

EVIDENCE OF NOT KNOWING THE UNIQUENESS AND DISTINCTIVENESS OF THE TWIN TOWERS COLLAPSE PROGRESSION MODES

The first evidence of a few people being aware of the specifics of highly unique collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers and having a comprehensive body of evidence to back it up was in 2009. This happened shortly after visual evidence was released by the NIST through FOIA requests.

The release of visual evidence was necessary for any attempt at comprehensive mappings. It wasn't possible to assemble them before having access to the NIST visual evidence. I cannot find any evidence in any news, government, or professional publication source of someone knowing of or presenting such evidence before that time. Can anyone else?

EVIDENCE OF UNIQUENESS, DISTINCTIVENESS OF TWIN TOWER COLLAPSE PROGRESSION MODES (DIRECTLY RELATED TO UNIQUE STRUCTURAL DESIGNS)

It is very important to understand these were not 'generic' buildings. They were of a highly unique architecture and as a result they underwent highly specific modes of collapse progression which were unique to these structures. The collapses were incredibly unique events with unique, distinct, recognizable features that would not have been observed in buildings of a different structural design. There was nothing 'generic' about it. The collapse progression processes of the Twin Towers are [mapped here](#).

The single most unique feature of the collapses is how the three building components (perimeter, core, flooring) moved in highly specific, distinct ways relative to each other. It was a very unique, specific type of collapse progression which was directly related to the unique structural designs.

All the global features witnessed were a direct result of this uniqueness.

THE EVIDENCE THERE WAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE UNIQUE, DISTINCTIVE NATURE OF THE TWIN TOWER COLLAPSE MODES

I checked the following sources to see how well the distinctive nature of the Twin Towers collapse progression modes was/is understood:

- 1) News archives
- 2) Archives of investigative news outlets
- 3) Professional technical journal records

- 4) Academic papers
- 5) U.S. Court records
- 6) The NIST reports
- 7) Congressional records

1, 2 are private news sources

3, 4 are professional and academic sources

5, 6, 7 are U.S. Government sources from the judicial, executive, and legislative branches.

These records were examined comprehensively for evidence of awareness of the unique, distinct, specific and knowable Twin Towers collapse progression modes at [this link](#).

I found no evidence that knowledge of the unique collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers existed in any of these sources. If it existed at all, it was most certainly not a knowledge which was commonly shared. It never emerged in print or online until around 2010. It continues to remain unseen in all Government records, professional journals and both corporate and alternative media more than a decade after first appearing online and 2 decades after the collapses.

1) NEWS ARCHIVES AS EVIDENCE

The archives of all major media stands as documented proof of this. All archives can be reviewed by anyone to see if there is any written evidence of people being openly and/or collectively aware of the specific, distinct collapse progression modes. I examine the whole range of journalism on the collapse modes of the Twin Towers [here](#) and [here](#).

2) ARCHIVES OF INVESTIGATIVE NEWS OUTLETS AND JOURNALISTS AS EVIDENCE

The archives of all investigative news sites and the records left by individual investigative journalists stand as documented proof of this. All archives can be reviewed to see if there is any written evidence of people being openly and collectively aware of the specific, distinct collapse progression mode.

3) PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS AS EVIDENCE

Those who have published on the subject in professional journals and have a sufficiently padded CV could be treated as expert witnesses in U.S. courts. The author has already publicly offered a critique of a series of papers in the Journal of Engineering Mechanics [here](#) and [here](#). This was available for about a decade. Professional/academic papers on the Twin Towers collapse modes are examined as an interactive whole at [this link](#).

4) ACADEMIC PAPERS AS EVIDENCE

There is no separation of professional and academic publications. Both Dr Bazant and Dr Benson worked at universities when they published.

5) COURT RECORDS AS EVIDENCE

I do not believe knowledge of the actual Twin Towers collapse progression modes was presented by any expert witness in any civil litigation in any U.S. court. If so, this knowledge does not legally exist in the U.S.

If this is true, then all litigation concerning assignment of blame and compensation took place in courtrooms where there was no open knowledge of any unique, distinct, specific way in which the Twin Towers fell by plaintiffs or defendants.

