“...If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it. The lie can be maintained only for such time as the State can shield the people from the political, economic and/or military consequences of the lie. It thus becomes vitally important for the State to use all of its powers to repress dissent, for the truth is the mortal enemy of the lie, and thus by extension, the truth is the greatest enemy of the State.”

- Joseph Goebbels, Reich Minister of Propaganda in Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1945.

“...society rests ultimately on the belief that Big Brother is omnipotent and that the Party is infallible. But since in reality Big Brother is not omnipotent and the party is not infallible, there is need for an unwearying, moment-to-moment flexibility in the treatment of facts. The keyword here is “blackwhite”. Like so many Newspeak words, this word has two mutually contradictory meanings. Applied to an opponent, it means the habit of impudently claiming that black is white, in contradiction of the plain facts. Applied to a Party member, it means a loyal willingness to say that black is white when Party discipline demands this. But it means also the ability to believe that black is white, and more, to know that black is white, and to forget that one has ever believed the contrary. This demands a continuous alteration of the past, made possible by the system of thought which really embraces all the rest, and which is known in Newspeak as “doublethink”. The alteration of the past is necessary for two reasons, one of which is subsidiary and, so to speak, precautionary...”

- George Orwell, “Nineteen Eighty-Four”.

“...We must speak the truth about terror. Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th: malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists, themselves, away from the guilty...”


Yes. Agree. Let us do it, Mr. Bush. Let us stop tolerating those outrageous conspiracy theories right away...

Let’s begin with the most outrageous of all of the 9/11 conspiracy theories – with the one that states that aviation fuel (“kerosene”) could instantly “melt” huge amounts of structural steel into fluffy microscopic dust and that the location where such a spectacular feat occurred could possibly be known as “ground zero”...
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The third truth about September 11

The official story of September 11th is a bag of lies and this seems to be a proven fact within communities outside the mainstream. What really did happen? A new series of revelations by a former member of Soviet nuclear intelligence has shocked even those who believed they had a clear view behind the curtain.

Dimitri Khalezov

How exactly did the WTC buildings collapse? The analytical work of an expert on nuclear explosions leads us to a shocking conclusion.

When ordinary people saw how two planes struck the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York and how the Twin Towers then collapsed into clouds of dust during the 9/11 events, they were too shocked by the incidents to subject the events to any level of scrutiny. Since then, the odd notion has been embedded into people’s minds: that hollow aluminum planes could supposedly penetrate thick steel buildings in their entirety and that aviation fuel (kerosene) could supposedly “melt” these steel buildings into fluffy microscopic dust...

Sooner or later, these ridiculous notions need to be discarded. The Twin Towers’ collapses had absolutely nothing to do with neither planes nor the fires which resulted as a result of the “crashes”. This is an obvious fact that occupies the minds of millions of Americans who are unhappy with the official interpretation of the World Trade Center’s destruction over the course of at least the last 6 years. After the initial shock caused by the 9/11 events had subsided, many people began to realize there were simply too many inconsistencies in the official version.
First off, what caught their attention was that the order in which the Twin Towers collapsed did not correspond to the order in which they were struck by planes. The South Tower, which was hit second, collapsed first, and the North Tower, which was hit first, collapsed second. This meant that it took the “fires” 1 hour and 42 minutes to “collapse” the first Tower and only 56 minutes to “collapse” the second Tower. Considering that the fires in both Towers were caused by approximately the same quantities of kerosene and considering that the Towers were Twins (i.e., they were absolutely identical in their strength), this became the first clear indication that their collapses had nothing to do with fire alone. The next realization came after 9/11 researchers began to consider that World Trade Center building #7 (an enormously strong modern steel-frame 47-story high skyscraper) had also collapsed in a similar manner later on that afternoon on that very same day, but without having been hit by a plane. If the collapse of the Twin Towers was to be officially blamed on kerosene carried by “planes”, then the collapse of WTC-7 was unexplainable to such an extent that the official Report of the 9/11 Commission preferred not to mention the collapse of WTC-7 at all – as if the collapse of a 47-story high modern skyscraper was not worthy of a single mention. Comparison of these three events and a lot of irregularities surrounding their collapses brought the first 9/11 researchers to the realization that they were being lied to by the authorities and that the destruction of the World Trade Center had nothing to do with kerosene or any “planes” because no planes were needed in the first place. The mere collapse of WTC-7 later on that same afternoon on September 11, 2001 proved that no actual terrorist planes were required in the first place and that the collapse of the World Trade Center buildings would have occurred regardless– irrespective of any “planes”. Someone simply needed the World Trade Center buildings to collapse and that is why they collapsed. From this point on, the so-called “9/11 Truth Movement” had begun.

People then began to accuse the US Government of having intentionally demolished the World Trade Center in an industrial process known as a “controlled demolition”. More and more people in America started to accuse their own government of having been the main culprit behind the 9/11 attacks and eventually more than 65% of the US population expressed their disbelief in the official explanation of the 9/11 attacks and of the World Trade Center’s collapse. In fact, anybody who has watched contemporary 9/11 coverage closely enough can remember the following screenshots where a “third explosion” was mentioned:

Video - YouTube direct link:  http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7oZ1h8mYwbw

Here it is – the seditious video footage by CNN where lines of text were shown that insisted it was a certain “third explosion” that first “shattered” and then – “collapsed” the South Tower of the World Trade Center. The North Tower (the one with an antenna) had not yet collapsed at that moment. It would fall later on – from a “fourth explosion”, but CNN by that time would receive a severe reprimand from the so-called “good guys” and would never again dare mention such seditious words as “explosions”. The Twin Towers of the World Trade Center would be declared as “destroyed by kerosene”, while WTC
building 7 (which was not hit by any plane from alleged “terrorists”) – “destroyed by diesel oil” (since the storing of diesel oil was indeed kept in WTC-7 for emergency power generators).

And, understandably enough, most people who disagree with the official “kerosene” theory accuse the US Government of having intentionally demolished the World Trade Center. However, they don’t actually have much understanding of demolition processes in general and more specifically of the World Trade Center’s actual construction. That is why quite a few “conspiracy theories” have emerged that range from claims that the WTC was supposedly “wired with explosives” to claims that it was supposedly demolished by so-called “nano-thermite” (a mystic substance never heard of until now) which they claim was supposedly “used as a coating” on each and every steel piece of the Twin Towers’ bearing structures. There are even more bizarre conspiracy theories that pin the collapse of the Twin Towers’ on supposed “high-tech weapons” – such as laser beams originating from space for example. Of course, none of these conspiracy theorists actually ever agree with one another and they focus their time not only on accusing the US Government of having been the main culprit behind 9/11, but they also accuse each other of “muddying the waters of the truth”. The problem with all these conspiracy theorists in general is that they do not really know what happened to the World Trade Center and, more importantly, they don’t know why it happened.

The author of this article will try to present his readers with something different. Instead of presenting just another “conspiracy theory”, he will instead present his expert opinion and eyewitness testimony along with his experience and knowledge from his former position in the Soviet Army. As a result of this approach, he hopes the reader will receive a far better explanation in regards to the demolition of the WTC that which he or she could never have received on any Internet forum dealing specifically with the WTC conspiracy.

Ground Zero and ground zero.

To begin with, I would like to remind everyone that the location of the former World Trade Center in New York is called “Ground Zero” in English. Many people don’t seem to realize what the term “ground zero” actually means and how important this is from an evidentiary point of view. Most of us just accepted “Ground Zero” as some sort of proper noun – as if it were the name of a city or the name of a ship. However, not many people today realize that the rather peculiar name “ground zero” was assigned to the location of the former WTC much too prematurely for it to have been an actual “Proper Noun” when referring to the WTC. Almost immediately after the collapse of the Twin Towers (and just a few hours before the collapse of the WTC-7) – i.e. by noon on September 11, 2001, almost every government official and even some news reporters had already begun referring to the location as “ground zero”. All news releases printed the next day even referred to the location of the former WTC as “ground zero” and this particular term continued to be spelled out in lower-case letters. The usage of the term “ground zero” in relation to the former WTC area continued even throughout September 12, 2001 and several news agencies even continued using the term “ground zero” in lower-case letters throughout September 13, 2001. Only then, as if someone had caught on, did this particular term immediately become elevated in status to “Ground Zero” with Capital Letters. As such, it, at last, became a Proper Noun. But what about the term “ground zero” in lower case letters – i.e. not in the status of a Proper Noun yet?

Why would officials have referred to the WTC almost immediately after its collapse by this particularly peculiar term? Was it a mistake caused by all the confusion going on in the midst of the unprecedented 9/11 events? I would answer “yes”. It was definitely a mistake that occurred during the overall confusion in that this particular term slipped out to the public. It was, however, not a mistake in the sense that the wrong term was being used to refer to the WTC as “ground zero” – simply because it was just too early at the moment to have chosen a Proper Name for the site where the WTC had just been destroyed. In fact, Civil Defense specialists were absolutely correct when they designated the area as “ground zero”. There was absolutely no mistake in
making such a designation from a Civil Defense specialist’s perspective. It was definitely a “ground zero” in the sense which they understood it to be. It was, however, absolutely a mistake in the sense that the particular term “ground zero” had inadvertently been leaked to journalists and through them...to the general public. After that, it was simply too late to quash the Civil Defense designation of “ground zero” and desperate US officials had no choice but to “Capitalize” the seditious term by converting its correct Civil Defense’s designation of “ground zero” to its very own Proper Noun: “Ground Zero”.

To begin with, I would like to quote a statement concerning a hero from 9/11 – Detective John Walcott, a “Ground Zero” responder, who spent a considerable amount of time at the WTC site cleaning rubble from of the World Trade Center. He had spent enough time there to develop a very interesting disease: acute myelogenous leukemia in its terminal form. Just a mere two paragraphs taken out of a frightening article entitled “Death by Dust” managed to contain and reveal practically all the “unexplainable” things many had questions about concerning “Ground Zero”. The excerpts below will provide the reader with some key basic points which will allow you to better understand the main point of this article – that of dust and radiation:

“...Because Walcott was a detective, he ended up spending his five-month stint not just at Ground Zero, but also at Fresh Kills. As much as he choked on the Lower Manhattan air, he dreaded the Staten Island landfill. Walcott knew everything in the towers had fallen - desks, lights, and computers. But apart from the occasional steel beam, the detritus that he sifted through there consisted of tiny grains of dust - no furniture pieces, no light fixtures, not even a computer mouse.

