

Swiss Professors: WTC 7 Collapse Most Likely Controlled Demolition

Jesse Goplen's Public Neural Interface, Wednesday September 27 2006

The Bitter Debate Over September 11th

Penetrating questions are repeatedly asked in the United States, and also in Switzerland, about the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 (9/11) and the resulting wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

By Daniele Ganser*
Translated by Jesse Goplen**

The Iraq War is not about fighting terror, it's primarily about the control of globally diminishing inventories of petroleum and natural gas, the American Fadel Gheit, former manager at the petroleum concern ExxonMobil, is convinced. "Our way of life in the US requires 20 million barrels daily, of which half must be imported. We resemble a patient on petroleum dialysis," according to Gheit. "This is about life and death here."

Contrary to the allegations of Vice President Dick Cheney, Saddam Hussein, the deposed dictator of Iraq, bears no responsibility for 9/11 and did not seek an atomic weapon, protests Scott Ritter, former UN inspector in Iraq. "We were told a lot of lies, and the media follow blindly and repeat these lies. The Bush Administration manipulated the data in order to provide a basis for the invasion of Iraq."

Afghanistan serves as a conduit country for oil and gas pipelines from the Caspian Sea to the Indian Ocean as well as a military base, to surround the Middle East "under the pretense of fighting terrorism," says Michael Ruppert, former police officer with the Los Angeles Police Department.

Three Theories

The thesis of the great geostrategic battle of the superpowers (US, Russia and China) over the dwindling oil and natural gas reserves is at first glance plausible, and widely held, also in Europe, not least because of the climbing oil price. The theory is nonetheless problematic. For this theory raises the fundamental question of whether the US Administration is primarily hunting terrorists or crude oil.

It is therefore not astonishing that the acrimonious debate in the US does not remain confined to the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but has also encompassed 9/11, the largest terror attack in history with 2973 dead. In the past five years, various films, websites and books about 9/11 have been published in the US. Today these form a nearly unmanageable mass of allegations and counter-allegations.

Three mutually exclusive 9/11 theories stand in opposition to one another. All three theories are conspiracy theories, although their proponents may well deny this. They are conspiracy theories because they all assume a secret agreement between two or more actors before September 11th as a given.

The first theory, the so-called “Surprise Theory,” comes from the US government and is supported by the official American investigation, the 9/11 Commission Report by Thomas Kean, which appeared in the Summer of 2004. This is the official 9/11 story: Osama bin Laden planned the attacks together with Khalid Sheikh Mohammed first in Afghanistan, then a group of 19 Muslims led by Mohammed Atta carried out the terror attack in the US with four airplanes. Bin Laden and his network are guilty of the criminal act.

The second theory, the so-called “Let It Happen On Purpose Theory” (LIHOP), alleges bin Laden and the Al Qaeda network had planned and carried out the attack. Portions of the US government found this out, but despite this deliberately did not avert the attack and sacrificed almost 3000 people to legitimize a series of wars, of which those in Afghanistan and Iraq are only the first two. Both bin Laden as well as portions of the US government are guilty of the criminal act.

Finally, the third theory, the so-called “Make It Happen On Purpose Theory” (MIHOP), maintains the attacks were carried out but the Pentagon and/or the US intelligence agencies, the videos of bin Laden are faked. Almost 3000 people were sacrificed in cold blood, and the people in the US and the world were deceived, in order to legitimize a series of wars. Portions of the US government are guilty of the criminal act.

Kevin Barrett, who teaches a seminar on Islam at the University of Wisconsin – Madison, is a MIHOP proponent, as he explained in June 2006. Other Americans were appalled. Barrett “is embarrassing for the University and the people of Wisconsin,” according to the Republican State Representative Steve Nass, who together with other Republicans called for the University to dismiss Barrett immediately.

The Provost of the University, Patrick Farrell, resisted, stressing freedom in teaching and research. “We cannot permit political pressure by critics of unpopular ideas to block the free exchange of opinions,” said Farrell. “That would open the door to still stronger and broader restrictions.” The students are by all means in a position to analyze deviating theories and form their own opinion. “Knowledge grows, when opinions are debated,” according to Farrell.

