

## Conspiracy theories in General

First consider yourself.

- Are you an unfair person?
- Are you an irrational person?
- Are you easily lead, by people pandering to your desires and fantasies?
- Are you lazy?

If you answered yes to any above, stop now, nothing said further will matter.

### 1. Are you a fair person?

Being fair has to do with serving the truth. The “who” and “what” are secondary. When the “who” or “what” are things that have emotional meaning to you, extra care and latitude are necessary if you want to be fair.

- a. Truth – how does one measure it if you are trying to be fair? Objective evidence, plain and simple. Motives may be great for TV court dramas, but plenty of innocent people have motives for crimes they didn’t commit. Motive comes into play mainly when there is none. It’s never evidence of a crime, ever.
  - b. The Who – if the who is a group of people, the government, the republicans, the Illuminati, space aliens, insert your favorite hated group here – psychologically this lowers the bar for the needed evidence supporting the crime and raises the bar for exculpatory evidence. To be fair, this has to be realized and worked against.
  - c. Emotions – park them at the door, IF you want to be fair.
- ### 2. Are you a rational person?

Rational means looking at both sets of evidence, for and against, without making excuses for one side or the other. It means avoiding argument flaws people will use to further one side’s position – i.e. recognizing it as a flaw in reasoning.

### 3. Are you easily lead?

Everyone says no to this question, but it’s remarkably easy to get someone to a position you want if you pander to their desires. Many Conspiracy Theorist love feeling that they have a corner on the truth while everyone else are sheep. They love that word sheep.

The trouble is they were likely lead to this position because a conspiracy both was against who they dislike and gives them the feeling of being special.

Because this is a common aspect of being human, looking at your own tendencies is important, if you want to be fair and rational.

### 4. Are you lazy?

Digging into both side, finding credible sources (versus those only provided by one side) requires work. Work most people are unwilling to put in.

Second, always second guess the premise

### *Grand Conspiracies*

If something requires a lot of people involved, the mathematics of the situation means someone will talk. The longer the time, the more people will come forward. The more heinous the act, the stronger the motivation those coming forward will have. Even if all the people were sociopaths, their desires would quickly diverge from the people calling the shots – meaning they would talk. Grand conspiracies (those with many, many people) are just untenable.

No matter the motivation, the people we would suspect of committing these crimes aren't stupid (else they'd be caught quicker) and know people would talk, getting them in trouble.

Two examples – both committed by the most powerful person in the world – POTUS. One, sabotaging a political rival via a burglary (Watergate) and the second was a blow job. Both had very few people knowing about it, the second only two. Both got caught.

### *Risk/Reward*

Back to the fact the people accused of pulling these off aren't stupid. They would do a risk/reward assessment. To risk disgrace and jail, there would have to be a lot of reward, usually personal reward for serious risk. How does the Risk/Reward set up? Could they have gotten the same reward with a much reduced risk by a different method?

### *Does it make sense when the details are taken into account?*

It's easy to make claims, but thinking through the details takes a bit of work. If someone pulled something off, what would have been needed? Do those details make sense in terms of what people would see and mention? There is currently someone claiming no plane hit the twin towers, somehow completely ignoring the thousands of in person eye witnesses and the live television coverage. It makes no sense to assume the thousands of eye witnesses were duped or lying. Men In Black isn't real and there is no little flashy thing.

### LOOK AT THE EVIDENCE

This cannot be emphasized enough. ALL the evidence. For every claim, look at the evidence supporting it AND the evidence against it. If one set really has to start into complex, unproven machinations to explain their side – that's suspect.

Extraordinary claims require extraordinary amounts of objective evidence.

Ensure good sources of information. Any idiot on the web can make a claim and cobble up bits and pieces to make something appear one way. To accept this alone is to be lazy, unfair, and the very sheep you claim others are, because you are being lead to a conclusion rather than determining it yourself.