At times, the detectives would take shelter in wooden sheds, in an attempt to get away from what Walcott likes to call “all that freaking bad air.” One day, he was sitting in the shed with his colleagues, eating candy bars and drinking sodas, when some FBI agents entered. They were dressed in full haz-mat suits, complete with head masks, which they had sealed shut with duct tape to ward off the fumes. As Walcott took in the scene, contrasting the well-protected FBI agents with the New York cops wearing respirator masks, one thought entered his mind: What is wrong with this picture?"

Yes, Mr. Walcott, unfortunately something was wrong. Something was very badly wrong with that picture...

Those FBI agents, who had no shame in showing up in full haz-mat suits, moreover sealed shut with duct tape, knew the truth, as they stood in front of the “commoners”. That is why today these guys don’t suffer from leukemia or from any other kinds of terminal cancer. The FBI agents will apparently live long and fulfilling lives, despite having briefly visited “Ground Zero”...

If you were to only open up a contemporary dictionary and look up the actual meaning of this peculiar term, you wouldn’t need to ask that question; you would immediately understand what was wrong with “Ground Zero”:

1 The entire story from which I am quoting is here: http://www.villagevoice.com/news/0648,lombardi,75156,2.html
2 Ibid., S.5

It should be noted that Mr. John Walcott eventually managed to survive, unlike many of his colleagues who used to work at “Ground Zero” and who were not as lucky as him. On December 17, 2007, it was briefly mentioned in an Internet news article\(^3\) that John Walcott had at last undergone a truly advanced (and extremely painful) operation known as a bone marrow transplantation. From now on, he could continue to live, but only on special immuno-depressant drugs which prevent transplant rejection; and without ever leaving his home due to the fact his entire immune system no longer exists and any kind of infection can easily prove fatal.

For anyone who doesn’t know what “marrow transplantation” is, I am obliged to explain. A marrow transplantation is required in patients who have incurred heavy doses of either penetrating or residual ionizing radiation (or both) and whose own bone marrow (which is responsible for blood regeneration) has been completely killed off by heavy doses of radiation.

This is a particularly unique property of radiation – it strikes bone marrow cells more heavily than it does other cells in the human body. That is why the majority of victims of radiation suffer from leukemia. And, the heavier the dose of radiation, the more bone marrow is killed off, thus, the worse the case of leukemia the patient suffers from. John Walcott apparently suffered from the most severe possible condition – before obtaining his bone marrow transplantation, he was living exclusively on donors’ blood because his own blood was not regenerating at all.

In addition to killing off or severely damaging bone marrow, ionizing radiation, especially when someone inhales or ingests radioactive dust or radioactive vapor, causes various kinds of cancers that can affect virtually any part of the human body and even several parts all at once.

It is, however, not too difficult for dishonest doctors and health officials to provide plausible “explanations” as to what may have caused these cancers. They can just claim it was due to “asbestos”, “toxic fumes”, “toxic dust particles”, etc. However, when it comes to bone marrow damage, these deceivers are caught right in their tracks because bone marrow damage can only be caused by ionizing radiation.

That is precisely why the FBI agents showed up in full “haz-mat” suits and even had their head masks sealed shut with duct tape to “ward off fumes” while visiting “Ground Zero”. They didn’t want to suffer from leukemia nor from any other cancer, so they went as far as to seal their head masks shut with duct tape, not just to “ward off the fumes”, as John Walcott had believed, but because they needed to ward off airborne radioactive dust, and more specifically, radioactive vapor, which must not be inhaled or ingested at all costs.

\(^3\) The full story about Mr. John Walcott who underwent a bone marrow transplantation was published here: http://www.nypost.com/seven/2007/12/17/9_11_hero_meets_his_cell_mate_11157.htm or here: http://nypost.com/2007/12/17/911-hero-meets-his-cell-mate/ and an even more shocking story was published here: http://abcnews.go.com/US/Story?id=2408066&page=1
Volunteers at “ground zero” amidst the Twin Towers’ debris and amidst streams of radioactive vapor ascending from under the debris – the photo was taken approximately five weeks after the events.

Indeed, I can assume some readers may simply be just too shocked by this particular revelation and may not tend to believe me – thinking that I am merely speculating on uncertainties. However, the abovementioned story regarding John Walcott and those FBI agents wearing hazmat suits at “ground zero” had nothing to do with me personally – it exists as a matter of fact independently of the humble author of this article. Also independent of the author of this article stands the actual legal definition of “ground zero” which before 9/11 used to be as follows:

“ground’ ze’ro” – the point on the surface of the earth or water directly below, directly above, or at which an atomic or hydrogen bomb explodes.


“ground zero” = point on the ground directly under the explosion of a nuclear weapon.

“ground zero” /ˌɡraʊnd zɪˈroʊ/ n [U] the exact place where a nuclear bomb explodes:
The blast was felt as far as 30 miles from ground zero. 2 [U] the site of the former World Trade Center in New York City, which was destroyed in an attack on September 11, 2001.


The above were complete, unabridged definitions of “ground zero”. It was the only definable and proper definition of its meaning. If you don’t believe your eyes and prefer to run to the nearest book store and buy an English dictionary, don’t be in too much of a hurry.

When you arrive at the shop you will be surprised even further because as of now it is no longer possible to even find a dictionary that contains the original, unedited definition of the term. All dictionaries printed before 9/11, like those which I mention above, containing the original correct meaning of “ground zero”, have been removed from book-shelves and replaced with newer ones. Unfortunately, the very English language itself was one of the first victims of the 9/11 perpetration...

The dictionaries’ photos below were not present in the original version of this article in NEXUS magazine; however, I decided to add them to this Internet-version, since they are very illustrative.

These photos compare similar dictionaries produced by the very same publishers that had previously printed them - and after the name “ground zero” was inadvertently awarded to the location of the nuclear demolition of the World Trade Center:

ground staff noun mechanics on an airfield responsible for the maintenance of aircraft; non-flying personnel on an airfield.
ground state noun the lowest and most stable energy state of a particle, nucleus, atom, or molecule.
ground station noun a radio station operating close to the ground immediately after the ball has bounced. Also, ground shot.
ground water noun the water beneath the surface of the ground, consisting largely of surface water that has seeped down.
ground wave noun that portion of a transmitted radio wave that travels near the surface of the earth.
groundwork noun the foundation, base, or basis of anything.
ground zero noun the point on the surface of the earth directly below the point at which a nuclear weapon explodes, or the centre of the crater if the weapon is exploded on the ground. Also, zero.
grunt verb [group noun] 1. any assemblage of persons or things; cluster, congregation, aggregation. 2. a number of persons or things regarded as related; a number of two or more battalions or squadrons, being regarded as a whole and not as a unit.
grunt noun 1. any number of two or more persons or things regarded as related; a number of two or more battalions or squadrons, being regarded as a whole and not as a unit.
group noun any assemblage of persons or things; cluster, congregation, aggregation. 2. a number of persons or things regarded as related; a number of two or more battalions or squadrons, being regarded as a whole and not as a unit.
3. the periodical table containing elements with similar properties. 4. a classification of elements according to their properties.
5. a group of words or sounds that form a unit in grammar.


Above – Random House Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary of 1983 and the Random House Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary of the infamous “September 11, 2001 edition” (the ISBN for the second dictionary - 0-375-42566-7 – was indeed reserved on the very day – the eleventh day of September, 2001 – and thus the date of 9/11 became the official date of the publication of that infamous dictionary...)

Deluxe Edition of 2001 (the Webster’s Encyclopedic Dictionary of the English Language is a carbon-copy of the Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary — that is why the two sets of photos above look identical).


ground rule ▶ n. 1. Sports A rule governing the playing of a game on a particular field, course, or court. 2. A basic rule.
ground squirrel ▶ n. Any of several burrowing or terrestrial squirrels resembling the chipmunk.
ground•swell (ground’swél′) ▶ n. 1. A broad gathering of force, as of public opinion. 2. A deep swell of the ocean.
ground water also ground•wa•ter (ground’wät′ər, -wōt′ər) ▶ n. Subterranean water that supplies wells and springs.
ground•work (ground’wārk′) ▶ n. A foundation; basis.
ground zero ▶ n. The point of detonation of a nuclear weapon.
group (grōup) ▶ n. A number of persons or objects gathered, located, or classified together. See Usage Note at collective noun. ▶ v. To place in or form a group. [< It., prob. of Gmc. orig.]
group•er (grōup′ər) ▶ n., pl. -er or -pers. Any of various large food and game fishes which inhabit warm seas. [Port. garupa.]
group•ie (grōop′ē) ▶ n. Slang A fan, esp. a young woman, who follows a rock group


ground effect ▶ n. A down force exerted on a racing car by special design features (as winglike airfoils) that enables it to achieve higher speeds through turns before starting to skid — often used in pl.
ground-effect machine ▶ n. an air-cushion vehicle for traveling over land or water
ground•out (grōound′) ▶ n. [fr. the phrase ground out] a play in baseball in which a batter is put out after hitting a grounder to an infielder

Above – Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of 1999 and Merriam-Webster's Learner's Dictionary of 2010 (the first dictionary has never been re-issued, while the second one was not even published before the 9/11 events, however, these two dictionaries are approximately equal in their status and are equal when it comes to the number of pages and numbers of words and definitions).

Don’t be surprised that almost every new English dictionary printed after 9/11 has begun to describe “ground zero” as having more than one sense. Now, at least 3-5 new meanings have been ascribed to this particular term, ranging from some supposed “great devastation”, “great disorder” and “busy activities” to some supposed “basic level” and “starting point” definitions. Some preferred another approach: editors of the new Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, for example, defined “ground zero” as a “place where a bomb explodes” without mentioning anything at all that such “bomb” is supposed to be nuclear or thermo-nuclear in nature. In addition to all of this, these days almost every dictionary – whether big or small – has begun to include this (to be exact “these”) definitions.

The term “ground zero”, obviously due to being such a specialized term prior to 9/11, existed only in really big English dictionaries – such as Webster’s Unabridged, full Collins, full American Heritage, and other similar large dictionaries (and even in those it contained only the single correct meaning of the term). It didn’t exist in smaller dictionaries – such as those intended for students and for advanced learners (with the only exception being the Longman Advanced American Dictionary – which is mentioned above). For example, “ground zero” was absent in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionaries in their 4th, 5th and 6th Editions published before September 11, 2001. Even Oxford’s 4th special “Encyclopedic” version (which was about 50% larger compared to the regular one) did not contain any reference to the term “ground zero”. Only Oxford’s Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of 7th Edition first published in 2005 began describing this term at last.

