



9/11: The Mysterious Collapse of WTC Building 7 was Not An Inside Job

Posted on [September 15, 2012](#) by [WashingtonsBlog](#)



Preface: If you believe that politics, war and terrorism do not greatly affect your lifestyle, your investment portfolio and the

economy, you are sadly mistaken. See [this](#), [this](#), [this](#), [this](#) and [this](#).

If, on the other hand, you believe that 9/11 was an inside job, then please point out any inaccuracies, shortcomings or erroneous conclusions contained within the post. Please don't just label it as being a "limited hang-out" propaganda sell-out hit piece ... instead, if you believe it is wrong, please link to actual evidence which disproves what I am saying, or which adds pieces of information which you think are missing. Maybe I'll agree with you, maybe I won't. But I will consider every comment. (Indeed, maybe this entire essay is a trojan horse – an attempt to "play dumb" – to give people a chance to criticize it and blast out some hard-hitting truth?)

People who state that 9/11 was an inside job are claiming that it is a [false flag](#) operation which killed people, was used to justify wars in Iraq and elsewhere and a power grab in the U.S.

But World Trade Center building 7 – the third building to collapse on September 11th – has nothing to do with any inside job:

- No one died as a result of the collapse
- No airplane hit the building, and so it was not directly involved in the terrorist attack
- No wars were launched to avenge WTC7
- No power grabs or loss of civil liberties ensued because of the collapse of this building
- Unlike the rest of 9/11, the government has been very quiet about its destruction

As such, the collapse of the building – also known as the "Solomon Brothers Building" – was **not** an inside job.

Of course, the building might have been demolished to save lives. For example, Paul K. Trousdale – a structural engineer with decades of experience – [says](#):

I had always thought the 3rd building was destroyed to prevent unpredictable collapse.

(some point to the World Trade Center owner's statement about [the decision to "pull" the building](#) as confirming Trousdale's theory).

So why am I wasting your valuable time in discussing this?

Because the government – as part of its [political cover-up of negligence](#) before and on 9/11 – pretended that the building collapsed due to "natural causes". This should not be entirely surprising ... we know that government personnel sometimes misspeak about things like the economy or Iraq and weapons of mass destruction, and they may also have made some minor errors peripherally related to 9/11:

- The EPA [misspoke about the dangers to heroic first responders](#) from toxic chemicals at Ground Zero
- Government officials misspoke about [9/11 being wholly unforeseeable](#) ... including pretending that [Al Qaeda's plans to fly planes into the World Trade Center and Pentagon](#) were a complete surprise
- Top government personnel misspoke about [Iraq's role in 9/11](#)

Again, this post has nothing to do with "9/11 inside job": no one died when building 7 collapsed.

[What Do the Experts Say?](#)

What does the evidence show about the Solomon Brothers Building in Manhattan?

Numerous structural engineers – the people who know the most about office building vulnerabilities and accidents – say that the official explanation of why building 7 at the World Trade Center collapsed on 9/11 is “impossible”, “defies common logic” and “violates the law of physics”:

- Two professors of structural engineering at a prestigious Swiss university (Dr. Joerg Schneider and Dr. Hugo Bachmann) said that, [on 9/11, World Trade Center 7 was brought down by controlled demolition](#) (translation [here](#))

- [John D. Pryor](#), with more than 30 years experience:

The collapse of WTC7 looks like it may have been the result of a controlled demolition. This should have been looked into as part of the original investigation

- [Robert F. Marceau](#), with over 30 years of structural engineering experience:

From videos of the collapse of building 7, the penthouse drops first prior to the collapse, and it can be noted that windows, in a vertical line, near the location of first interior column line are blown out, and reveal smoke from those explosions. This occurs in a vertical line in symmetrical fashion an equal distance in toward the center of the building from each end. When compared to controlled demolitions, one can see the similarities

- Kamal S. Obeid, structural engineer, with a masters degree in Engineering from UC Berkeley and 30 years of engineering experience, [says](#):

Photos of the steel, evidence about how the buildings collapsed, the unexplainable collapse of WTC 7, evidence of thermite in the debris as well as several other red flags, are quite troubling indications of well planned and controlled demolition

- [Steven L. Faseler](#), structural engineer with over 20 years of experience in the design and construction industry:

World Trade Center 7 appears to be a controlled demolition. Buildings do not suddenly fall straight down by accident

- [Alfred Lee Lopez](#), with 48 years of experience in all types of buildings:

I agree the fire did not cause the collapse of the three buildings [please ignore any reference in this essay to the Twin Towers. This essay focuses solely on Building 7]. The most realistic cause of the collapse is that the buildings were imploded

- Ronald H. Brookman, structural engineer, with a masters degree in Engineering from UC Davis, [writes](#):

Why would all 47 stories of WTC 7 fall straight down to the ground in about seven seconds the same day [i.e. on September 11th]? It was not struck by any aircraft or engulfed in any fire. An independent investigation is justified for all three collapses including the surviving steel samples and the composition of the dust

- Graham John Inman [points out](#):

WTC 7 Building could not have collapsed as a result of internal fire and external debris. NO plane hit this building. This is the only case of a steel frame building collapsing through fire in the world. The fire on this building was small & localized therefore what is the cause?

- Paul W. Mason [notes](#):

In my view, the chances of the three buildings collapsing symmetrically into their own footprint,

at freefall speed, by any other means than by controlled demolition, are so remote that there is no other plausible explanation

- David Scott [says](#):

Near-freefall collapse violates laws of physics. Fire induced collapse is not consistent with observed collapse mode

- Nathan Lomba [states](#):

How did the structures collapse in near symmetrical fashion when the apparent precipitating causes were asymmetrical loading? The collapses defies common logic from an elementary structural engineering perspective.

Heat transmission (diffusion) through the steel members would have been irregular owing to differing sizes of the individual members; and, the temperature in the members would have dropped off precipitously the further away the steel was from the flames—just as the handle on a frying pan doesn't get hot at the same rate as the pan on the burner of the stove. These factors would have resulted in the structural framing furthest from the flames remaining intact and possessing its full structural integrity, i.e., strength and stiffness.

Structural steel is highly ductile, when subjected to compression and bending it buckles and bends long before reaching its tensile or shear capacity. Under the given assumptions, "if" the structure in the vicinity ... started to weaken, the superstructure above would begin to lean in the direction of the burning side. The opposite, intact, side of the building would resist toppling until the ultimate capacity of the structure was reached, at which point, a weak-link failure would undoubtedly occur. Nevertheless, the ultimate failure mode would have been a toppling of the upper floors to one side—much like the topping of a tall redwood tree—not a concentric, vertical collapse.

For this reason alone, I rejected the official explanation for the collapse

- Edward E. Knesl [writes](#):

We design and analyze buildings for the overturning stability to resist the lateral loads with the combination of the gravity loads. Any tall structure failure mode would be a fall over to its side. It is impossible that heavy steel columns could collapse at the fraction of the second within each story and subsequently at each floor below. We do not know the phenomenon of the high rise building to disintegrate internally faster than the free fall of the debris coming down from the top.

The engineering science and the law of physics simply doesn't know such possibility. Only very sophisticated controlled demolition can achieve such result, eliminating the natural dampening effect of the structural framing huge mass that should normally stop the partial collapse. The pancake theory is a fallacy, telling us that more and more energy would be generated to accelerate the collapse. Where would such energy would be coming from?

- [Antonio Artha](#), with 15+ years of experience in building design

Fire and impact were insignificant in all three buildings [Again, please ignore any reference to the Twin Towers ... this essay focuses solely on WTC7]. Impossible for the three to collapse at free-fall speed. Laws of physics were not suspended on 9/11, unless proven otherwise

- [Steven Francis Dusterwald](#):

The symmetrical "collapse" due to asymmetrical damage is at odds with the principles of structural mechanics

- [John S. Lovrovich](#):

It is virtually impossible for WTC building 7 to collapse as it did with the influence of sporadic fires. This collapse HAD to be planned

- [Travis McCoy](#), M.S. in structural engineering

- [James Milton Bruner](#), Major, U.S. Air Force, instructor and assistant professor in the Department of Engineering Mechanics & Materials, USAF Academy, and a technical writer and editor, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

- [Christopher Michael Bradbury](#):

It is very suspicious that fire brought down Building 7 yet the Madrid hotel fire was still standing after 24 hours of fire. This is very suspicious to me because I design buildings for a living

