

Reynolds & Rajter paper, comments.
October 3, 2006

Reviewer 3:

Reviewer's Summary

This paper attempts to prove that the no Boeing airliners crashed at the any of the four sites involved in the September 11, 2001 events. To establish their claim, the authors cite the lack of plane debris at each location, the complete disappearance of the planes involved in the WTC events into the buildings with little or no deceleration and the unlikeliness of the resulting "silhouettes", the sudden loss of kinetic energy of the alleged WTC planes after they completely entered the buildings, problems surrounding the alleged hijackers, the unreliability of eyewitness reports, and other anomalies regarding the planes such as the very late de-registration of the airliner tail numbers. The authors indicate that videos showing planes entering the building must be fake, physical evidence was planted, and stealth technology may have been employed as a means of covering the truth and getting people to believe that airliners hijacked by fanatical Muslims were involved.

Comments

I would like to begin this review by saying that I believe that there is sufficient material to build a good, though not necessarily compelling, case in support of the authors' thesis worthy of ongoing discussion and hence publication. However, I found that this particular paper was extremely difficult to read and follow. In brief, I find that this paper:

- is poorly organized
- uses a great deal of inflammatory, insulting, and inappropriate rhetoric
- makes emotional appeals
- is speculative in some of its claims
- uses potentially misleading images
- is poorly referenced and does not establish the credibility of some references
- does not sufficiently support many of its claims
- does not provide enough information on some of its points
- relegates what should be a central part of the thesis to an appendix
- is dismissive of issues it should examine more closely
- does not properly catalogue and investigate all the available data
- includes issues not directly supporting to the thesis without

Due to the extensive problems with this paper I will not be exhaustive on all of the above points, but will support each one.

1) Organization

The paper does not clearly state each of the claims it will make in its introduction. The organization of the paper as a whole should follow a clearly written introduction and build the case for each claim point by point. The conclusion of this paper could be more complete in summarizing the main points and indicating any lingering issues that may need further consideration. The use of unnecessary and inappropriate rhetoric throughout the paper (see next point) obscures the organization of the paper by diverting the reader from the main theses. I would prefer to see the authors assume very little prior knowledge on the relevant issues by prospective readers. The authors can and should assume the readers are able to determine the importance of the paper for themselves and need not dwell on it in this paper. The section that they devote to this is also laden with the rhetoric that is the subject of the next point.

2) Inappropriate Rhetoric

The use of inappropriate language is so prolific in this paper that only a few examples will be cited. Phrases such as "government-media-paymaster complex", "the world domination project", "mind control engine", "propaganda matrix", and "killers-for-hire" are vague, undefined, and unsupported. The following sentence:

Credulous Americans, including physicists and engineers judging by their silence, join in embracing such a WTC Boeing crash fiction at each tower.

Is unnecessarily insulting and judgmental. This paper should be building building its NBB case rather than involving itself in such judgements.

The sentence:

This theory led Australian 9/11 researcher Gerard Holmgren to suggest that carbide-tipped rotary saw blades to cut steel will be superseded by aluminum blades.

is employed for effect, does not lend any substance to the paper's thesis, and is hence unnecessary.

Other examples could be cited.

3) Emotional appeals

The section titled "Importance" attempts build sympathy for the paper's case by decrying that "the other side" has labeled NBB proponents as "kooks". This type of argumentative approach should be avoided, the paper should unemotionally build its case.

The following argument:

Once their deception and treasonous collaboration come into the bright sunlight for all to see, an unprecedented wave of anger will be unleashed against the killers, their media mouthpieces, and their paymasters. The traitors will be drowned, and America's reinvention will begin.

is violent, emotion-laden imagery that assumes the case the paper should be trying to build. It should have no place in this paper.

4) Speculative claims

That the military "may have cloaking or stealth technology" that was used on the aircraft involved in the 9/11 events is highly speculative. The credibility of the single web reference given in support is not suitably established. No other evidence that this technology was available and employed is offered. The suggestion that a plane "might have taken off from Stewart Air base", blended in with a radar inject, and switched to invisibility is purely speculative with no supporting evidence.