Apparently no expert witness pointed out that the unique, specific, mappable ways in which the Twin Towers collapsed was directly related to the structural design of the buildings. That the collapse progression modes were knowable and provable. That there was nothing 'generic' about how these towers fell.

Court records of insurance and victim compensation litigation would most probably reveal more evidence of the same Twin Towers collapse progression misrepresentations. I do not have access to documents exchanged by parties during discovery procedures.

No expert witness testimony on this vital issue of the relation of structural design to the actual collapse progression modes apparently entered the court records. (How could it have? From whom?) This clearly favored legal positions that have an interest in obscuring the connection between design issues and issue of liability. It is highly enlightening to look back at billions of dollars changing hands through insurance and wrongful death and injury lawsuits with apparently no knowledge of the unique, distinct, and highly specific way the Twin Towers actually collapsed.

If so, we would expect to see the Twin Towers collapse progression processes in U.S. Court records described in only the most vague, general and generic terms. This is just as they are described in Government and professional publications.

To what extent are these civil court records available for review?

To what extent would clear knowledge of the distinct, specific modes of collapse of the Twin Towers, which was directly related to their unique structural designs, have changed the outcome of litigation?

The group of expert witnesses for both plaintiff and defendant constitute the highest level of knowledge during a trial. They compete with one another. Other witnesses are 'lay witnesses'. Lay witnesses are not 'authorized' to make certain judgements about certain technical things like the collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers.

Accurate collapse progression mappings could be accessible online and available to anyone for more than a decade. That does not mean they exist in a legal sense. Information of this nature cannot be used in a U.S. courtroom. No independent group of researchers would legally qualify as authorized to comment on this subject matter. And since those who could qualify as expert witnesses on the Twin Towers collapse progressions, like Dr Bazant, could easily say the idea of well ordered and knowable decomposition of 3 key structural components is 'rubbish', the collapse progression modes mapped here do not and have never existed in any legal sense. They cannot legally exist until a qualified expert witness states within court records that they exist in a way that can survive a denial from other expert witnesses. There is no precedent for this in any U.S. court of which I am aware.

20 years after the collapses of the Twin Towers, 10 years after detailed mappings made the largest scale processes knowable, the mappings are completely unknown and cannot be presented within any courtroom in the U.S. They do not exist in a legal sense and probably never will.

6) GOVERNMENT REPORTS AS EVIDENCE

The absence of any but the most generic descriptions of the Twin Tower collapse progression modes in the NIST reports has been documented for well more than a decade. There is nothing concerning the unique and distinctive Twin Tower collapse progression modes which has appeared in any government publication since then. There is not one documented instance of any knowledge of the uniqueness and distinctiveness of the Twin Towers collapse progression modes in any U.S. Government literature.

The NIST used only 3 phrases with a total of 5 words to describe the collapse progression modes of the Twin Towers in their final report. All NIST quotes are highlighted in yellow at the top of [this link](#).

7) CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS AS EVIDENCE

There is nothing more to add to the congressional testimony collected and analyzed [here](#).

WHAT THE EVIDENCE DEMONSTRATES CONCLUSIVELY

All these forms of documented evidence must be viewed collectively to understand how the Twin Towers collapse progression modes have been misrepresented through U.S culture as a whole. One must look at misrepresentations in U.S. legal and congressional culture, the culture of professional peer-reviewed technical literature and the culture of U.S Government investigative bodies to understand how misrepresentations permeate U.S. journalism and popular culture.

There is not any description or drawing in any records of any U.S. Government agency in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches that recognizes the unique, distinctive way in which the Twin Towers fell.

There isn't a single professional or academic publication which recognizes distinctive, mappable and knowable collapse modes of the Twin Towers.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR TWIN TOWERS COLLAPSE PROGRESSION MISREPRESENTATIONS

Comparison of the visual record with claims of U.S. Government agencies and professional publications prove beyond doubt that responsibility for misrepresentations of the Twin Towers collapse progression modes rests with professional culture. Professional and popular misrepresentations are inter-related and dependent on one another, but it is the professional misrepresentations that carried so much weight in U.S. Congress and the U.S. Courts.

[Return to website](#)