you go to my 911SpeakOut.org web site I have a link that takes you right there. But that article is written for the general public. It talks about freefall, what it is, and then the measurement of the building being in freefall and then how NIST handled it. And then at the end I do the implications. So what I'm doing in that article is I'm saying, what if the only thing you know about Building 7 is it was in freefall? What are the implications? The implications are huge. Like let me just start you down that road. If it was at freefall; therefore, there were explosives. If there were 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 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. So just starting with the fact of freefall you can get that the hijack was a cover story, I mean it's almost a direct consequence of this. So you don't have to know a whole lot to get to that point where you can say this was something that was orchestrated, and you can put constraints on who did it, because it had to have been somebody who had access to the buildings, access to this high grade military grade material of nano-thermite. And it had to have been somebody who could coordinate with the State Department to get these hijackers into the country the way they did. It had to be somebody who could coordinate with the military not to shoot down the planes. I mean there was so much coordination at high levels within the U.S. Government that there really are big fat blinking arrows pointing at this being an operation conducted within the U.S. establishment -- the military industrial complex the administration all of these had roles to play into this.

**John Shuck:** [00:49:01] And anyone can look at the evidence of the 50 consensus points that the 9/11 Consensus Panel has put together and make their own evaluation. Is that right?

**David Chandler:** [00:49:11] Sure. Other people come at this with other levels of expertise. Graeme Macqueen. I don't know if he's going to be one of your...

**John Shuck:** [00:49:20] Yes. [He was on a week ago](#). Or two weeks ago.

**David Chandler:** [00:49:23] Well he did a study of looking at all this eyewitness testimony by the firefighters. [He's also looking at the anthrax issue](#). The anthrax attacks were part of this overall thing. The anthrax was the way they tied this, or tried to tie this to Iraq. They said the anthrax was supplied by the Iraqis. Turned out that's not true. But that was an attempt to tie 9/11 to Iraq. So there was a lot of other elements to this picture that you can come at with people with varying perspectives or varying insights or different directions you can come at the problem, and it all fits together. My particular approach might put some people to sleep. But anybody out there that has

some background in science and engineering and those kind of things. And there is a large part of the population; there is a significant number of people who should be able to take the things I'm saying and make good sense out of it. Other people might get more insight by reading some of this other material, so the consensus panel is a good a good way to get more diversity of viewpoint there.

**John Shuck:** [00:50:40] I was just going to close I want to close with the thing that you said earlier that what you're doing is showing the science of what is obviously in front of our eyes.

**David Chandler:** [00:50:49] That's right. So I'm basically saying, you can tell intuitively what is happening just by looking at it. And what I'm doing is verifying that you're not crazy.

**John Shuck:** [00:50:58] David Chandler has been my guest. He is a member of the 9/11 Consensus panel. That website is [Consensus911.org](http://Consensus911.org). Part of the book that has come out in September called *9/11 Unmasked: An International Review Panel Investigation*. And you can go to David's Web site to see all of his videos at [911SpeakOut.org](http://911SpeakOut.org). David thanks so much for your work and for being with me today.

**David Chandler:** [00:51:25] Thank you very much.

**John Shuck:** [00:51:27] 9/11 Consensus Panel's Web website is [Consensus911.org](http://Consensus911.org). Next week my series on the 9/11 Consensus panel continues I speak with psychotherapist Fran Shure about the psychology or the PSYOP of 9/11 and the role of the media.

**Frances Shure:** [00:51:46] 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. We're afraid to discuss it so the media becomes an extremely crucial becomes a critical part of carrying off a PSYOP.

**John Shuck:** [00:52:19] Progressive Spirit is heard every week. Progressive Spirit you hear interviews with cutting edge scholars, authors, and activists who have something to say about social justice, human flourishing, and things that matter. Progressive Spirit is formatted for radio and is distributed every week through the Pacifica Radio Network and PRX the Public Radio Exchange. You can download Progressive Spirit for free on your favorite podcast app the website is [ProgressiveSpirit.net](http://ProgressiveSpirit.net) follow also on Facebook and Twitter. Progressive Spirit is produced in the studios of KBOO in Portland Oregon. I'm John Shuck. Be Well.