- [David Anthony Dorau](#), practicing structural engineer with 18 years' experience in the inspection and design of buildings under 5 stories tall, who worked as a policy analyst for the Office of Technology Assessment, an arm of the U.S. Congress providing independent research and reports on technological matters

- [Russell T. Connors](#), designed many buildings and other types of structures

- [Lester Jay Germanio](#), 20+ years experience

- [Daniel Metz](#), 26+ years experience

- [Jonathan Smolens](#), 11 years experience, with a specialty in forensic engineering

- [William Rice, P.E., structural engineer](#), former professor of Vermont Technical College

- [Marshall Casey Pfeiffer](#)

- [Paul A. Thomas](#)

- [Steven Merritt](#)

- [Kers Clausen](#)

- [Dennis Kollar, American structural engineer](#)

- [Doyle Winterton, American structural engineer](#) (retired)

- [David Topete](#)

The above is just a sample. [Many other structural engineers](#) have questioned the collapse of Building 7, as have numerous top

experts in other relevant disciplines, including:

- The top European expert on controlled building demolition, Danny Jowenko ([part 1](#), [part 2](#), [part 3](#))
- A demolition loader for the [world's top demolition company](#) (which is based in the United States), Tom Sullivan
- The former [head of the Fire Science Division of the government agency which claims that Building 7 collapsed due to fire](#) (the National Institute of Standards and Technology), who is one of the world's leading fire science researchers and safety engineers, a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering (Dr. James Quintiere)
- Harry G. Robinson, III – Professor and Dean Emeritus, School of Architecture and Design, Howard University. Past President of two major national architectural organizations – National Architectural Accrediting Board, 1996, and National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, 1992. In 2003 he was awarded the highest honor bestowed by the Washington Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the Centennial Medal. In 2004 he was awarded the District of Columbia Council of Engineering and Architecture Societies Architect of the Year award. Principal, TRG Consulting Global / Architecture, Urban Design, Planning, Project Strategies. Veteran U.S. Army, awarded the Bronze Star for bravery and the Purple Heart for injuries sustained in Viet Nam – [says](#):

The collapse was too symmetrical to have been eccentrically generated. The destruction was symmetrically initiated to cause the buildings to implode as they did

- A prominent physicist with 33 years of service for the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington, DC (Dr. David L. Griscom) said that the official theory for why Building 7 collapsed [“does not match the available facts” and supports the theory that the buildings were brought down by controlled demolition](#)

Watch this short video on Building 7 by Architects and Engineers (ignore any reference to the Twin Towers, deaths on 9/11, or any other topics other than WTC7):

Fish In a Barrel

Poking holes in the government's spin on Building 7 is so easy that it is like shooting fish in a barrel.

As just one example, the spokesman for the government agency which says that the building collapsed due to fire said there was *no molten metal* at ground zero:

The facts are a wee bit different:

- The structural engineer responsible for the design of the WTC, described [fires still burning and molten steel still running 21 days after the attacks](#) (page 3)
- A structural engineer who worked for the Trade Center's original designer saw ["streams of molten metal that leaked from the hot cores and flowed down broken walls inside the foundation hole."](#) (pages 31-32)
- An engineer stated in the September 3, 2002 issue of The Structural Engineer, ["They showed us many fascinating slides ranging from molten metal, which was still red hot weeks after the event."](#)
- New York firefighters recalled in a documentary film, ["heat so intense they encountered rivers of molten steel."](#)
- A NY firefighter described [molten steel flowing at ground zero, and said it was like a "foundry" or like "lava"](#).
- A public health advisor who arrived at Ground Zero on September 12, said that ["feeling the heat" and "seeing the molten steel" there reminded him of a volcano.](#)
- An employee of New Jersey's Task Force One Urban Search and Rescue witnessed ["Fires burn\[ing and molten steel flow\[ing\] in the pile of ruins still settling beneath her feet."](#)
- The head of a team of scientists studying the potential health effects of 9/11, reported, ["Fires are still actively burning and the smoke is very intense. In some pockets now being uncovered, they are finding molten steel."](#)
- According to a worker involved with the organizing of demolition, excavation and debris removal operations at ground zero, ["Underground it was still so hot that molten metal dripped down the sides of the wall from Building 6."](#)
- A reporter with rare access to the debris at ground zero ["descended deep below street level to areas where underground fires still burned and steel flowed in molten streams."](#)
- A witness said ["In the first few weeks, sometimes when a worker would pull a steel beam from the wreckage, the end of the beam would be dripping molten steel"](#)
- According to a member of New York Air National Guard's 109th Air Wing, who was at Ground Zero from September 22 to October 6, ["One fireman told us that there was still molten steel at the heart of the towers' remains. Firemen sprayed water](#)