Post-9/11 editions of the Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners and the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, all kinds of new Merriam-Webster’s Dictionaries, the majority of new American Heritage Dictionaries, the new Collins English, the Microsoft Encarta Dictionary...
and many other new dictionaries and encyclopedias after the September 11 affair have all begun to include “ground zero” and to define it in such a sense that it might supposedly have more than one meaning, all trying their best to divert attention away from the former nuclear (and only nuclear) nature of this term. By the way, editors of the last mentioned above Cambridge Advanced Learner’s Dictionary should be praised for not having deceived their readers: they were brave enough not to include any misleading definitions of the term “ground zero” in their post-9/11 dictionary, which is in sharp contrast to every other dictionary that was edited at the behest of the 9/11 cover-up. It was reported there had even been attempts to prove that the WTC was already referred to as “ground zero” even before September 11, 2001. All these post-9/11 linguistic efforts in attempting to obscure the term “ground zero” are understandable indeed. That obviously revealing name, rashly awarded by Civil Defense specialists to the demolition grounds of the former New York World Trade Center, was obviously too revealing to just leave this particular term in future editions of dictionaries with only its former sense alone...

Nuclear demolition of the WTC.

The author of this article used to be a commissioned officer in the Soviet military unit 46179, otherwise known as the "Special Control Service of the 12th Chief Directorate of the Defense Ministry of the USSR". The 12th Chief Directorate itself was an organization responsible in the Soviet Union for the safe-keeping, the production control, the technical maintenance etc. of the entire nuclear arsenal of the state. The Special Control Service was responsible for detecting nuclear explosions and was responsible for the observance of all international treaties related to nuclear testing. It is especially important to note the existence of the so-called “Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty” of 1976 between the USSR and the United States of America. In accordance with this Treaty, all parties were obliged to inform one another about all nuclear explosions intended for non-military purposes.

During my military service in the abovementioned organization at the end of the ‘80s, it came to my knowledge that there was a so-called “emergency nuclear demolition schema” built into the World Trade Center Twin Towers in New York. The actual nuclear demolition schema was based on huge thermo-nuclear charges (about 150 kilotons in TNT yield) which were positioned about 50 meters below the lowest underground foundations of each of the Towers. It was strange to me by then and, to be honest; it was hard to believe that US authorities would be crazy enough to demolish buildings in the middle of a populated city using underground nuclear explosions.

However, as I understood it correctly, nobody had ever actually planned to demolish the World Trade Center in such a way. It was merely a means to get around the bureaucracy: such a nuclear demolition schema had to be built into the Twin Towers not to get them demolished, but to get permission to build them in the first place. The problem was that the then building code of New York (as well as that of Chicago) didn’t allow the Department of Buildings to issue permits to build a skyscraper unless its constructor could provide a satisfactory means by which he could demolish the building either in future, or in the case of emergency. Since the late ‘60s (when the Twin Towers were first proposed) this type of steel-framed buildings was a totally new concept and nobody knew how to deal with them in the sense of demolition. Given that traditional (“conventional”) controlled demolition methods were applicable purely to older-style buildings, they had to come up with something new for the incredibly strong steel Twin Towers that would convince the Department of Buildings to issue permission for their actual construction. And the solution was indeed created: nuclear demolition.

A brief history of the atomic and nuclear demolition concept.

The initial idea of using nuclear devices to demolish various constructions was born almost immediately after the emergence of actual nuclear weapons in the beginning of the 50s. At first, nuclear munitions were not called "nuclear", but "atomic", so the concept of demolition using these munitions was accordingly called “atomic demolition”. These terms managed to survive, and despite having renamed “atomic weapons” to “nuclear weapons”, the term "atomic
demolition" is still used to this day with respect to special engineering devices – such as SADM and MADM. The first term stands for "Special Atomic Demolition Munitions", the second term stands for "Medium Atomic Demolition Munitions", while many people mistakenly believe that SADM means "Small Atomic Demolition Munitions", rather than "Special".

In fact, it's not a mistake to call them "small" instead of "special" because SADM are indeed "small" - their nuclear explosive yields usually don't exceed 1 kiloton in TNT equivalent. Considering that all modern SADM have variable yields which can be set to as low as 0.1 kiloton, and sometimes even set to as low as 0.01 kiloton (equivalents to 100 and 10 metric tons of TNT respectively), they deserve to be called "small" munitions. Other popular names for these Small Atomic Demolition Munitions are "mini-nuke" and "suitcase nuke", though the second one is probably not logically correct. In reality, most SADM resemble big pots weighing between 50 to 70 kilograms that can be carried as back-packs - so it is very unlikely that they would fit into a suitcase. However, there are also modern "mini-nukes" which are made of Plutonium-239 rather than Uranium-235, and due to the much lower critical mass of Plutonium, their size can be significantly decreased - some of the newer Plutonium-based "mini-nukes" can indeed fit into even a case as small as a handbag. Medium Atomic Demolition Munitions (MADM) are bigger in both a) their size and b) their TNT yield. They can range up to 15 kilotons in TNT yield, weigh up to 200 kg and be as big as any large regular gas-cylinder you'd find in your home.

Either of the abovementioned atomic demolition munitions can be successfully used in demolishing large objects which otherwise could not be demolished by any reasonable amount of conventional explosives - especially in times of emergency, when there is neither the time nor the means to plan for their "regular" demolition using conventional means. For example, they can demolish bridges, dams, tunnels, reinforced underground structures, large reinforced buildings, etc., however, the efficiency factor of using such nuclear demolitions as SADM or MADM isn't quite that high. As it is publicly known, the main goal of the controlled demolition of buildings through implosion is not to actually eliminate the buildings by blowing them up and ejecting their debris everywhere, but to bring them down neatly while at the same time minimizing damage to surrounding buildings.

For precisely this reason, engineers who prepare controlled demolitions have to first figure out the exact points within a building’s bearing structure to cut and attach charges of conventional explosives to those spots - in order to break the bearing structures.

In almost every case, there is more than one spot to attach explosives since it is unlikely that any structure would have a single supporting girder or a single supporting column to cut; at best there would be at least several, if not many. In the case of atomic demolition, however, using the abovementioned atomic demolition munitions is quite different.

People who work in the planning of the usage of atomic munitions for emergency purposes require neither the time nor the training to make the precise calculations which are needed in conventional controlled demolition. What these people would have at the very most is a basic knowledge of field-engineering and a basic understanding of nuclear demolitions. Thus, atomic demolition munitions are not used to "neatly" bring down a structure, but rather as a means to bring down a structure by any means necessary and at any cost no matter what the toll is. This is why the explosive yield of the atomic munitions used to demolish such a structure in the case of emergency would be excessive. This is because the majority of the explosive energy from atomic munitions would be spent in vain. So, the majority of energy released by the nuclear explosion of an atomic demolition device would be spent on the well-known factors of an atomic blast: thermal radiation, air-blast wave, ionizing radiation, electro-magnetic pulse – all of which have nothing to do with the actual demolition task at hand and would not contribute much to the end goal of neatly demolishing the building. The destructive factors of an atomic explosion would greatly damage the surroundings - and this damage itself is rather extreme and definitely comes at a much higher toll than the actual cost of a demolition itself.
It is to be said then that nuclear demolition in the abovementioned sense would have a rather poor performance index when compared to carrying out a precisely-calculated conventional controlled demolition. This is due to the fact that the latter directs its almost entire explosive energy on breaking the bearing structures, rather than on creating an air-blast wave and thermal radiation.

Regardless, the use of an atomic demolition device alone is just far too costly. At the bare minimum, a Uranium-based "mini-nuke" costs a few million US dollars if not more and a Plutonium-based one costs much more than that. Apparently, a thousand tons of TNT would cost cheaper than 1 kiloton of atomic munitions. However, it is possible to demolish most buildings using 1000 tons of TNT while it is possible to demolish only a single building using a "mini-nuke" (but while damaging many other buildings in the surrounding area).

Considering all of this, it is to be concluded that it is not a viable option whatsoever to use atomic demolition munitions, whether small or medium, for the demolition of civil infrastructure in times of peace, especially when we have sufficient time on our hands to prepare for their demolition using professional conventional controlled demolition methods. And, in any case, a conventional controlled demolition is much cheaper than a nuclear demolition. Mini-nukes can only be used for a demolition job in the case of a real emergency.

How then did it come to be that this old atomic demolition concept, despite being known to be too costly and having such a poor performance index when compared to conventional controlled demolition by implosion, came to be eventually revived and even implemented in the World Trade Center nuclear demolition schema?

It just so happens to be because a newer generation of buildings came into existence at the end of 60’s, namely steel-framed buildings.

Despite the common misconception, no steel-framed skyscraper has ever been demolished by implosion anywhere in the world prior to the WTC towers. This is primarily due to the fact that most skyscrapers are newer buildings and the need to demolish them has yet to come. Even the tallest building ever demolished by implosion was only 47-stories high - it was the Singer Building in New York City which was built in 1908 and demolished in 1968 due to it being so obsolete. This building was much weaker in structure when compared to the incredibly strong hollow-tube type steel-frame skyscrapers which are built today. So, despite this common misconception, it is not possible to demolish a steel-frame building using any conventional controlled demolition (implosion) schema.

In older times, when buildings were brick-walled and concrete-panelled, their bearing structures used to be concrete supporting columns and concrete supporting girders. Sometimes these concrete bearing structures were reinforced by the insertion of metal bars and even sometimes just by concrete alone. In any case, it was always possible to calculate the right amount of conventional explosives that was needed to attach to these bearing structures and in the correct spots (or to be placed into holes drilled into the bearing structures) in order to break them all at once and cause the building to collapse into its own footprint. However, with modern steel-framed buildings this is simply no longer possible. Examples of modern steel-framed buildings include the former Twin Towers of the World Trade Center, World Trade Center building # 7 and the Sears Tower in Chicago.

Here is an example of the steel structure of the WTC Twin Towers:
There was no "bearing structure" in the older sense of the meaning - the entire Tower was essentially a "bearing structure" in of itself.

The steel-frame of the WTC consisted of exceptionally thick double-walled steel perimeter columns and core columns.

This co-called "tube-frame design" was a totally new approach which allowed open floor plans rather than columns distributed throughout the interior in order to support the loads like it had traditionally been implemented in older structures.

The Twin Towers featured load-bearing steel perimeter columns (square in cross-section) which were positioned one meter apart from each other on the Towers' facades which formed an exceptionally rigid structure that in turn supported virtually all lateral loads (such as wind loads) and even shared the gravity load with the core columns.

The perimeter structure contained 59 of such columns per side. The core structure of the Tower consisted of 47 rectangular steel columns that ran from the bedrock all the way up to the tops of the Towers.

In the following picture, you can see steel perimeter and core column remnants that remained at “Ground Zero”:
Here is one more picture (from the NIST report) showing the Twin Tower perimeter columns during their construction:

**Figure 1-4.** Perimeter column/spandrel assembly and floor structure.
Perimeter columns are being inspected at “ground zero”.

