

Reply to Stephen Phillips
(“A physicist critiques Steven Jones' new paper”, May 21, 2007)

By Steven E. Jones

I will respond to points raised regarding my paper <http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JonesWTC911SciMethod.pdf> by Stephen Phillips (http://janedoe0911.tripod.com/physicist_critiques_jones.html). Described below are points on which I agree with the Phillips and points on which Phillips misrepresents my stated views.

The astute reader will note that the questions Phillips has posed are already answered for the most part in the peer-reviewed papers published in the Journal of 9/11 Studies and in my presentation given April 14, 2007 at the University of Texas at Austin: <http://www.anomalytv.com/site/archives/1737>

This Austin talk provides EDS spectra for iron-aluminum-rich microspheres, answering a number of Phillips' questions (some time ago).

Points on which we agree

1. Phillips: *Let us not forget what the 9/11 truth movement is about. It is about forcing a re-investigation of 9/11 so that the real mass-murderers are brought to justice.*

Agreed. I made this point in detail in my paper from last year, “What are the Goals in the 9/11 Truth community?”¹ The main goal (it is argued) **is not to have a complete theoretical explanation of the destruction WTC buildings based on limited available evidence – but rather to raise sufficient forensic evidence to bring about and support a criminal investigation and trial.** It is by getting to this needed release of data that we know is being withheld (by NIST and the FBI among others) and an in-depth investigation (including subpoenaing and questioning witnesses under oath) that we will secure the release of data and justice. My research on WTC 7 and the use of thermite (and other areas) has this goal in mind. Note that one person cannot be expected to pursue all lines of inquiry – and I have encouraged (in talks and papers) researchers to pursue lines of research with the goal of amassing evidence to motivate and support a serious investigation of 9/11.

2. Phillips: *I do not deny that there is evidence suggestive of thermate present at WTC.*

Glad to hear that – for there is considerable hard evidence for the use of thermate at WTC, sufficient along with other evidence for malfeasance (money made on put-options on AA and UAL is one salient example) to necessitate a criminal investigation NOW.

3. Phillips: *My current view is that thermate was probably not used during the clean up at Ground Zero*

Amen to that also!

¹ <http://journalof911studies.com/letters/c/what-are-the-goals-of-the-911-community-by-steven-jones.pdf>

4. Phillips: *Jones then goes through arguments well-known to students of 9/11 research for WTC 7 being a controlled demolition and for the Law of Conservation of Momentum not allowing the two towers to collapse at near free-fall speed if their floors had been dropping on top of one another like dominoes. So far, so good.*

Thank you – and note that I cover a lot more than just the evidence for the use of aluminothermics (i.e., thermite analogs). In the paper I also point to recent papers in the Journal on the subject, including papers by Gordon Ross and Professor Kuttler on the collapse (their term) of the Towers.

5. Phillips: *“...even if Wood is correct about very hot aluminium not looking silvery but glowing, it is not necessarily fatal to his cause. She would still have a hard time explaining what (if not thermite or some other agent) heated aluminium cladding around girders to the 1000 degrees Centigrade or more needed to increase its emissivity and to lose its reflectivity enough for it to glow yellow-orange like the molten metal that flowed out of the corner of the South Tower. A temperature as high as this is rarely seen even in momentary flashovers in building fires. It behooves her to explain how aluminium in the tower could have reached a temperature high enough for it to look like this if it had been merely heated by office fires.”*

Agreed – and see these published papers which similarly challenge claims of Judy Wood regarding molten aluminum:

[Glowing Aluminum Disinformation](#) (Feb 8, 2007) Brian Vasquez

[Molten What?](#) May 16, 2007 Jerry Lobdill

[A description of molten aluminum poured onto rusty steel](#) Wes Lifferth (March 2007)

Points on which Phillips misrepresents my views

1. *“We should also be wary of research that focuses only on one hypothesis and rejects (even ridicules, as Jones does) other possibilities for no better reason than that they involve physics about which the scientist (in this case, Jones) knows nothing.”*

“Focussing on only one dubious reason for the damage to the WTC and mindlessly dismissing all other possibilities as unworthy of investigation amounts to poor science. How can one make that judgement until one has conducted a study sufficiently thorough to decide whether other causes of the destruction are plausible? The credibility of the movement is not helped by a mainstream scientist if his evidence for one of the causes of the collapse of the towers is refutable and if he discourages without good reason other avenues of investigation that might explain what he found

I do not focus on “*on only one dubious reason for the damage to the WTC*” nor am I “*mindlessly dismissing all other possibilities as unworthy of investigation.*” The charges are unfair and untrue. The critique by Phillips appears in Judy Wood’s site, where the “Star Wars

beam” notion is promoted along with the notion that no big Boeings hit the Towers – and that is fine to consider these hypotheses. I do not object to that consideration. At the same time, it is desirable using scientific methodology to critically and fairly evaluate such ideas, as is done in several papers in *the Journal of 9/11 Studies*. For example (from the index of the Journal), here are papers addressing the suggestion that there were no big planes which hit the WTC.