Think for yourself, recognize your own prejudices, find good evidence, examine both sides.

## 911 Grand Conspiracy Examined

Premise: Some element in the government arranged to have the 911 attacks, forming a “wag the dog” scenario to justify unspecified actions.

Most common claim: The Towers were preset with explosives for a controlled demolition of the buildings.

First and most obvious question: Why that way? Wouldn't it be easier to con 21 extremists into flying planes into a building? The death toll would be quite sufficient to claim a major attack and take action, with vastly lower risk, i.e. same reward with much lower risk. Even assuming they wanted the buildings actually taken down, they could more easily have required the buildings to “upgrade” the insulation around the support beams holding up the building, the first step being to remove the old insulation – hit the building then. Heat from a 1000 lbs of JP40 would weaken the steel enough to let gravity take over.

Second question requires some knowledge of controlled explosives and building implosion science: *Required for taking down a building via controlled explosion **per building**.*

- Each support beam needs to be weakened – concrete broken to expose the steel girder.
- Each support beam needs at least one, up to three, linear shaped charges placed to cut the girder.
- Each charge needs to be tamped with sandbags to help force the power through the beam rather than dispersing the blast energy into the surrounding area. Steel is hard, the energy would prefer an easier path rather than through it.
- Each charge is a minimum of 1 lb. For the largest beams up to 5 lbs each.
- Minimum required explosives: 1 linear shaped charge x each beam on each floor below point of plane impact. On the order of 50,000 lbs of explosives (minimum, likely much more to ensure the building came down. The powers that be couldn't afford to have a misfire with building in place and all the evidence of the crime discoverable).
- Minimum wiring: Assuming one master controller, plus one controller on each floor (below plane impact), avg 40 feet of 2-wire conductor per beam times the number of beams per floor, plus 1 2-wire conductor per floor, avg length ½ height to plane impact zone. Wild ass guess, 5 miles of 2-wire conductor.
- Minimum prep time: 1 week to weaken the beams on each floor, using 4 workers per floor. Approx 400 workers with jack hammers unless you wanted them to not finish this in one week.
- Minimum prep time to place charges and tamp: 1 week to place charges and tamp, 2 workers to place charges and 2 to run wiring and tamp explosives. Expertise level of placement engineers – high. Currently not more than 100 qualified to do this in the US, needed 200 expert level explosives engineers and 200 experience tamping and wiring engineers support personnel.
- Minimum final wiring time: Master implosion expert to wire each floor controller, 3 hours per floor. 300 hours divided by the number of Master implosion experts employed.

- Absolute minimum time total: 3 weeks, with most professional implosion companies requiring 6 months for this size building.

If this was a controlled Blast: Common sense questions:

Why didn't the residents hear the hundreds of workmen with jack hammers weakening the building beams in the month(s) prior to the attack?

*To answer the contrary position, yes, this could be done w/o weakening the building beams, but the amounts of explosives needed jump by a factor of at least 15\* and the explosive blast jumping the same degree, being obvious and extremely visible on each floor, to anyone seeing the buildings come down. \* Keep in mind without concrete weakening (removal) linear shaped charges would no longer be viable, resulting in charges needed to sever steel and concrete both. See <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/479244.pdf>. This is not a viable option given it's inconsistent with the visual records of the buildings going down.*

*To answer a contrary position, Nano thermite has been posited as the explosive used to take out the towers. 1) Nano thermite is a hyperbaric explosive, great for blowing out all the walls but with much, much too low a brisance to cut steel effectively. It isn't even considered a high explosive. 2) All thermites produce an immense amount of heat. This would have been visible, which was inconsistent with the visual records of the building going down. This is not a viable option due to either reason above.*

Why, with all the people cleaning up the millions of tons of debris didn't they see that every support girder had been clean cut by the explosives? The number of cuts would be equal to the numbers of support girders per floor times the number of floors. Linear shaped charges make very distinctive cuts to steel.