These steel columns were incredibly thick - each wall measuring 2.5 inches (6.35 cm), so the entire thickness of each column was 5 inches (12.7 cm). To imagine how thick this is, here is a good example to compare to: imagine the front armor of the best tank from the WWII period - the T-34 – whose steel was only 1.8 inches (4.5 cm) thick and was just single-walled. The T-34 tank and its armor are in the pictures below:

Yet there were practically no armor-piercing artillery shells available at the time capable of penetrating such front armor.
Of course, no explosives whatsoever could ever tear through the front armor of a tank (except for hollow-charge shells which would still not even be able to tear through the armor completely, but would merely just burn a narrow hole through the armor plate).

Considering that the Twin Towers' steel frames consisted of double-walled steel columns that were almost three times as thick as the front armor of a T-34 tank, it would not be possible to come up with a solution to break these columns simultaneously and do so in many spots simultaneously in order to achieve the "implosion" effect – which is, of course, the basic goal of controlled demolition.

It was, of course, technically possible to break some of these columns in certain spots, using exceptionally huge amounts of hollow-charges attached to each individual column, but even such an incredible amount of explosives wouldn’t be enough to achieve the desired "implosion effect". The Towers were simply too high and too rigid - their steel cores would have been simultaneously broken in too many spots on every floor, which no one could afford, and even if they could, still, such a solution would not lead to the desired effect - there would not be any guarantee that such a high-rise structure would fall straight down into its footprint. It would most likely just scatter its debris over the course of a quarter mile given its mere height alone. So, it was impossible to bring the WTC Towers down by any form of traditional controlled demolition.

The same thing could be said about WTC building # 7 and the Sears Tower in Chicago. Both of them were constructed using similarly thick double-walled steel frames which were impossible to break at once due to the same reasons described above.

However, in accordance with US laws governing the construction of skyscrapers, designers had to submit a satisfactory demolition schema before construction would be approved by the Department of Buildings. No one would be allowed to build a skyscraper that could not be demolished in future.

This is the main reason for having a built-in nuclear demolition feature. Ironically, the nuclear demolition schema of a skyscraper is not actually meant to demolish the skyscraper, especially considering that no one has any practical experience in demolishing skyscrapers by such means - it is merely intended to convince the Department of Buildings to give permission to build the skyscraper.

It appears that all designers and proponents of such nuclear demolition schemas sincerely hope their ideas not be put to use during their life-time.

**How does this work?**

First off, such a modern nuclear demolition has nothing to do with the previously discussed atomic demolition using SADM or MADM as described above. It is an entirely new concept.

During the modern nuclear demolition process, a demolition charge does not produce any atmospheric nuclear explosion - with its trade-mark atomic mushroom cloud, thermal radiation, air-blast wave and electro-magnetic pulse. It explodes quite deep underground - much in the same sense as any nuclear charge explodes during a typical nuclear test. So, it produces neither air-blast wave, nor any thermal radiation, nor any penetrating ionizing radiation, nor any electromagnetic pulse. It causes only relatively minor harm to surroundings by its ensuing radioactive contamination, which, nonetheless, is considered to be a negligible factor by the designers of such projects.

What is the basic difference then between an atmospheric and an underground nuclear explosion?
The basic difference is as follows. During the initial stage of a nuclear (as well as a thermo-nuclear) explosion, its entire explosive energy is being released in the form of "primary radiation" which in its main part (almost 99%) falls within an X-ray spectrum (and the remaining portion is represented by a gamma-ray spectrum which causes radiation injuries and a visible spectrum which produces a visible flash). So, the almost entire explosive energy represented by X-rays is spent on heating the surrounding air within a few hundred feet around the explosion’s hypocenter.

This occurs because X-rays can’t travel very far as they are consumed by the surrounding air. The heating of the relatively small area around the hypocenter of a nuclear explosion results in the appearance of "nuclear fireballs" which is physically nothing more than extremely overheated air.

These nuclear fireballs are responsible for the two main destructive factors of an atmospheric nuclear explosion –

1) thermal radiation

and

2) an air-blast wave since both factors result exclusively from the high temperatures of air around the nuclear explosion.

When it comes to an underground nuclear explosion, the picture is entirely different.

There is no air around the tiny "zero-box" which the nuclear charge is placed into, so the entire amount of energy instantly released by the nuclear explosion in the form of X-rays is spent on heating the surrounding rock instead.

It results in the overheating, melting and then vaporizing of the rock. The disappearance of the vaporized rock results in the creation of an underground cavity whose size depends directly on the explosive yield of nuclear munitions used.

You can get the idea on how much rock would disappear during an underground nuclear explosion based on the table below - whereby the quantities of vaporized and melted materials of various kinds (in metric tons) are shown on a "per kiloton of yield" basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock type</th>
<th>Specific mass of vaporized material (in tons per kiloton yield)</th>
<th>Specific mass of the melted material (in tons per kiloton yield)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry granite</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>300 (±100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moist tuff (18-20% of water)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>500 (±150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry tuff</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>200 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alluvium</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>650 (±50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock salt</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as an example: the detonation of a 150 kiloton thermo-nuclear charge buried sufficiently deep in granite rock would result in the creation of a cavity measuring roughly 100 meters in diameter - such as the one shown in this picture:
All skyscrapers have their lowest foundations approximately 20-30 meters beneath the surface of the Earth. So therefore it is easy to calculate the position under the skyscraper where you would need to position the "zero-box". This is the precise location from where it will expand its upper cavity which is in the direction of the lowest subbasement of the building.

For example, in the case of the Twin Towers, their lowest underground foundation was 27 meters beneath surface. A 150 kiloton thermo-nuclear demolition charge was positioned at a depth of 77 meters below surface (or 50 meters below the underground foundation). A thermo-nuclear explosion at a depth of 77 m would create an extremely overheated cavity whose upper sphere would expand to the lowest underground foundations of the tower it intended to demolish. However, it would still be short of reaching the surface of the Earth by 27 meters - so the surrounding structures would not to be affected by the destructive factors of the underground nuclear explosion, with the possible exception of radioactive contamination. The Tower being demolished then loses its foundations completely and is sucked into the overheated cavity whose internal temperatures are hot enough to melt the entire Tower. The nuclear demolition schema of WTC building # 7 and that of the Sears Tower in Chicago were calculated in the exact same way.

However, there is one additional factor that needs to be taken into consideration during the calculation of the nuclear demolition of any skyscraper. This is the actual vaporized granite rock inside the cavity. How is all that former granite rock, which now exists in a gaseous state, supposed to escape from the cavity? In fact, a picture of the physical events after an underground nuclear explosion is quite interesting. Let's consider it.
Typical physical processes during an ideally deep underground nuclear explosion.

1) Nuclear explosion starts to heat the rock around its hypocenter.

2) Rock is vaporized. As a result of the disappearance of the vaporized rock, a “primary cavity” appears and is filled with the former rock which now exists in gaseous form. The extremely high pressures from the gases in the cavity now begin to expand the actual primary cavity at the expense of neighboring areas of the still solid rock.

3) The actual cavity reaches its final “secondary” size because of the extremely high pressure from the gases inside of it and as such expands from its original size (shown by the dotted line) to an even bigger size (shown by the firm line). Given that this expansion occurs at the expense of the neighboring areas, these neighboring areas of rock become tightly compressed.

4) Final picture. White: the underground cavity (the secondary size); blue: the “crushed zone” – totally pulverized rock (crushed into complete microscopic dust ~100 micron particle size); green: the “damaged zone” – partly crushed rock.

This pictorial rendition schematically outlines all the important physical processes of an ideally deep (meaning that it occurs sufficiently far from the Earth surface) underground nuclear explosion. So, now it should be clear that the extreme pressures from the vaporized rock inside the cavity takes on at least two important tasks: 1) it expands the actual cavity from its “primary” size to its “secondary” size; and 2) because it does this expansion at the expense of the neighboring areas of the rock, it produces two damaged zones around itself, each representing a different degree of damage.

The zone immediately adjacent to the cavity in nuclear jargon is called the “crushed zone”. This zone can be as thick as the diameter of the cavity itself and is filled with a very interesting matter. It is filled with rock that is now completely pulverized. It is reduced into a fine microscopic dust, an approximate particle of which is about 100 microns in size. Moreover, the particular state of material within this “crushed zone” is in a very interesting state – nothing in the world can produce the following phenomenon other than an underground nuclear explosion:
If you were to pick up a stone from this zone, but do so very gently, it might still stick together and resemble a stone by its form and its color. However, if you just squeeze the stone a little bit with your fingers, this "stone" will immediately be crushed into complete microscopic dust which it actually now consists of. The second zone – just outside of and surrounding the "crushed zone" is called the "damaged zone" in professional nuclear jargon. This "damaged zone" is filled with rock crushed to various pieces - from very small (millimeters in size), to some relatively larger fragments. The closer to the border of the "crushed zone" you get, the smaller the debris becomes, and the further away from hypocenter you go - the larger the debris. Finally, outside the "damaged zone’s" border, there would be virtually no damage inflicted to the surrounding rock.

However, the physical processes we discussed above are true in an "ideally deep" underground nuclear blast. When a nuclear charge is not buried deep enough, the picture will be slightly different. The "damaged" and "crushed" zones will not appear as round as in the prior example. They will be rather elliptic – whereby the longer end is directed upward – like the shape of an egg. This happens because the pressure from the gases encounters less resistance in the direction of the Earth’s surface (given that it is so close), and both the "crushed zone" and "damaged zone" will expand upwards as well in the same fashion.

The drawing above is an illustration of the resistance of the surrounding rock when a cavity is located not very deep below the Earth’s surface. Evidently, the resistance of the rock towards the Earth’s surface will be much less than in any other direction. Given that everything goes in the way of least resistance, it is understandable to note that the cavity will expand more towards the Earth’s surface and won’t look so “round”. It will look more like an egg. In other words, it will be ellipsoidal in shape.

When the pressure propagates upwards, the upper boundaries of the "damaged zone" and the "crushed zone" eventually reach the underground foundations of the Tower they are about to demolish, the picture is even more different. This is because the actual materials the Tower is built of differ from the surrounding granite rock in the sense of their resistance. Besides, there is a lot of empty space inside the Tower, while the remaining granite rock in all other directions (to the sides and below the cavity) is solid. So, the expansion of the upper boundaries of the "damaged" and "crushed" zones by the Tower’s structure will be the furthest. In the case of the WTC Twin Towers and the Sears Tower, the "damaged zone" could likely reach up to 350-370 meters, while the "crushed zone" which follows immediately, will likely reach up to 290-310 meters. However, in the case of the much shorter WTC-7, its entire length was well within the "crushed zone" - so it was pulverized completely from bottom to top. The ability of a nuclear demolition to pulverize steel and concrete alike is one of its unique features.
5) Propagating fronts of damaged and crushed zones encountered foundations which are less firm than surrounding rock - it caused much greater extensions of their upper boundaries which continued to propagate upwards by this structure.