[to cool the debris down but the heat remained intense enough at the surface to melt their boots.”](#)

- A retired professor of physics and atmospheric science said [“in mid-October when they would pull out a steel beam, the lower part would be glowing dull red, which indicates a temperature on the order of 500 to 600 °C. And we know that people were turning over pieces of concrete in December that would flash into fire—which requires about 300 °C. So the surface of the pile cooled rather rapidly, but the bulk of the pile stayed hot all the way to December.”](#)
- A fireman stated that [there were “oven” like conditions at the trade centers six weeks after 9/11.](#)
- Firemen and hazardous materials experts also stated that, six weeks after 9/11, [“There are pieces of steel being pulled out \[from as far as six stories underground\] that are still cherry red” and “the blaze is so ‘far beyond a normal fire’ that it is nearly impossible to draw conclusions about it based on other fires.”](#) (pay-per-view)
- A NY Department of Sanitation spokeswoman said [“for about two and a half months after the attacks, in addition to its regular duties, NYDS played a major role in debris removal – everything from molten steel beams to human remains...”](#)
- New York mayor Rudy Giuliani said [“They were standing on top of a cauldron. They were standing on top of fires 2,000 degrees that raged for a hundred days.”](#)
- As late as five months after the attacks, in February 2002, firefighter Joe O’Toole saw [a steel beam being lifted from deep underground at Ground Zero, which, he says, “was dripping from the molten steel.”](#)
- A rescue worker [“crawled through an opening and down crumpled stairwells to the subway five levels below ground. He remembers seeing in the darkness a distant, pinkish glow—molten metal dripping from a beam“](#)
- And see witness statements at the beginning of [this video](#)
- Indeed, not only was structural steel somehow melted on 9/11, but it was *evaporated*. As the New York Times [reports](#), an expert stated about World Trade Center building 7:

*A combination of an uncontrolled fire and the structural damage might have been able to bring the building down, some engineers said. But that would not explain steel members in the debris pile that appear to have been **partly evaporated** in extraordinarily high temperatures.*

(pay-per-view). Evaporation means [conversion from a liquid to a gas](#); so the steel beams in building 7 were subjected to temperatures high enough to melt *and* evaporate them

Please remember that firefighters sprayed *millions of gallons* of water on the fires, and also applied high-tech fire retardants. Specifically, 4 million gallons of water were dropped on Ground Zero within the first 10 days after September 11, according to the [U.S. Department of Energy’s Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratories](#):

Approximately three million gallons of water were hosed on site in the fire-fighting efforts, and 1 million gallons fell as rainwater, between 9/11 and 9/21

The spraying continued for months afterward (the 10 day period was simply the timeframe in which the DOE was sampling). [Enormous amounts of water were hosed on Ground Zero continuously, day and night](#):

“Firetrucks [sprayed] a nearly constant jet of water on [ground zero]. You couldn’t even begin to imagine how much water was pumped in there,” said Tom Manley of the Uniformed Firefighters Association, the largest fire department union. “It was like you were creating a giant lake.”

This photograph may capture a sense of how wet the ground became due to the constant spraying:

murphy Arguments Regarding the Collapse of the World Trade Center Evaporate Upon Inspection
In addition, the fires were sprayed with [thousands of gallons of high tech fire-retardants](#).

The fact that there were raging fires and molten metal even after the application of massive quantities of water and fire retardants shows how silly the government spokesman's claim is.

Again, this has nothing to do with "inside job" ... no one was killed in the collapse of Building 7, no wars were launched based on a rallying cry of "remember the Solomon Brothers building", and no civil liberties were lost based on a claim that we have to prevent future WTC7 tragedies.

It is merely meant to show that government folks sometimes lie ... even about issues tangentially related to 9/11.

