


## Incorrect historic narratives require a breakdown in critical thinking

An incorrect historic narrative cannot become fixed around an event without the breakdown of critical thinking.



This essay looks at these 4 questions:

Around the collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers, how did critical thinking break down?

Around the more than 800% exaggeration of tilting of the North Tower, how did critical thinking break down?

How much resistance did this breakdown of critical thinking encounter?

How easy was it to create an information black hole around these things in the post 9/11 world?

Around the collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers, how did critical thinking break down?


All National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) comments about the collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers are highlighted in yellow at the top of [this link](#).

All key professional / academic peer reviewed papers on the Twin Towers collapse progression modes are available through the interactive graphic in [this link](#).

This graph is a basic summary of what happened:


Government	NIST makes no comment from 2002	
Professional / Academic	Highly generic descriptions and allusions to collapse modes	Described and drawn literally as 'blocks' from 2007
Professional / Academic resistance?	Described and drawn literally as 'blocks' from 2006	

No comment by the government investigating agency was followed by a false, weak exchange among professionals and academics over which 'block' misrepresentation is more correct. This allowed the actual collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers [mapped here](#) to slip through the first 3 nets with relative ease:



The breakdown in critical thinking happened like this:

- 1) The collapse progression modes were allowed to fall through the U.S. Government net.
- 2) It fell through the professional/academic net by creating a false simple cartoon debate around 'blocks'.
- 3) It fell through 'mainstream' large corporate media by editors and journalists taking the default or 'lockdown' position as shown:



- 4) As for the 4<sup>th</sup> net, accurate descriptions of the Twin Towers collapse progression modes slipped through alternative media and independent investigative journalism by being so polarized and polarizing that many journalists took the same censorship positions as 'mainstream' corporate media.

As a result the general public was left unprotected and received a false technical narrative unfiltered with:

No critique of why the NIST refused to comment since 2002

A false professional/academic debate reinforcing generic 'blocks'


A barrage of media reports containing the default world-view

Around the subject of an information black hole the general public is basically attacked from multiple angles. In this case they were assaulted by government agencies, by professional and academic journals, by 'mainstream' corporate media and also by alternative and independent investigative journalism.


An information black hole is like an assault on the general population. These fact-checking nets basically became weapons of misinformation which were used on the general population.

# Around the more than 800% exaggeration of tilting of the North Tower, how did critical thinking break down?

This process was also pretty simple.



Blocks 2, 3 and 4 all are about tweaking the visual evidence to make a core-led collapse look like a perimeter-led collapse, so this is how it was done:



Breakdown in critical thinking:

There are a number of red flags here. FEMA already mapped the North Tower early motion enough to notice multiple indications of collective core failure. The NIST reversed the FEMA mappings with an exaggerated, cartoon-like 'rigidness' and an extreme exaggeration of the tilting process.

One would think the red box would be something independent journalists or some kind of 'peer review process' would watch for. But the evidence shows that they weren't watching for it and didn't notice when it happened.

All of these stages were pretty open and blatant efforts to reverse the FEMA mappings. Weren't FEMA and the NIST using the same visual evidence? How could the same visual evidence lead 2 groups of government investigators to such extremely different conclusions?

How do FEMA researchers show the NIST evidence of early deformation and collective core-led collapse in 2002, and the NIST ignore all of them and claim the upper portion 'tilted rigidly' 3 years later?

When the NIST claimed that the North Tower tilted the same amount that the south Tower tilted, this should have been another big red flag.

When the NIST reversed the FEMA mappings of the early motion of the North Tower in 2005 without allowing the public to see the visual evidence on which both the FEMA and NIST decisions were based, this should have been another big red flag.

So it isn't as if alternative media and independent investigative journalists didn't have a number of open warnings that the evidence was being manipulated and misrepresented.

The general public once again was subject to a false technical narrative unfiltered:

- No critique of why the NIST didn't release their video evidence they used to make claims with the final report on the Twin Towers in 2005

- No critique of why the NIST reversed the earlier mappings of FEMA

- No critique on how the deformations pointed out by FEMA became 'rigid' 3 years later

- No instinct to compare the visual record to verify whether what the NIST claims is true or to compare them with the FEMA claims by using ones own eyes.


- A barrage of media reports containing the default world-view

This was the same default world-view as used with the collapse progression modes: The NIST is the ultimate authority, there is a wide consensus among the professional/academic community, and only 'truthers' question the correctness of the North Tower early motion given by the NIST.

## Where was the resistance?

How much resistance did this encounter? How easy was it to create an information black hole around these things in the post 9/11 world?

The breakdown in critical thinking depended on people talking around the collapse progression modes without knowing what they were:



Once this behavior could be established as 'normal' and perfectly acceptable the information black hole became fixed in the historic narrative.


It had to, because it is impossible to talk about the Twin Towers collapses coherently if one doesn't know the collapse progression modes. In this way any discussion of the collapses of the Twin Towers was permanently crippled before it even began.

[Accurate, detailed mappings](#) of the Twin Towers collapse modes were pushed into 'non-history' or the murky domain of 'conspiracy theory'.

Technical illiteracy of the collapses of the Twin Towers was the inevitable result.

This gives a glimpse of how journalism and science actually work in the 21<sup>st</sup> century

In the case of the North Tower (WTC 1), this is what happened:



How did people manage to talk to each other about the North Tower collapse without noticing or resisting these large scale absences of records? How did so many people not notice the absence of something so big?

This is how the North Tower was recorded over the last 20 years in the written record. This is now a normal way to present the North Tower collapse. This is now what we call 'history' since the behavior is considered normal.

The Twin Towers collapse modes show that, depending on the subject, science may have nothing to do with conformity to observation and measurement.

It may be about conformity to power in human organization instead. When some people with the power to do so make a decision that a subject is to be bypassed, the scientific and journalism establishments conform to the decision. If they decide observations and measurements should be manipulated or disappear altogether, they will be manipulated or disappear.

That does not mean all will conform willingly or knowingly. They may conform because they were tricked into doing so.

In certain subjects the peer review process works only within certain limits. In the phrase 'independent investigative journalism', the words 'independent' and 'investigative' have limits. If some people with the power to do so decide that an investigation is to be limited, it will be limited. If the same people decide that 'independent' should cease to exist on a subject, it will go away on that subject.

In this case, depending on the subject, science is not something that conforms itself to observation and measurement. It conforms itself to the power of certain organizations instead. Observations and measurements become things to be manipulated for the purposes of power.

[Back to website](#)