2), 3), 4) Upper boundaries of damaged and crushed zones become more and more extended as depths of hypocenters decrease.

1) "Ideal" deep underground nuclear explosion.

Relatively undamaged zone (heavy and solid) some debris complete dust.

Dust covers an abandoned produce stand in lower Manhattan. Photo © Aris Economopoulos / The Star-Ledger
The picture above shows an example of the fine microscopic dust that covered all of Manhattan after the WTC demolition. Many people mistakenly believed that it was "concrete dust". No, it was not. It was dust – but mainly pulverized steel. Despite the common misconception, the WTC structures did not contain much concrete at all. Concrete was used only in some limited quantities to make very thin floor slabs at most. It was not used anywhere else. The majority of the WTC Twin Towers was steel, not concrete. So accordingly, the majority of this ultra-fine dust is represented by steel dust. However, it was not only "steel dust" alone - it was also "furniture dust", "wood dust", "paper dust", "carpet dust", "computer parts dust" and even "human dust", given that human beings were left to be pulverized in the Towers the same manner in which the steel, concrete and furniture were.

Some may wonder how WTC-7 collapsed so neatly into its own footprint, and in its entirety, while the Twin Towers came down not only scattering dust, but even larger debris and ejecting them to such far distances. This question is very easy to answer – you just have to look at the distribution of the "crushed" and "damaged" zones within the Twin Towers structures and the answer will become obvious.

The picture above represents the approximate distribution of the damaged zones in the scenario of a nuclear demolition of a skyscraper using a 150 kiloton thermo-nuclear charge positioned 50 meters deeper than the lowest underground foundations of the building. Don't forget that the demolition charges in this particular case were buried not "ideally deep", which is why the formations of the "crushed" and "damaged" zones were not "ideally round" either - they were elliptic, with their sharper ends facing upwards – like an egg – in the way of least resistance. It is easy to understand that the entire length of the WTC-7 fit well into the "crushed zone" alone so there were not any undamaged areas on top of it that might produce the effect of an undamaged top falling down like we saw during the collapse of the North and South Towers.
The particular distribution of damage within the skyscrapers’ structures inflicted by such a process could be better understood when you watch the videos that show the details of the collapses of the WTC Twin Towers and of WTC-7. These contemporary videos are widely available on YouTube.

![Image of the North Tower just began to collapse a moment ago.](image1)

2) VIDEO - YouTube direct link: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OcsBQHvggnU](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OcsBQHvggnU)

These two pictures show the North Tower’s collapse (which collapsed 2nd). It is clearly seen that the Tower was reduced to a fine fluffy dust. In the lower right corner it is clearly visible that WTC-7 (the glassy shining nice brownish building) was not damaged at all. On the right picture WTC-7 appears to be a little bit “shorter” than in the left one, but this wasn’t because WTC-7 was “collapsing” in any way, it was because the helicopter taking the picture was on the move and the second picture had been taken from a slightly different angle and with the photographer himself being at that moment slightly further away from the WTC location. WTC-7 did not collapse until 7 hours later.
This video contains a very good compilation of the detailed view (3 different view points) of the collapse of the WTC North Tower. It leaves no doubt that the steel structure of the Tower was reduced to complete microscopic dust. The pattern of collapse of the heavy and undamaged Tower's top clearly shows that nothing solid remained under it, except only complete, fluffy steel dust. Note also that the heavy top of the Tower falls down at freefall speed – as if there were no remnants of steel underneath, just air alone.

3) VIDEO - YouTube direct link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QY3qYr3dpdU

This video is a very good view of the collapse of the WTC South Tower that was completely ‘dustified’. This footage leaves no doubt that the steel structure of the Tower was reduced to complete microscopic dust. The pattern of collapse of the heavy and undamaged Tower's top clearly shows that nothing solid remained under it, except complete, fluffy steel dust.

4) VIDEO - YouTube direct link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MXeAPcsD3-o

This is a very HQ video from the recently released NIST Cumulus Video Database. Excerpt from file "WNBC Dub10 54". This video clearly shows a strong earthquake (well over 5.5 on the Richter scale - telling us that an underground nuclear explosion of no less than 100 kilotons is responsible). The earthquake consists of one shock and one aftershock and took place exactly 12 seconds before the top of the North Tower started to move down. This coincides with the North Tower’s shaking on the famous Etienne Sauret video show. Aside from showing the clear details of the North Tower's complete pulverization during collapse, this video also clearly displays details of the pulverization of the remaining steel spear visible to the right that was missed by the Tower's top falling downwards and was pulverized under its own pressure a few seconds later (pulverization of the steel spear is clearly seen after the passing by of a truck). This footage leaves no doubt that the steel structure of the Tower was reduced to complete microscopic dust. The pattern of collapse of the heavy and undamaged Tower's top clearly shows that nothing solid remained under it, except for complete, fluffy steel dust.

This is a detailed view of that remaining steel spear, turning into steel dust, but filmed by another camera and at a different angle.

5) VIDEO - YouTube direct link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CM88xJX5FsA

This is the famous video by Etienne Sauret. It clearly shows a strong earthquake (well over 5.5 on the Richter Scale - telling us that an underground nuclear explosion of no less than 100 kilotons is responsible). This is clear proof of the WTC nuclear demolition. The actual earthquake caused by the nuclear explosion underneath it – the one that took place 12 seconds before the top started to move downwards. These 12 seconds were required for the nuclear explosion to vaporize the rock, accumulate sufficient pressure and then create
the “breaking point” at which the “primary” cavity expands to its “secondary size” which results in a “compressing wave” that propagated with supersonic speed up the Tower’s body “dustifying” it instantaneously. Note – this is the very same earthquake which is seen on the previous video above.
These photos show in detail how the steel WTC South Tower (which fell first, despite being hit second by a “plane” hijacked by “terrorists”, and despite the fact that the fire in it lasted a much shorter period of time than in the North Tower) was instantly transformed into fine dust.

It should also be noted that despite the apparently insufficient 150 kiloton thermo-nuclear charge used to attempt to pulverize the Twin Towers in their entirety (as shown in the above sample where the Twin Towers were pulverized to only about 80% of their entire lengths, leaving the very tops heavy and intact), nuclear charges of higher yields could not have been used in the nuclear demolition industry due merely to legal reasons. The problem is that in accordance with the USA - Soviet "Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty of 1976", the yield of nuclear munitions used for non-military purposes was limited to 150 kilotons /per individual nuclear explosion and to a maximum of 1.5 megaton aggregate yield for group explosions.

So, the nuclear demolition industry had to fit into these legal frames: in the case of the WTC demolition, it was possible to use as many charges as necessary, but not in excess of 150 kiloton per charge. That is why the WTC nuclear demolition schema consisted of three of such charges - whose aggregate yield was 450 kilotons. For those people who have difficulty in imagining how powerful 150 kilotons is, you should be reminded that the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 was less than 20 kilotons.

The “planes”.

Now, as I presume the reader has already understood how strong the Twin Towers were and that it was not even possible to bring them down using any conventional demolition and only possible by huge underground thermo-nuclear explosions, it would be interesting to consider another question: If aluminum-made passenger planes would ever be capable of penetrating the Twin Towers like it was shown to us on TV?

This is the second terrorist “plane” which is about to penetrate the thick double-walled steel perimeters and completely disappear into the South Tower.
This video is the most shameless 9/11 concoction by Evan Fairbanks. It shows an aluminum plane cutting through the steel perimeters of the WTC South Tower (that were as thick as a tank’s armor) with as much ease as if the plane itself were made of steel, and the Tower made of butter.

Besides, a man that was accidentally caught in the frame reacted to neither the sound of an approaching plane, nor to the sound of aluminum crashing through steel. The man reacts to the actual explosion inside the Tower only. It is clearly noticeable. When it comes to the plane - you can see that the plane merely digitally erases itself upon disappearing inside the Tower - not even the tiniest part of the plane falls back onto the sidewalks. And what is even more ridiculous is that the plane does not even reduce its speed upon “penetrating” the Tower....

First of all, to make this understanding easier, let’s briefly come back to the point I started this article with: since the Twin Towers collapsed not due to “kerosene”, but because of huge underground thermo-nuclear explosions, moreover, they collapsed in the “wrong order”, and, in addition to that, WTC-7, which was not even hit by a “terrorist plane”, also collapsed, we can presume that the planes were not actually needed. They were redundant because they had no contribution whatsoever to the actual collapse of the World Trade Center (kerosene for the fires could have been as well brought in in barrels).

Since the planes were redundant it would be safe to presume that the 9/11 perpetration could have been performed even if there were no planes involved – the Twin Towers and the WTC-7...
had to go, because someone had decided so and it had absolutely nothing to do with any “planes”.

Therefore many reasonable 9/11 researchers began to question the allegation the US Government put forth saying it was “planes” striking the Twin Towers that supposedly caused the demolitions.

Many researches exist now on the Internet (especially famous video presentations such as “September Clues” and “FOXED OUT” which are available on YouTube) that include the analyzing of various contemporary 9/11 “plane” footage and they prove in the most satisfactory manner that the “planes” were merely digitized into the frames.

However, the author of these lines prefers a different approach. Instead of analyzing various inconsistencies of the said 9/11 videos, which many people might doubt, the author of these lines prefers to go straight to the self-evident point: that aluminum cannot penetrate steel. Period. To believe that two aluminum Boeing 767’s were indeed able to penetrate those thick double-walled perimeter columns as shown in the above picture is no different than believing that the laws of physics suddenly decided to take holiday on the 11th day of September, 2001, AD.

Some people, understandably, could ask the question: since the planes, even though aluminum-made, were flying at almost 500 mph, due to their tremendous mass and speed would they not have had enough kinetic energy to penetrate the Twin Towers even if the Twin Towers were made of steel?

This is the wrong approach, however.

Yes, intuitively, it seems that a large, fast moving aircraft represents a lot of energy, and one would think it would be reasonable for an aircraft to do a lot of damage to a building on impact.

But what do you think would happen - hypothetically - if the aircraft were stationary in the air, and someone picked up one of the enormously massive WTC Tower, swung it violently, and hit the aircraft at an impact speed of 500 mph?