[Interpreting the Boeing-767 Deceleration During Impact with the WTC Tower: Center of Mass Versus Tail-end Motion, and Instantaneous Versus Average Velocity](#) (April 11, 2007) Gregory S. Jenkins, PhD

[Letter added to A Critical Review of WTC 'No Plane' Theories](#) (March 21, 2007)
Eric Salter

And here are papers addressing the idea of a “Star-Wars Beam” being used at the WTC:

[“Scientific Critique of Judy Wood’s Paper “The Star Wars Beam Weapon”](#) (January 9, 2007)
James Gourley

[Why the damage to WTC Bldgs. 3 and 6 does not support the beam weapon hypothesis and some correspondence with Dr. James Fetzer about it](#) (Updated March 20, 2007)
Tony Szamboti

[The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center](#) Gregory S. Jenkins

Additionally, there are papers addressing various speculations put forth by Judy Woods and Morgan Reynolds:

["A study of some issues raised in a paper by Wood & Reynolds"](#) (January 11, 2007)
Dr. Frank Legge.

[A Brief Analysis of Dr. Judy Wood’s Request for Correction to NIST: the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly](#) (May 15, 2007) Greg Jenkins and Arabesque

[Responses to "Brief Analysis" Letter, by Judy Wood; Greg Jenkins and Arabesque](#) (May 15, 2007) **Judy Wood; Greg Jenkins and Arabesque**

["Thermite Hypothesis versus Controlled Demolition Hypothesis: a response to "The Scientific Method Applied to the Thermite Hypothesis "](#) (April 17, 2007) Arabesque

The above is just a sampling of the papers involved in the free and open scientific discussion regarding 9/11 at the Journal. Let me add one more:

[The American Empire and 9/11](#) by **David Ray Griffin**

I strongly encourage this discourse and have invited (as co-editor of the *Journal of 9/11 Studies*) the proponents of various alternative theories to present their detailed ideas in peer-reviewed publications. Note that Judy Wood accepted my invitation and has two letters in the *Journal* which one may read (she requested publication without peer review and we honored that request). Since the end of December 2006, about 44 papers have been published in the *Journal of 9/11 Studies* in less than five months, eclipsing the number of peer-reviewed papers published last year on the subject.

To suggest that I discourage discussion of various lines of inquiry is shown to be egregiously wrong.

2. Phillips: *“He realises that these and other photos taken at Ground Zero of incandescent fires emitting sparks could weaken his claim that the thermate he thinks he found came only from the towers.”*

Mind-reader?² I “realise” nothing of the sort. One of the photos shown by Phillips clearly shows a red cage of the sort used with gear for oxyacetylene torches seen in numerous photos and known to be used at ground zero, and the cage could be present in the other photo, but obscured by sparks generated by an oxyacetylene torch (photos given below).



Furthermore, the microspheres contain abundant aluminum as well as (typically) potassium and sulfur and so are NOT from melted steel; further discussion is provided in my

² Dr. Phillips is noted for his writings on ESP, e.g., *Extra-Sensory Perception of Quarks*, First Edition 1980, ISBN: 0-8356-0227-3, and *ESP of Quarks and Superstrings* / by Stephen Phillips--Bangalore: New age international (P)ltd., 1999. ISBN : 81-224-1209-2.

presentation given April 14, 2007 at the University of Texas at Austin:

<http://www.anomalytv.com/site/archives/1737>

This Austin talk provides EDS spectra for iron-aluminum-rich microspheres, answering a number of Phillips' questions. I have considered other possible explanations in my talks.

3. Phillips: **“Whoops! WTC 7? Who has suggested that thermate was used for WTC 7? It was a classic controlled demolition! There is no video evidence for thermate burning away before the demolition itself. This is an example of how ridiculously obsessed Jones is in invoking thermate as a causative factor for the collapse of every building in the WTC.”**

Dr. Phillips evidently missed the evidence I presented for the use of thermate at WTC 7 in particular, given in my paper on pages 75-76. I quote from my paper:

“The significance of the work on a [steel] **sample from Building 7** and a structural column from one of the twin towers becomes apparent only when one sees these heavy chunks of damaged metal. A one-inch [steel] column has been reduced to half-inch thickness. Its edges--which are curled like a paper scroll--have been thinned to almost razor sharpness. Gaping holes--some larger than a silver dollar--let light shine through a formerly solid steel flange. This Swiss cheese appearance shocked all of the fire-wise professors, who expected to see distortion and bending--but not holes.”³

The “fire-wise professors” had evidently not seen such effects on steel due to fires in buildings before, since they were “shocked” by the thinning and holes in the steel members from WTC 7 and from the Towers. Now we can point to a source for the high-temperature attack on the steel including sulfur/sulfidation (sulfur added to thermite to make thermate) AND the oxidation (metal oxides, KMnO_4 , etc.) AND the high temperatures observed (thermate reactions take place at around 2500 °C or so). The confluence of WTC data and thermate data provides a very compelling case that thermite variants were used in the destruction of the World Trade Center. And the use of thermite in this way requires pre-positioning of the thermite (and probably other) cutter-charges over time, which in turn implies that at least some of the 9/11 events were orchestrated and intentional. A serious investigation will now be required to determine the persons involved. <http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JonesWTC911SciMethod.pdf>

I did not and do not claim that thermate was used in the other WTC buildings.

