Debunking of debunkers 2.

Following my interview with Kevin Barrett and Gordon Duff aired on 19 Feb 2011 (available here): http://eddieleaks.org/barrett-khalezov-duff/
http://www.radiodujour.com/mp3/20110218-kevin-barret-dimitri-khalezov-gordon-duff.mp3
http://www.veteranstoday.com/2011/02/21/dimitri-khalezov-gordon-duff-and-kevin-barrett-nuclear-terrorism/?utm_source=twitterfeed&utm_medium=twitter

Kevin Barrett received a lot of comments. Some of the comments sent to him must be addressed. Here they are addressed.

This was forwarded to me by Kevin Barrett with his note:

A point-by-point response to the article below, ideally in the form of a paper, would be better than email exchanges...
-K

http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/a/Hard-Evidence-Rebudiates-the-Hypothesis-that-Mini-Nukes-were-used-on-the-wtc-towers-by-steven-jones.pdf

Conclusion and a challenge
The hard physical evidence presented is strongly against the hypothesis that mini-nukes destroyed the WTC Towers:

1. Observation of tritium (an important component of hydrogen-bomb fuel) at WTC sites at the few nano-curie level only. This is strong evidence against the mini-nuke hypothesis.
11
2. The fact that radioactive iodine concentrations were actually *lower* in the upper/WTC debris-filled layers.
3. Radioactive hot-spots in NYC were found to be due to *radium*, which is traceable to industrial uses (not bombs). This in itself does not rule out mini-nukes, but these data certainly do not support the mini-nuke hypothesis.
4. Lioy *et al.* report that radioactivity from thorium, uranium, actinium series and other radionuclides is at or near the background level for WTC dust.
5. Nuclear activation or residual "fall-out" radioactivity (above background) was NOT observed, in tests performed by the author on actual WTC samples. This result is consistent with the low Iodine-131 measured by independent researchers (point 2 above) and the low radionuclide counts (point 4 above) and again provides compelling evidence against the mini-nuke-at-Towers hypothesis.
6. No fatalities due to radiation "burning" were reported near ground zero. William Rodriguez survived the North Tower collapse.
7. No observed melting of glass due to the collapse-process of the Towers.
8. One more: The mini-nuke idea fails completely for WTC 7 where vertically-directed plumes of dust were absent during the collapse, and the building fell quite neatly onto its own footprint. (Molten metal was observed under the WTC7 rubble as well.)

The requested point-to-point response:

Conclusion and a challenge The hard physical evidence presented is strongly against the hypothesis that mini-nukes destroyed the WTC Towers: ---------- I have never claimed that the WTC was destroyed by "mini-nukes". I claimed it was destroyed by 150-kiloton thermonuclear (aka 'hydrogen') charges exploded deep underground.

1. Observation of tritium (an important component of hydrogen-bomb fuel) at WTC sites at the few nano-curie level only. This is strong evidence against the mini-nuke hypothesis. ---------- I am not sure about "nano-curie level", because I am not a scientist and I haven't participate in sampling and analyzing, but I could say that the 55x times or so elevated levels of Tritium were found DESPITE the fact that firefighters CONTINUOUSLY, FOR MANY DAYS poured HUGE amounts of waters into the WTC cavities thus causing a GREAT DEAL OF DISSOLVING of the disputed substances. And yes, I agree that the elevated levels of thermonuclear fuel are the primary indication that thermonuclear charges were used. And this is exactly what I claim.

2. The fact that radioactive iodine concentrations were actually lower in the upper/WTC debris-filled layers. ---------- of course, it is logical to presume so. Because the actual nuclear reaction happened deep underground. So, it is logical to presume that the lower you go the higher radioactivity levels you encounter and the vice-versa. This perfectly matches my actual claims.

3. Radioactive hot-spots in NYC were found to be due to radium, which is traceable to industrial uses (not bombs). This in itself does not rule out mini-nukes, but these data certainly do not support the mini-nuke hypothesis. ---------- total garbage. Absolutely unsubstantiated claim tantamount to a claim that "there is a life on the Mars" or that "Timothy McVeigh was indeed put to death and not just given a new identity" (since nobody is going to verify it anyway). First of all, why the admitted "radioactive hot-spots" were found whatsoever? If it were kerosene or so-called "nano-thermite" that did the actual demolition job? Was kerosene radioactive? Or was the so-called "nano-thermite" radioactive? Radioactivity "hot-spots" were due to thermonuclear explosions underground and not to "industrial uses (not bombs)". And it was not "Radium", found at ground zero, but Barium, Strontium, Thorium, Cerium, Lanthanum, Yttrium – all those classical radio-nuclides that are typically left by nuclear explosions. Plus Trititum that is typically left by thermonuclear explosions.