Would it flatten the aircraft, do you think, or would the aircraft go clean through the moving building without even the slightest part of the aircraft remaining outside of the outer skin of the Tower (which was twice as thick as the front armor of a tank)?

Give that a thought for a moment, because whether the aircraft was hitting a stationary Tower, or the Tower hitting a stationary aircraft, the physics of the situation is identical.

The intuitive response to the damage from a “fast moving aircraft” may not be quite so intuitive.
In the photo above, you can see damage inflicted to the neighboring “Verizon-Building” by such a piece of steel perimeter assembly.

Now, look at the photo above and imagine that such a steel perimeter assembly fell on a Boeing-type aircraft parked right under the building. What would happen with such an aircraft? Yes, you guessed it – the aircraft would be flattened. You will lose all doubts as to how a passenger aircraft is flattened if you watch the video below (it is enough to watch only the first one and a half minutes of it in order to understand what I mean – the rest of the video you can skip):

7) VIDEO – YouTube direct link: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTytIbuAg9U](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTytIbuAg9U)
   spare link: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=inXhxm47JrY](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=inXhxm47JrY)
   or, if this video is no longer available, you could probably find it on YouTube by searching for the following keywords “Filmtricks und falsche Zeugen”.

Many people who at first didn’t pay much attention to the actual Twin Towers’ construction and at first thought that the outer façades of the Twin Towers were simply made from huge glass panes alone (which would, understandably, allow planes to break in) later, to their utter dismay, discovered that the Twin Towers were in reality made of thick steel columns – no different than its steel core columns and that such densely positioned steel columns indeed constituted their outer perimeters. Once this becomes clear, it then becomes obvious that no plane could have ever sliced in its entirety (even including the ends of its wings and tail, not to mention the large turbofan engines beneath its wings) through such densely positioned thick steel perimeter columns and completely disappear inside the Towers without even the slightest part falling back onto the street.
Our previous generation may remember the effect of Japanese kamikaze pilots hitting American main battle ships and aircraft carriers and what happened when the planes hit the side of the ship: the plane was just broken apart (without even penetrating the ship’s wall) and simply fell back into the ocean. In the example of a non-armored ship – the only thing that could penetrate into the ship was the steel motor, but never any other parts of the plane – such as the wings, tail or fuselage.

Above is a WWII photo showing damage inflicted by a kamikaze plane to a non-armored US ship. Note: an armored ship (like a main battle ship) could not have been penetrated whatsoever.

Based on this premise, one can make his own estimation looking at the pictures of core columns below:

Above: profiles of the remaining core WTC columns found at “Ground Zero”; their comparative thickness can be easily estimated; actually they feature walls that are 2.5 inches thick; such thick columns made of steel constituted both – the cores and the entire perimeters of the Twin Towers.
In this official sketch, you can see how the thick core structures were positioned – not only in the Towers’ middles, as believed by many people, but also along their entire perimeters.

Does anyone seriously believe that an aluminum-made “Boeing” could slice through, in its entirety (including its tail, wings and large turbofan engines), the above-shown steel perimeter columns? Placed only one meter apart of each other?

Above you can see the thickness of a steel perimeter column of the Twin Towers being examined at “ground zero”.
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Actually, it might be a little difficult to comprehend that it is impossible for an aluminum object to penetrate steel; so, exclusively for this reason here is a hint – as a basic premise. It is well-known that an armor-piercing artillery shell is made of materials stronger than the actual armor it is intended to penetrate. Typically, armor-piercing shells are made of Wolfram (Americans also produce armor-piercing shells which contain, instead of very expensive Wolfram, Uranium-238, which is an otherwise useless material, but capable of penetrating armor due to the fact that it is much heavier than steel).

Armor-piercing shells made of aluminum obviously don’t exist – this is quite obvious in of itself. Neither do aluminum swords nor any other cutting/piercing tool used to cut through steel. The mere notion that an aluminum object can slice through steel doesn’t just sound far-fetched, it sounds crazy. It shall be also noted that any armor-piercing shell fired against a tank or against any other armored object needs to travel at a speed of at least three times the speed of sound – because even though they are made of Wolfram, this aspect alone is not enough to achieve the ability to pierce steel – a very high speed is the second factor required in order to pierce steel. The speed of a typical armor-piercing shell fired from an anti-tank cannon is actually more than three times the speed of sound – it is at least 1000 meters per second and usually much faster than this, while the maximum cruise speed of a Boeing passenger jet is subsonic – meaning less than 250 m/sec even in its best scenario.

It is a good idea to look at these columns again and try and recognize the fact that their thick double walls are comparable to the armor used to make tanks. To penetrate one of these columns alone would be a challenge for even an armor-piercing shell fired from a long-barreled anti-tank cannon at point-blank range. In fact, the concept of “double-walls” is applicable only in the case of an armor-piercing shell because it faces the mere task of penetrating only two perpendicular walls that stand in its way.

However, an aluminum plane faces a much more difficult task – in addition to the two perpendicular walls standing in its way, it must also cut though two additional parallel walls because each of these tubes is actually comprised of 4 walls, not just two. And these two parallel walls, as you can see below, have a much greater “thickness” because they represent an entire 17 inch wide wall you have to slice through as well!

The picture above depicts the official diagrams showing the profiles of the peripheral columns of the Twin Towers of two types from the floors corresponding to the hits of the supposed “planes” and with arrows added by me that are illustrating the thickness of the steel being...
penetrated/sliced by the aluminum wings of the aircraft and of those by an armor-piercing artillery shell for comparison. The actual official diagrams of this kind can be found here: http://wtcmodel.wikidot.com/nist-core-column-data

Now, you can see how impossible it would be for the supposed armor-piercing capability of an aluminum “Boeing 767” – after seeing how difficult it is even for an artillery armor-piercing shell designed specifically for this purpose. Why then didn’t the “9/11 Commission” or the “engineers” from NIST dare not to perform experiments in which they penetrated several steel columns with a Boeing (even a de-commissioned one)? That kind of experiment would have been ideal in proving to non-believers that it was really “terrorist planes” which managed to demolish the World Trade Center… This particular realization led many people to believe that since aluminum planes simply can’t perform such a feat, that it must have been “digital” plane which managed to cut through the dense double-walled steel perimeters of the now defunct Twin Towers…

Above is a detailed view of the damage inflicted by the supposed “Boeing-767” to the WTC North Tower’s steel perimeter columns.

It is clearly observed that the perimeter bars were all cut in just a few ridiculously straight lines, moreover parallel to one another, such that the actual shape of the “impact hole” doesn’t even match the silhouette of a plane. In fact, the explanation to this ridiculous phenomenon is quite simple.

As you can see from this picture, the Twin’s perimeters were not made from steel columns alone. There was also additional aluminum coating fixed on the outer sides of the steel perimeter columns. And, unlike the steel columns (which were more or less solid from the bedrock all the way up to the Tower’s tops), the aluminum coating was arranged in much shorter vertical segments. If you look at the above picture’s detail carefully enough, you will notice certain horizontal lines parallel to each other repeating on equal intervals which are slightly visible on the undamaged parts of the Tower’s façade. These lines are nothing more than joining points where aluminum coating pieces connect together length wise.

The problem the 9/11 perpetrators had was that they needed to position the hollow-shaped charges of conventional explosives (which were designed to imitate the impact holes – the
planes’ silhouettes) not inside the Tower, but OUTSIDE the Tower – because their explosive energy need to be directed inwards to make the entire set up look plausible.

If they positioned the charges inside the Tower, then the entire section of the Tower that was supposed to be “hit by a plane” would not fall inside the Tower as it was supposed to happen. It would have been blown out of the Tower and, instead of the “landing gear” and the “plane’s engine” simpletons would find on a sidewalk, they found pieces of the Tower’s own perimeters. Apparently, this was not an option.

Attaching the cutting charges outside the Twin Tower’s facades was not an option either – they would be visible to the public.

Therefore, the tricky 9/11 perpetrators placed the hollow-shaped charges in between the outer aluminum coating and the actual perimeter steel columns. The explosive energy of the charges was directed inwards – in order to cut the steel bars precisely in the right spots. And, indeed, it worked – as you can see the inner steel bars (which appear to be a “rusty” color as opposed to the bluish-shiny aluminum coating) were indeed cut in the correct spots to imitate the planes’ silhouettes precisely. Moreover, the cut ends of these steel bars additionally bend inwards – exactly as it was supposed to look.

However, the 9/11 perpetrators miscalculated something.

Even though most of the explosive energy of the hollow-shaped charges was directed inwards (towards the steel), some relatively minor explosive energy was directed backwards – creating a kind of recoil effect. This managed to blow the aluminum coating outwards. However, instead of actually “cutting through” this aluminum coating, the unruly explosion simply tore out these entire full strip lengths of aluminum and threw them back outwards onto the sidewalks.

Therefore, depending on the vertical disposition of the hollow-shaped charges in some parts, it was single vertical length of aluminum bars that got torn out, and, in some other places – double vertical length ones, and, in some other portions – triple vertical length, etc. Therefore these “impact holes” look so ridiculously silly – displaying their “stepped” pattern, instead of the perfect silhouette of a “plane” like it would have been if there were only steel bars alone.

[The below insertion was missing in the original NEXUS-magazine version; it was added only to the Internet-version of this article.]

You can see in detail how these pieces of aluminum coating were blown outwards on the very last video which is at the end of this article and is designed to demonstrate the absence of the vortices from the planes’ engines.

At the very beginning of that video, you can clearly see multiple fixed length pieces of aluminum coating being blown outwards slightly ahead of the fireballs from the actual explosion which was supposed to have been caused by the “first plane” which supposedly penetrated the North Tower of the WTC.

Here is a screenshot of that video showing the pieces of same length aluminum coating flying outwards:
I have always dreamed of finding some good quality pictures which show the pieces of that outer aluminum coating flying away the moment of explosion. But because such pictures were considered “highly seditious” by the US authorities, they were all censored and it was nearly impossible to discover them anywhere on the Internet for many years. However, maybe because of my good luck, I was actually able to find one of such pictures by mere chance (or, perhaps by God’s grace).


The edition was titled “Brought to JUSTICE” and was devoted entirely to the then recent alleged “murder” of Osama bin Laden (who was claimed to have been allegedly “murdered” by US commandos somewhere in a sovereign territory in the independent state of Pakistan and whose body was hastily drowned in the nearest deep sea location some approximate 2,000 kilometers away).

Usually I have no interest in such propaganda material, especially of this kind, but this time I was waiting for a friend and had nothing better to do. So I took the magazine from the stand and lazily flicked through it.
Aside from a few high quality portraits of Osama bin Laden and his relatives and of a few ridiculously propagandistic photos, on pages 8-9 of the magazine was placed a highly seditious shot of the explosion in the South Tower – exactly the one I had always dreamed of finding!