4. Phillips: **“When forced by public pressure to respond to evidence of thermate at WTC, officials in the American government will no doubt say that it was, indeed, used during the clean-up— whether it was or not! Who, then, will be able to prove that they are lying? Where is your smoking gun then, Dr Jones?”**

³ (“The “Deep Mystery” of Melted Steel,” WPI Transformations, Spring 2002, <http://www.wpi.edu/News/Transformations/2002Spring/steel.html>)

A taunting question – but not so fast – these “officials in the American government” will then have to explain:

- a. Details of the chemicals used in the thermate and their quantities, and this had better check out with the chemical signatures observed in the microspheres or they will be caught in a lie. (Hint: we see more than one set of chemical “fingerprints” in the microspheres, demonstrating the use of more than one type of thermite variant. Thus, they will need to identify the various thermite analogs used, and why different formulations were used).
- b. They will need to show who purchased the chemicals and how much – and the compositions will need to agree quantitatively with the thermate-residue spheres seen in the dust.
- c. The distances traveled by the microspheres will need to be accounted for – as these microspheres are seen five and ten blocks away from ground zero. This will not be so easy if they claim the spheres originate from use of thermite variants during clean-up. (During the destruction of the Towers, on the other hands, we see dust clouds traveling for many blocks...)
- c. The government officials (in Phillips’ hypothetical) will need to explain who was authorized to use such dangerous substances during clean-up. Insurance companies will also be interested in these “government” admissions – the safety and legal issues involved in using such highly-dangerous chemical reactions for clean-up are obvious.
- d. Did these residues, these metallic microspheres, not affect the respiratory systems of the clean-up workers? Who is responsible for their illnesses if such chemicals were used during clean-up then? There are lawsuits involved in the hurt caused by the EPA’s “false reassurances” regarding the toxicity of the WTC dust – and now are we to suppose that government officials will add to this conundrum by lying about use of thermite during clean-up?

5. *“ignoring anomalous evidence (oddly burnt or melted cars, cookie-cutter holes in WTC 5 and WTC 6, etc), which Fetzer, Wood and others judge cannot be so simply explained.”*

Interesting – because I am not ignoring this evidence at all! Indeed, I discuss the “**oddly burnt or melted cars**” in the very paper which Phillips is critiquing. (Pages 66-67 in my paper.) And I have been discussing this evidence for a number of months, as evidence for the use of aluminothermics which are known to cause corrosion and melting of vehicles. (See also papers in the *Journal of 9/11 Studies* by Gourley, Moore, Legge and Szamboti.)

The holes in other WTC buildings are analyzed in a paper by Tony Szamboti published in the Journal, which is why I do not need to consider the matter again in this current paper. Szamboti points out that falling debris explains the observed holes very well and challenges the notion (promoted in this case by James Fetzer and Judy Wood) that a “star-wars beam” (DEW) made the holes seen: [Why the damage to WTC Bldgs. 3 and 6 does not support the beam weapon hypothesis and some correspondence with Dr. James Fetzer about it](#) (Updated March 20, 2007).

One paper does not need to cover all topics nor can it realistically do so. However, the *Journal of 9/11 Studies* covers a very broad set of 9/11-related areas, answers nearly all of the questions posed by Phillips, and encourages further discussion and research. Serious empirically-based contributions are invited. We are attempting to discuss many lines of evidence and to consider the various alternative hypotheses -- some of which are already found to be compelling, some very weak, as we look at the empirical evidence and perform quantitative analyses.

In particular, the “official government theory” for the destruction of the WTC buildings and blaming it all on Muslim hijackers, is found to contrary to the laws of physics and to many empirical facts which we are bringing forth. The collection of about sixty peer-reviewed papers (the number is growing) in this Journal by scientists, engineers and other experts supports a serious re-investigation of 9/11 with hard evidence and solid quantitative analyses. In my opinion, we do not need to answer every question regarding 9/11 based on limited available data nor do we need to endlessly debate each alternative theory. We need and we now have sufficient empirical evidence to motivate a criminal investigation and trial – with subpoena power. That is where details of precisely HOW the crimes of 9/11 were committed and the names of WHO were involved will likely emerge.¹