4. Lioy et al. report that radioactivity from thorium, uranium, actinium series and other radionuclides is at or near the background level for WTC dust. ---------- but why should it be in the WTC dust? When dust was created well above the spot of the actual underground nuclear explosions? The WTC dust owes its existence to merely mechanical processes – it was created by the pressure wave. The WTC dust has nothing to do with radioactivity, indeed. But the method proposed by Lioy at. al should not dupe you. They shamelessly exploit your supposed ignorance. The radioactivity was concentrated inside deep underground cavities and was gradually released with vapors, and not with dust.

5. Nuclear activation or residual "fall-out" radioactivity (above background) was NOT observed, in tests performed by the author on actual WTC samples. This result is consistent with the low Iodine-131 measured by independent researchers (point 2 above) and the low radionuclide counts (point 4 above) ---------- lie. Blatant lie. These shameless guys take a good use of the fact that the actual radioactivity measurements were classified by the US Government. It should not dupe you into believing them.

and again provides compelling evidence against the mini-nuke-at-Towers hypothesis. ---------- I have never claimed the "mini-nukes" hypothesis. I claimed that 3x150 kiloton thermonuclear charges (8 times the Hiroshima bomb each) were used to destroy the three WTC buildings.

6. No fatalities due to radiation "burning" were reported near ground zero. ---------- yes, because the "radiation burning" (aka "beta-burning") results from being subjected to an instant flow of fast electrons (aka "beta-radiation") flying to every direction from a hypocenter of a nuclear explosion. Since in that case the actual explosions occurred deep underground all their primary radiations (X-, beta- and gamma- inclusive) were stopped by the surrounding rock and could not reach the surface. However, it does not mean that there were "no radiation poisoning" on account of the most dangerous alpha-radiation. The alpha-particles were carried by vapors ascending from the deep underground cavities beneath the debris and the gullible ground zero responders (who did not bother to open a pre-9/11 dictionary and to check what 'ground zero' did mean in the pre-9/11 English language) were freely inhaling these alpha-particles. And now all of them developed classical chronic radiation sickness. Many of them died from leukemia and other kinds of radiation-related cancers. And many are dying right now.

William Rodriguez survived the North Tower collapse. ---------- as far as I can recollect William Rodriguez survived not the nuclear explosion that actually collapsed the Tower, but he survived a so-far unexplained explosion in the basement that coincided in time with the explosion on the upper floors (aka the "plane's impact"). Rodriguez got out of the Tower well before the Tower was demolished. Because if not, only microscopic dust would remain of poor Willy's mortal body.

7. No observed melting of glass due to the collapse-process of the Towers. ---------- the "pre-collapse process" took not more than a few milliseconds. Considering that waves generally travel in metals at a speed of roughly 4 kilometers per second while the Twin Towers were ~350 meters (I mean their pulverized parts; the entire Towers were ~415 meters high), we could conclude that the entire "pre-collapse process" took about 0.086 second only. Why should any "melting of glass" occur? Especially considering that it was a "cold" process – effects of the "pressure wave" that had nothing to do with high temperatures? This argument is taken out of the blue. It is the same if I ask why do you believe that the United States are located on the American continent, while crocodiles do not live in Siberian rivers?

8. One more: The mini-nuke idea fails completely for WTC 7 where vertically-directed plumes of dust were absent during the collapse, and the building fell quite neatly onto its own footprint. (Molten metal was observed under the WTC7 rubble as well.) ---------- as I have said many times I have never claimed any "mini-nukes" were used. I claimed that three huge 150 kiloton thermonuclear charges were used. The WTC-7 was much shorter than the WTC Twin Towers and as such it was "dustified" in its entirety, without any heavy undamaged tops that could pressure downwards (such as in the case with the Twins). That is why the WTC-7 was instantly transformed into a compressed pile of dust that was about to disintegrate under its own weight. And it indeed happened. It started to crumble from its lowest parts (that logically sustained the heaviest pressure compare to the upper parts of that "dustified" structure). And so the former building went down. But it went down too fast, so some dust from the upper parts of the WTC-7 could not catch up with it and so it was "delaying". It is clearly visible on available movies showing the WTC-7 collapse. There are clearly visible two different sources of dust - ascending dust from beneath and "delaying" dust left by the falling WTC-7's top that went down too fast. Thus your claim that what you call "vertically-directed plumes of dust" allegedly did not exist is not true. Something of this kind is clearly visible on the WTC-7 collapse's videos.

For more of my answers to debunkers, please, get and read this file:

http://www.911-truth.net/!_Debunking_the_debunkers-_famous_physicist_Jan_Zeman_vs_infamous_impostor_Dimitri_Khalezov.pdf

Sincerely yours,
Dimitri.