Of course, I immediately bought the magazine and scanned the photo out of it.
The photo belongs to a certain Naomi Stock. I feel that I have simply no right to deprive my reader of seeing this absolutely unprecedented shot and I sincerely hope that Ms Naomi Stock doesn’t mind if I place her photo here along with the claim that this is the most important 9/11 evidence that has long been hidden from the community:

This unique high-quality picture shows in detail those pieces of aluminum coating of equal length, projecting away from the explosion, just a split second ahead of the orange fireballs that originate from within the Tower.

Some of those pieces of aluminum coating are seen on that photo in more or less exact detail.

Another interesting thing is that here you can see the pieces of aluminum coating flying in both directions – to the right (i.e. by the supposed “course” of the “plane”), as well as to the left – i.e. in the direction that is exactly opposite of the supposed “course” of the “plane” (the “plane” according to the official story and according to the video shown on TV approached the South Tower from the left).

Let's come back to the first photo above that shows the details of the damage and the peculiar “stepping pattern” hole that was supposedly created by the aluminum plane in the steel perimeter of the WTC North Tower (even including “narrow cuts” purported to have been made by aluminum wings and the aluminum tail of the aluminum “terrorist plane”).

Actually, I have an even better photograph of that spot than the above one. Here it is:
Since we now understand everything about the aluminum coating (that was positioned in same-length segments) and since we now understand everything about the whole steel columns under those pieces of coating, now we can clearly understand what happened in reality.
Regardless and aside from everything else, in this particular photo a woman can clearly be seen desperately holding onto one of the up-right columns; she is recognized as Mrs. Edna Cintron, who was hoping to be rescued at that last moment; unfortunately, she was killed in the collapse of the North Tower; but in that last moment of her life she demonstrated to the world (by her mere presence at the supposed “hot spot” where steel columns “melted”) that the US Government lied to the public.

Actually, many people reading this can quite reasonably ask: But what about the eye-witnesses who saw “planes”? The answer is this: the number of eye-witnesses who DID NOT SEE ANY PLANES is about equal to the number of “eye-witnesses” who said they saw “planes”.

NOTE: on my personal YouTube Channel there are a few “seditious” contemporary news releases pertaining to the very first minutes of the 9/11 tragedy. These videos show that NONE of the very first witnesses saw or heard any “planes”, but only saw and heard EXPLOSIONS on the upper floors of the Twin Towers. Here are direct links to these videos:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0YarBxlJzUk
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y68DfCMQS7c
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kPOF53TSr4
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d3LXJwI-7xY
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bq1-BCeNcm0
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XA8xD9CFu40
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LT-Xa7m7K4
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2VpQ88Y9WM
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CI2WZY869I
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7c8eT99_BAs
However, the mass media preferred to mostly air footage of “eye-witnesses” who claimed they had seen “planes”.

The entire 9/11 production was a grand deception. If somebody could manage to produce falsified images of “planes” cutting through the steel perimeters of the Twin Towers like the planes were steel and the Towers made of butter, and managed to feed this footage to every mass media outlet, would it not be reasonable to presume he couldn’t prepare some bogus witnesses ahead of time who would claim they saw “planes”? Of course, we have to presume so. All those “eye-witnesses” who allegedly “saw” how aluminum planes penetrated the steel double-walled perimeters of the Twin Towers with such ease were merely actors hired by the 9/11 perpetrators themselves to lie to the mass media and to the public in order to set the “official storyline” in motion.

And, finally, here are two more videos.

8) VIDEO – YouTube direct link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rml2TL5N8ds http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uT1q0j5Pzr0 (second edition)

This is so far the best and the most comprehensive research on the 9/11 “planes” made by a famous 9/11 researcher and a specialist in video compositing Collin Alexander alias “Ace Baker”. This video is an absolute “must see”.

And this final one is a brief video which, without having to say a word, clearly shows how we were tricked by “planes”. Regardless, at the beginning of this video you can see those same pieces of aluminum coating discussed above which fly outwards from the building.

9) VIDEO – YouTube direct link: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xlj1mVD2-HM

[Description verbatim from the YouTube by the video’s creator:] On all Videotapes of the 1st and 2nd strike there is no Vortex visible. I came aware of this when Factfinder general on Pilots for Truth told me half a year ago. Back then Rob Balsamo, Pilot, made me skeptical saying that the Heat of the Explosion, is too hot to be affected by the Vortices. But then I became aware of these Videos which clearly show that even in Napalm fire, Vortices are still present, as in normal air conditions. Watch the 911 Videos in HD and look closely, there is no turbulence in the smoke or fire. This is only possible when there are no Planes. This might look like a small piece to the perps, but is in fact hard evidence. Pre planted charges can look nice, but cannot reproduce the real effect of Jet Engines Turbulence/Vortices.

The laws of physics didn’t take a holiday on 9/11. But the common sense of gullible people watching TV appeared to have taken that holiday instead…

Nonetheless, older English dictionaries printed before September 11 which define the very special nuclear term “ground zero” could serve as the best medicine to overcome the 9/11 illusion and to regain your common sense…

Along with older English dictionaries, for the same reason, these photographs could also be used to show the molten rock left behind after the underground cavities were created by nuclear explosions under all three buildings of the World Trade Center. They eventually cooled down and were, at last, cleared of all remaining radioactive materials:
Perhaps, without an obligatory formal witness’s testimony the 9/11 picture drawn by me in this article would not be complete. Perhaps at least one testimony of a witness is indeed required. There are many of such testimonies available, but I selected the best and the most convincing ones.

There is one remarkable article titled “Rudy Tuesday” published by The New York Magazine online. This article is not only remarkable because the term ground zero in relation to Manhattan’s “Ground Zero” is used in it “as is” – i.e. without any quotation marks and without any capitalization – as it would normally appear in any civil defense manual, but because of the actual statement by former Mayor of New York Rudolph Giuliani.

I think it is such a masterpiece of the important 9/11 evidence and such an important witness’ testimony from the point of view of psychology, that I have to quote here the entire part of the article “as is”, without modifying anything.

The important things you should pay close attention to, however, are made in bold by me. Make sure to notice that in the aftermath of the unprecedented WTC kerosene-pancake collapse the Mayor of New York for no apparent reason “went nuclear” and began his speech with silly comments about nuclear reactors and continued it with his claims that he KNEW on top of WHAT the ground zero workers were actually standing on (meaning the same people he sent to clean up ground zero without having issued any of them lunar-looking haz-mat suits):

“Right, 9/11. Out in the dining room, after the salads are served, Delaware congressman Mike Castle takes the microphone. He talks about Rudy and the squeegee men. BlackBerrys continue scrolling. But then Castle tells of the ground-zero tour the mayor gave him and other congressmen in the days after the terror attacks. People start to pay attention. “He attended most of the funerals; he was there in every way possible,” says Castle. “I don’t think we can ever thank him enough for what he did.” Now Rudy strides to the podium. The room rises. Suits at the cheap tables stand and a banker type sticks his fingers in his mouth and gives a loud whistle. Initially, Giuliani squanders the goodwill. A bit on immigration lands with a thud. He notes that China has built more than 30 nuclear reactors since we last built one. “Maybe we should copy China.” What? You can see the thought bubbles forming over people’s heads: Can this be the same guy we saw on television? The guy who was so presidential when our actual president was MIA? But then Rudy finds his comfort zone. Along with McCain and Mitt Romney, his best-known fellow Republican presidential contenders, Giuliani is out on the thin, saggy pro-surge limb with the president. But Rudy can spin the issue in a way McCain and Romney, not to mention Hillary and Barack Obama, cannot. And now he does just that: Iraq leads to 9/11, which leads to the sacred image of construction workers raising the flag over ground zero. “I knew what they were standing on top of,” Giuliani says. “They were standing on top of a cauldron. They were standing on top of fires 2,000 degrees that raged for a hundred days. And they put their lives at risk raising that flag.” The room is silent. Not a fork hits a plate, not one gold bracelet rattles. “They put the flag up to say, ‘You can’t beat us, because we’re Americans.’ ” The mayor pauses and, as if on cue, an old woman sniffles. He continues. “And we don’t say this with arrogance or in a militaristic way, but in a spiritual way: Our ideas are better than yours.”

I am not quite sure, of course, if “their ideas” are indeed “better than ours” because I don’t think that it was a good idea at all – to demolish skyscrapers in the middle of a populated city by thermonuclear explosions whereby each explosion is 8 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb, but in principle I agree with Mr. Giuliani. The poor ground zero responders were indeed standing on top of a cauldron and they indeed did put their lives at risk – as you may sincerely expect to be the case when gullible people visit the location of a fresh nuclear explosion and without wearing any protective gear.

From now on, I believe, the reader has more or less a complete picture of the events – what exactly took place at Manhattan’s “Ground Zero” and what the term “ground zero” used to mean in the pre-9/11 English language and this is even supported by important witness’ testimony.

I guess that many readers, of course, will have a lot of questions – what hit the Pentagon? If planes didn’t hit the Twin Towers, then where did the actual planes disappear to? What happened to the passengers? What happened with the alleged “hijackers”? What happened with Flight 93? Why was the Doomsday Plane seen flying on 9/11? Why was it not possible to collapse the North Tower before the South Tower? Why did US officials demolish the Twins and WTC-7 at all? Why were there not a lot of cases of acute radiation sickness among ground zero responders, but rather cases of chronic radiation sickness? Who sent the anthrax letters, and why? Why did the controlling services of other countries – for example, those of Russia, India and China – prefer to “look the other way” when the US Government demolished the World Trade Center using three 150 kiloton thermonuclear explosions and knowing that Afghanistan and Iraq had absolutely nothing to do with it? Why was the IAEA silent? And, at last, who organized 9/11 and why?

As you can probably imagine, 9/11 was such a complicated operation and its separate aspects are so much intertwined that it is simply impossible to describe the entire 9/11 affair “in brief” while devoting such little attention to each of its aspect. It is quite difficult to fill in all the blanks regarding the entire 9/11 scenario in such a short article.

In September of 2009, I produced a more or less comprehensive video-presentation that lasts well over 4 hours and explains quite a bit about 9/11 in its entirety. This video can be found on the Internet by searching for “Dimitri Khalezov video”. Besides, I wrote a book that comprises well over 500 pages in A4 format. This is just to illustrate that it is really impossible - to explain in a fully comprehensible manner, what really happened on 9/11 in its entirety and in such a limited article. Perhaps, just attempting to explain the technicalities of the 9/11 missile attack on the Pentagon and the circumstances surrounding the Pentagon attack alone would require about as much info as contained in this article. But, hopefully, this story can be continued here.