Also James Fetzer, emeritus Professor of Philosophy of the University of Minnesota, considers the “surprise theory” nonsense. He thinks LIHOP or MIHOP depicts the truth better. For this he has been repeatedly attacked, but this doesn't scare him or other Americans off. “We will continue this,” said Fetzer, facing CNN. “Our role is to find out what really happened on September 11th.”

Debate in Switzerland

“I'm not surprised that after the difficulties in Iraq and in Afghanistan, 9/11 is now

also debated,” says Kurt Spillman, Emeritus Professor of Security Policy at Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH) Zurich. “But one has to investigate carefully, as the LIHOP and MIHOP theories have an unbelievable explosive political force.”

Which theories the Swiss population prefers is yet unknown. “A broad debate on these theories is, to my knowledge, not yet public in Switzerland or being conducted on a grand scale. But they flare up here and there consistently,” according to Professor Karl Haltiner, director of the annually appearing compendium Sicherheit (“Security”) of the ETH's military academy.

That American intelligence had a hand in 9/11, Weltwoche Journalist Hanspeter Born considers a “monstrous suspicion,” as he writes in an article on the anti-Americanism that is also widely prevalent in Switzerland. “If it were so, then America would actually be a rotten, sick country to its very core.”

Philipp Sarasin, Professor of History at the University of Zurich, produced a book about the anthrax attacks that followed 9/11 in which he critically scrutinizes the politics of fear and advocates the thesis that these letter-attacks were possibly an “inside job.” 9/11, Sarasin states, remains fully unexplained: “Which of the three 9/11 theories is true must be further investigated by historians. But already today it can be said that the official version - we could never have imagined that we would be attacked by civilian aircraft - is at least in one point provably false: such attacks have been taken into consideration as a possibility for years; in November 2000 an attack on the Pentagon by civilian aircraft was even practiced on a large model building.”

World Trade Center 7 (WTC 7) is among the many complicated factual matters the three theories dispute. It is little known that on September 11th in New York not two skyscrapers collapsed - WTC 1 and WTC 2, the familiar “Twin Towers” - but three. The third building was the 170 meter tall WTC 7 that collapsed in on itself in seven seconds at 5:20pm.

Mistrust Due to WTC 7

In a May 2006 Zogby poll 43% of Americans revealed they had never heard anything about WTC 7. This was largely because only the twin towers were shown repeatedly on television. An unsettled 42% declared they believed the US government and the 9/11 investigation would conceal something.

“Americans have been poorly and one-sidedly informed about 9/11, first and foremost the 'surprise theory' has been disseminated through every channel,” according to Professor Albert Stahel of the University of Zurich. “Now that is taking its toll. Alternative media have launched a counter-attack, spreading LIHOP and MIHOP theories. Who wins will only be shown in the future. The mistrust of government is great.”

“There is a problem with WTC 7,” explained the actor Charlie Sheen, known for his roles in Platoon and Wall Street. “And if there is a problem with WTC 7, then there is a problem with the entire 9/11 story,” Sheen said on the radio in March 2006. WTC 7 could not have been brought to a collapse by an airplane, as it was never in fact hit by an airplane. It could also not have been broken down by an earthquake or by the

collapse of the twin towers, because almost seven hours passed between the collapse of the twin towers and WTC 7. Possible causes are said to be only fire or demolition.

In fact there was a small fire in WTC 7. But Sheen doubts that this fire caused the collapse of WTC 7. Anyone who believes that “needs psychiatric evaluation,” says Sheen. A demolition requires multiple days of preparation. It was hardly Osama bin Laden and his helpers, as they were never accused of it. Therefore only MIHOP remains.

Sheen's statements led to a fierce debate. “How can any rational person believe that our government attacked our own people?”, asked a CNN viewer via e-mail. Another opined: “This is a very important issue that must be discussed by the general public. It is our patriotic duty to find out why and how 9/11 could have occurred.”

Sheen, supported by Hollywood star Sharon Stone, stuck to his question: “I am simply an upstanding American citizen who pays taxes, loves his country, and who resists the propagation of such great nonsense over such obvious truths.”