Share this:



Related

[Prosecute Bush and Company for their Criminal Negligence and Cover-Up Regarding 9/11](#)

January 27, 2009
In "General"

[Did the Saudi Intelligence Chief and Other High-Ranking Officials Trade on Inside Information Regarding 9/11?](#)

October 17, 2013
In "Business / Economics"

[Why Is Washington's Blog Defending the "Official" Version of 9/11?](#)

September 16, 2012
In "General"

This entry was posted in [General](#), [Politics / World News](#), [Science / Technology](#). Bookmark the [permalink](#).

184 Comments Washington's Blog

Login ▾

Recommend 2 Share

Sort by Best ▾



Join the discussion...

**John S** · 2 years ago

Is this a joke? This was not an inside because they did a CD? Silverstein himself admitted to such, until informed that this takes months to set up. I agree with you that WTC7 WAS imploded. It's the smoking gun.

12 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**truth4wtc7** · 2 years ago

Anyone who thinks no one died in Building 7 needs to google "Barry Jennings" and watch a few youtube videos of him BEFORE his untimely DEATH. (he was killed because of who he was, what he saw, and what he said about WTC-7) This article is an abomination... an INSULT to anyones intelligence... A sad JOKE!

9 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**J fremlin** · 2 years ago

Your theory is flawed. So are you admitting that 9/11 WAS a false flag attack, because without that your theory holds no water. Who put the explosives in building 7? And did the same people wire up the WTC complex. For your theory to be sound, then 9/11 WAS in fact an inside job.

7 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**David A .Hereaux** → J fremlin · 21 hours ago

Now you've got it.

^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**Wolfen Batroach** · 3 years ago

Your logic is fallacious. I suppose one could call it "arguing the consequent". That no one was killed in the demolition of WTC7 does not _therefore_ prove a damn thing. My understanding is that most truthers see 7 as a "dud". It was supposed to be destroyed that morning along with the others. The Insiders corrected the malfunction and blew it that afternoon. To separate 7 from the rest of that day's events, to be convinced it was a controlled demolition, but maintain it was not an inside job is just plain silly.

6 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**Pooua** → Wolfen Batroach · 2 years ago

Why would the Insiders bother blowing Building 7? Indeed, why would the Insiders bother with WTC at all? Exactly what were the motivations of the Insiders supposed to be?

1 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**JusticeFor911** → Pooua · 2 years ago

Larry Silverstein had a magic ball that told him to insure the buildings for "terrorist attacks". In February of 2002, Silverstein was awarded \$861,000,000 for his insurance claims from Industrial Risk Insurers. His initial investment in WTC 7 was only \$386,000,000. I'd say nearly half of \$1,000,000,000.00 was the primary cause to include this building with the towers. Keep in mind that President Bush's brother Marvin was a principal in the company Securacom that provided security for the WTC, United Airlines and Dulles International Airport. Are dots connecting yet?

3 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**Pooua** → JusticeFor911 · 2 years ago

If you buy a new car, you take out full coverage insurance on it. Insuring billion-dollar buildings is standard procedure, especially when one had already suffered a terrorist attack. You insinuation is nothing but gossip and suggestion.

No, Securacom did not provide security for WTC; that's the job of the Port Authority of NY & NJ. Securacom had a contract to perform a limited service for PANYNJ, and Marvin Bush was only a bit player (he was on the board of directors) in the company. Your paranoid ramblings are lies.

2 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**IBSHILLIN** → Pooua · 9 months ago

Perhaps after the first couple of attempted attacks on the WTC in the 90's they had a good look at what would happen if an attack was successful. Perhaps they then decided that the massive collateral damage from a partial or messy collapse could be greatly reduced by having the buildings ready to be brought down in a controlled way.

All this would have to be kept secret as noone would work in a building lined with explosives. However the insurance companies, and the owner of the building would know, and this would explain the comments made by silverstein (comments that he himself never clarified).

This may all be completely wrong, but lets face it, explosives did bring these buildings down.

2 ^ | ▾ · Reply · Share ›

**Pooua** → IBSHILLIN · 9 months ago

Twitter

翻译 अनुवाद 翻訳 번역 ترجمة

Select Language

Powered by  Translate

© 2007 - 2015 Washington's Blog

Proudly powered by WordPress.

[Home](#) > [General](#) > China: Doomed If You Do, Doomed If You Don't