Therefore, from all the potential questions mentioned in the above paragraph, I can only answer the last one: the 9/11 perpetration was organized by those who wanted to drive the United States along with other countries into ridiculous wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and who want to strip the citizens of these countries of their last remaining civil liberties and human rights. It should be understood that no Al-Qaeda and not any other Muslim organization could have afforded to feed falsified “plane” footage to the US mass-media, to hire witnesses who “saw” aluminum planes penetrate steel and to simultaneously demolish the World Trade Center by three 150 kiloton underground thermo-nuclear explosions, each of which was 8 times as powerful as the first atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima.

P.S. The most seditious diagram from the “old good days”...

The diagram below was discovered by one of my readers on the Wikipedia web site in an article describing nuclear tests here: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_weapons_testing

The actual picture was published here:

The picture file was originally named: 591px-Types_of_nuclear_testing_svg.png

Though this picture was not included into the original version of this article published by the NEXUS magazine, I loved this silly drawing and couldn’t resist adding it to the Internet-version of my article.
The diagram apparently represents four types of nuclear explosions conducted in various environments:

1) atmospheric; 2) underground; 3) exoatmospheric; 4) underwater.

Guess why they position a certain “tall structure” on top of the spot of an underground nuclear explosion (2)? Which one creates certain “waves” around itself?

This was a classic diagram of the ’70s. Those days nuclear explosions were not “evil” yet and they were widely discussed. And it was not a big secret yet those days – that underground nuclear explosions could be successfully used for demolishing skyscrapers…

**About author**
Mr. Dimitri A. Khalezov, a former Soviet citizen, a former commissioned officer of the so-called “military unit 46179”, otherwise known as “the Special Control Service” of the 12th Chief Directorate of the Defense Ministry of the USSR. The Special Control Service, also known as the Soviet atomic (later “nuclear”) intelligence was a secret military unit responsible for the detection of nuclear explosions (including underground nuclear tests) of various adversaries of the former USSR as well as responsible for controlling the observance of various international treaties related to nuclear testing and to peaceful nuclear explosions. After September the 11th Khalezov undertook some extensive 9/11 research and proved that the Twin Towers of World Trade Center, as well as its building 7, were demolished by three underground thermo-nuclear explosions – which earned the very name “ground zero” to the demolition site. Moreover, he testifies that he knew about the built-in “emergency nuclear demolitions schema” of the Twin Towers as long ago as the ’80s – while being a serviceman in the Soviet Special Control Service.

PLEASE, READ:

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

It was not easy at all – to produce this research and to create the corresponding video presentation. Besides taking several years to collect evidence, it also took several years of fighting with various secret services who opposed this work in one way or another. None of it was at all cheap…

In addition to all of that, it requires considerable expense to distribute these materials today and to translate them to various languages.

As a result of our efforts, you got to know, at last, the truth about the most complicated and the most incredible event of the 21st century – 9/11. It is unlikely that anything else could be compared with the importance of this knowledge you have received free of charge.

However, it was free of charge for you, but not for me. I still have to pay from my pocket to bring this information to you.
If you want to express your gratitude or support my efforts, or both, please, consider donating. Funds are badly needed to keep things moving. When you donate to us you can be sure that you support the very Truth.

You can find details on how to donate on our web sites mentioned at the end of this article [please, note that access to some of our web sites may be blocked by police depending on your country and so they might be accessible from certain countries only via a proxy].

Or you can transfer money (in any currency) directly to this bank account in Bangkok, Thailand:

**Beneficiary Bank:** Krung Thai Bank Public Company Limited

**SWIFT code:** KRTHTHBK

**BIC code:** not used by banks in Thailand (if really necessary, it could be substituted for by the SWIFT code)

**ROUTING NO/ CHIPS UD:** 007895

**Branch:** Yannawa branch

**ADDRESS:** Krung Thai Bank Public Company Limited, Yannawa branch, 1674/3 Charoen Krung Road, Yannawa, Sathon, Bangkok, 10120, Thailand. Telephone +66(0)2211-0156, +66(0)2211-0-2211-3300

**Beneficiary's Name:** MR. DMITRI KHALEZOV

**Beneficiary's Account No:** 010-0-47535-3

**IBAN No:** not used by banks in Thailand (if really necessary, it could be substituted for by “TH0100475353”, but it is better to avoid doing so)

Should the abovementioned account become closed by authorities, you would be duly notified of such a sad fact and you could always find updated information in regard to another bank account that could be used for donations on www.911thology.com or www.911thology.co web sites, or you can contact me personally for that reason.

For those who do not trust online donations and prefer to send a check here is the postal address:

**Mr. Dmitri Khalezov** [note that “Dmitri” is without “i” in between “d” and “m”]

P.O. Box 36
Yannawa
Bangkok
Thailand 10120
Alternatively, the donations could be sent via the “Western Union” service directly to:

Mr. Dmitri Khalezov, Bangkok, Thailand.

[P lease, make sure to note that in this case the first name spells not “Dimitri”, but “Dmitri” without “i” in between “d” and “m”, and that the middle-name is not used; note also that the name and surname cannot be switched, otherwise the Western Union will reject such a transaction.]

If the Western Union for some reason demands my street address, here it is:

Dmitri Khalezov, 333, Soi 40, Phahonyothin Rd, Senanikom, Chatuechak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand. (please, do not send me letters there, because they are likely to be lost; send them, instead, to my P.O. Box 36 mentioned above).

If the Western-Union was used, please, make sure to send an SMS with the following details regarding the Western Union transfer:

- MTCN (Money Transfer Control Number);
- the name of the sender (the FULL name);
- the country the money was sent from;
- currency type;
- the amount transferred;

- to this mobile phone number in Bangkok: +66812492233, and, please, repeat the same information once again to this e-mail address: donate(AT)911thology.com

If you use Bitcoin, here is my wallet: 1L4VE5ED5k1RS56i9wg4QDE3ehurHFNz3F

Alternatively, donations could be sent via “WebMoney” ( http://www.webmoney.ru/eng/ ) system into either of these Web Money “purses” that belong to Dimitri Khalezov:

Z285632610819 (US dollars)
E159784303016 (Euros)
R384502243216 (Russian rubles)
U327130392143 (Ukrainian hryvnias)

(Please, do not use any “confirmation/authorization” option if you wish to donate money via the WebMoney system and, please, do not specify such a transfer as “donation”, but merely as a “payment for the book” or a “payment for the video”).

You could contact me if you have some other ideas regarding support or offers of cooperation too.

My telephones in Bangkok, Thailand:  +6681-2492233 and  +6681-4403337
081-2492233  081-4403337
Convenient time for contacting via telephone: 8 AM – 9 PM Bangkok time (+7 GMT). Please, note that mobile phones +6685-1230760 and +6681-1333644 formerly shown on my web site as contact telephones are still functioning, but now they are reserved for strictly personal use.

My other contact details can be found here:

www.dkhalezov.com

or here:

www.911thology.com

or here:

www.911thology.co

Besides donating, some volunteers are needed who could help to copy and redistribute the truth about 9/11, as well as volunteers who could help to translate these materials into foreign languages, primarily Persian, Arabic, Turkish, but also French, Spanish, Japanese and Chinese. Translating it to other languages could be beneficial as well. However, please, contact me before starting any particular translation to verify if it is still needed, because translations of certain materials into certain languages might exist.

Should you desire to contribute any funds or any personal efforts to either distribution or translation of these materials, please, contact me. Contact details could be always found on www.dkhalezov.com or www.911thology.com or www.911thology.co [please, note that an access to some web sites could be blocked by police in your country and so they might be accessible from certain countries only via a proxy].

In sensitive cases, an encrypted way of communication using CipherWall Network is preferred. Please, see www.dkhalezov.com (contacts page) for more details on how to use this program.

Thank you in advance for donating.

I will be grateful as well if you help us to redistribute these materials. Make copies and send them to others. Upload them to the Internet and burn them to DVDs. Send them to your Senators, send them to the Ground Zero responders, send them to those who rent offices around Ground Zero and to those who rent offices in the Sears Tower, send them to your friends, send them to your relatives, and send them just to everyone. Urge others to do the same thing and to send it to more people. People must know the Truth. When every US citizen will know what really happened with the WTC, the US Government will have no choice than to admit the Truth, at last, and to punish those, who were really guilty of 9/11. Perhaps, you will even have a chance to demand back some of your former
civil liberties that were taken from you as a result of 9/11 and the war against so-called “terror”…

Send these materials to more people and you will see more public response of the same kind:

Endnotes:


2 Ibid, S5.


yet another shocking story here: http://abcnews.go.com/US/Story?id=2408066&page=1


Further links:

Latest information (including information of the latest published materials, the Author’s contact information and information concerning donations) [please, note that an access to some web
sites could be blocked by police in your country and so they might be accessible from certain countries only via a proxy:

http://www.dkhalezov.com
http://www.911thology.org
http://www.911thology.biz
http://www.911thology.fr
http://www.911thology-arabic.com
http://www.911thology-turkish.com

http://www.911thology.com
http://www.911thology.net
http://www.911thology.ru
http://www.911thology.es
http://www.911thology-it
http://www.911thology-pl

http://www.911thology.info
http://www.911thology.de
http://www.911thology.fr
http://www.911thology-es
http://www.911thology-it
http://www.911thology-pl

Download videos and other files: http://911-truth.net
YouTube Channel: http://www.youtube.com/user/DimitriKhalezov

I would like to inform you about another scandalous article of mine – this time dealing with the so-called “bio-terrorism”, namely with infamous “Anthrax letters” that were sent in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 by the supposed “Muslim terrorists”. It could be downloaded from here:

http://www.911-truth.net/911_Anthrax_Attacks_Dimitri_Khalezov_English.doc
http://www.911-truth.net/911_Anthrax_Attacks_Dimitri_Khalezov_English.pdf

I am also glad to inform everyone that the full edition of my book is now available in English. Download links could be found on this web site: http://www.911thology.com

English, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Thai, Italian, Chinese, Turkish, Arabic, Dutch, Polish, Swedish, etc. versions of this article in MS Word and PDF formats could be from this web site http://www.911-truth.net/ (some translations might not be ready yet; while additional zip-archives with pictures used could be found on the same web site):

http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_English.doc

http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_Farsi.doc

http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_Arabic.doc
http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_Arabic_Farsi.doc
http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_Turkish.doc
http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_Spanish.doc
http://www.911-truth.net/11th_of_September-the_Third_Truth_NEXUS_magazine_German.doc