Why didn't anyone see the hundreds of prep work workers during the month(s) leading up to the attack?

Given the numbers of implosion experts in the US are fairly small and virtually none work for the military, why were none missing (by being in NY prepping the buildings) nor have any of them spoken out?

If you have watched a building being explosively imploded, you will see the charges clearly going off, prior to a floor collapsing. While there were some windows blown out during 911, this isn't consistent with a typical building implosion which would show windows and visible explosive flashes on every floor just prior to the floor collapsing. Given the risk of an incomplete implosion, reduction of explosive charge sizes would not have been an acceptable option for the planners. Increasing the size of the charges, to reduce the risk of an incomplete implosion, would have amplified the visibility of charge detonation on every floor (not just a few, explained by internal pressure wave of the collapsing building).

Why hasn't someone talked? People keep secrets usually because they feel it is the right thing to do. The larger the group, the greater danger of someone talking over time. Add that few would have considered this the right thing to do, it doesn't pass the BS test.

The security community keeps secrets because of two reasons: The people knowing these secrets consider it the right thing and extremely few people have need to know for important secrets, limiting the number of people who know. No matter your clearance, you cannot get to see classified information without a “need to know”.

Weakened buildings – ones with the support beams weakened, are unstable. They have been known to either partially collapse prior to explosive demolition, or incompletely implode during demolition. This is a danger the 911 planners would have had to accept as a risk. It doesn't balance the reward, especially given there were safer methods to do the same thing (conning 21 extremists into flying into the buildings).

### Addressing Conspiracy Theorist's questions

#### *Why did the buildings fall straight down, rather than toppling?*

We are used to seeing smaller structures tip and fall – so it's easy to expect that here. Trouble is, it didn't tip. An entire floor collapsed, once all beams lost enough strength for one to fail, the others took just a slight nudge to go – causing a virtually simultaneous collapse. Once a floor with multiple floors above fell the 20 feet of a floor –the energies involved became immense, almost instantly overloading the capacity of the supporting structures to even slow the fall. Things tend to fall down if not impeded by a lateral force.

We would assume that a small force sideways would just keep amplifying as the collapse continued, but this neglects two things. 1) the floors were extremely wide, 50 yards on edge (half a football field length); and 2) if there was any slight tilt, the bottom edge would hit at the side it was tilting – resulting in a transient push backwards against the tilt – self-correcting.

Possibly this would not have remained this way were the structure thousands of stories tall, but in the 20 seconds it took for the collapse to complete, it was enough to remain upright during the collapse.

#### *Why did windows several floors below the collapsing floors appear to be blasted out?*

Two words, pressure wave. The floors were extremely wide. If you clap your hands together, it makes a loud clap. Try the same thing with two fingers and nothing. The air trying to escape the collapsing floors had to go somewhere besides outwards – it went two places, 1) down the elevator shafts, causing nothing visible, and 2) down the stairwells. The stairwells were located at the corners of the buildings, the most common place you might see an occasional window blown out well below the point of collapse. It would only take about a 10 PSI differential blast out windows.

*How could a flimsy aluminum shell plane cause that much destruction?*

Physics 101 – The planes hitting the trade centers Boeing 767-200ER, max weight on takeoff 397,000lbs, aka 198.5 tons. Assuming only 80% max weight that's ~160 tons.

160 tons, flying at cruising speed of 400 miles/hr. That's an immense amount of momentum. That weight at that speed wouldn't matter if it were feathers, the momentum could create massive damage.

Some straw man arguments have said they could not sever support beams. It's a straw man flaw because no one has claimed they did. The claims are the crash blasted off the insulation around the steel/concrete support structures and the resulting and massive fire caused by 24,000 gallons of jet fuel atomized by the crash had time to raise the temperature of the beams such that the concrete turned into dust (dehydrated) and the steel weakened due to the 1000deg+ temps to the point it could not support the millions of tons of building above the fire.