If one searches in the 566-page long Kean Report for WTC 7 and the cause of its collapse, one will be disappointed. WTC 7 is not mentioned once in the official report on 9/11. Theology professor David Ray Griffin sharply criticized this “omission and distortion” and published a book on the many deficiencies of the Kean Report which has received much attention. He writes: “The 9/11 Commission bypasses another embarrassing problem – the explanation of how WTC 7 could collapse in practically free-fall – as it simply does not mention the collapse of the building.”

“If the official and final investigation of September 11th only speaks of the collapse of two skyscrapers, while in fact and truth three skyscrapers collapsed in Manhattan, then it is difficult to classify the Kean Report as a solid historical source for the monumental incident that is 9/11,” said history professor Georg Kreis of the University of Basel. “Only the fewest know of these details, but they are alarming.”

Fire or Demolition?

Peter Forster, President of the Swiss federal Konsultativkommission für innere Sicherheit (Consultative Commission for Interior Security), emphasizes that it is also very important for Switzerland to know if the “war against terrorism” is a subterfuge for capturing energy resources. “The debate about WTC 7 one has to keep an eye on, certainly. But the LIHOP and MIHOP theories are very explosive, that would be enormous.”

In the US, FEMA produced an interim report in May 2002 explaining that WTC was a completely custom building. The Pentagon, the CIA and the US Secret Service had rented portions of the building. In the basement were large diesel generators to supply the building with energy during emergencies. It was “presently still unknown,” according to the conclusion of FEMA, “how the fire could have caused the collapse of the building.” The New York Times commented that WTC 7 was the “great secret” of the attacks, because until that day in the US a building made of steel and concrete had never collapsed due to fire.

“We simply don't know what exactly happened in WTC 7,” said Mario Fontana,

sitting Professor of Structural Analysis and Construction at ETH-Zurich. At conferences of structural analysis experts one has discovered only very little on the collapse of WTC 7. It is at least thinkable that a long, on-going fire could have caused the collapse of the building, according to Fontana.

FEMA forwarded the WTC 7 file to the government's National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) . Whereupon unsettled Americans and journalists called and wanted to know from NIST why WTC 7 collapsed. "I don't understand this fascination people have with WTC 7," retorted NIST speaker Michael Newman in March 2006.

"In my opinion the building WTC 7 was, with great probability, professionally demolished," says Hugo Bachmann, Emeritus ETH-Professor of Structural Analysis and Construction. And also Jörg Schneider, likewise emeritus ETH-Professor of Structural Analysis and Construction, interprets the few available video recordings as evidence that "the building WTC 7 was with great probability demolished."

The owner of WTC 1, WTC 2 and WTC 7, Larry Silverstein, reminisced on US television one year after the attacks in September 2002 about the collapse of WTC 7. The fire department informed him that there was a fire in the building. After that Silverstein recounted his own statements: "Perhaps it's best if we pull it." "And so they decided to pull it, and we watched as the building came down." Later Silverstein defended himself, by "pull it" he meant "evacuate the firefighters." 9/11 critics like US millionaire Jimmy Walter point out that this makes no sense, "it" would have to refer to a thing.

Steel Beams in Asia

To find out whether fire or demolition led to the collapse of WTC 7, one would have had to examine the steel beams. But they're gone. "Over 80% of the WTC steel has already been sold, most, if not all, before the scientists and criminologists could examine it," protested Anthony Weiner, US Representative from New York, in March 2002 in the US Congress. The steel was recycled in Asia. Professor Frederick Mowrer of the University of Maryland's Fire Protection Engineering Department, who, together with other experts, had to investigate the collapse of the WTC buildings, criticized this action sharply: "I find the speed with which important evidence was taken away and recycled alarming."

* Daniele Ganser is a historian at the University of Zurich. His book "NATO's Secret Armies" explores staged terrorism in the Cold War. He contributed a chapter to a new collection by David Ray Griffin ("9/11 and American Empire: Academics Speak Out"). www.danieleganser.ch

** Translator's note: I have not sought the original quotes in English from English-speaking figures in the article, but translated the translations back into English. www.jessegoplen.com

The original story appears at <http://tagesanzeiger.ch/dyn/news/ausland/663864.html> - Zurich Tages-Anzeiger 09/09/06