5) Misleading images

The cartoon image of the roadrunner and Wile E. Coyote and the image of the roadrunner on a WTC facade is unnecessary and potentially misleading. In building its case that the penetration of the planes into the buildings and that their resulting silhouettes are unlikely, this paper need not and should not resort to such images. Figure 3. with the plane nose down at the Shanksville site is potentially misleading since it is not adequately explained by its caption.

6) References

As mentioned previously the authenticity and reliability of the web site given as a reference on stealth technology is not established. The conclusions at the end of the first paragraph of section V of the paper are not adequately supported or referenced. The credibility and reliability of the references cited at the end of section V are not established. The citation of an un-reviewed article by one of the author's of this paper is inappropriate. Any relevant material from that

article which supports the author's case should be included directly in this paper.

I suspect that issue of references needs much greater review, however, I don't recommend undertaking that effort until a much better paper is produced.

7) Claims insufficiently supported

There are numerous examples in this paper of claims that are either not sufficiently supported or need to be expanded upon. In some of these cases an appropriate reference would also be acceptable. I list some examples here:

- more information needed to establish the improbability of the 25% ave. occupancy of the flights
- that gag orders were placed FAA and emergency workers needs support - the technical ability of the purported Arab pilots is questioned without accompanying support or references
- that "the perps probably hired actors ..." is stated without any support
- that "the witnesses offered often are media" needs further support
- it is stated that the media is controlled without sufficient support
- the case of the first unidentified female witness who "insisted the North Tower hit came from inside" needs further expansion since she in the Path train so did not see the hit and may have only been stating her impressions
- that the south tower fireball "went off too fast to be natural" needs further support
- that the FBI's possession of the Fairbanks video is suspicious needs support as it would not ordinarily be considered suspicious
- that the government planted evidence is stated but not supported

8) Points requiring more information

Figure 3 shows the interesting results of a C-130 colliding with a 10-story apartment building. No mention of this event is made in the text of the paper so the reader must rely on the caption which provides insufficient information and further details. The news article linked to the caption mentions that the plane was performing an emergency landing, however, this fact should be mentioned directly in the paper with estimations of the planes speed. Further details on the location of the impact on the building are needed along with structural details of the building. The article states that the plane hit the building "ripping open the top of the structure and igniting a huge fire". The picture does not show the top of the structure so we are not able to

assess the damage. That this crash can be compared to the WTC collisions needs to be further established.

More data should be supplied on the degree of tower oscillation that is to be expected in each of the proposed scenarios, plane collision versus explosion. There is no support offered for the conclusion that plane impacts and asymmetric gas expansion caused by an explosion would yield similar oscillations.

9) Main point relegated to appendix

The discussion of the deceleration of the plane (alleged) that struck the south tower should be a central part of the paper as it is one of the main pieces of evidence.

Some clean up of the appendix is needed, for instance, a better error estimations in its own measurements and those of others should be made. The parenthetical statement "perhaps I drank too much coffee and was too jittery with the mouse" is inappropriate and an inadequate explanation of measurement error which can proceed from several different sources. It is stated that "the 15 picture spread was (allegedly) taken using fixed .033 second intervals". From the ensuing discussion it does not appear that the precise time interval is required, but that they are intervals of fixed duration is important. Since it is only alleged, this needs further support along with error estimates.

10) Improperly dismissed issues

The major issue on which this paper is improperly dismissive is eyewitness testimony. A much more extensive investigation of eyewitness testimony should be carried out and should include the testimony of witness who report hearing planes. While this paper states that examination of eyewitness testimony "many not be entirely worthless", I would counter that it is essential and should be a central part of the paper.

11) Data not catalogued or investigated

In the context of a more thorough investigation of eyewitness testimony, that testimony should be collected and catalogued for easy examination by the reader, including testimony not directly examined by the paper. A suitable reference to an external catalogue would suffice.

The only airplane debris directly mentioned by this paper is the landing gear near the WTC site. All of the available debris should be catalogued and made available to the reader. A more convincing case that this debris is suspicious needs to be made. It is not clear that figures 7(a), 7(b),

and 7(c) are meant to be of the same piece of landing gear. It is stated that "all planted airplane were under scaffolding, they just pulled the covers off at the right time" without any evidence to support this claim.

12) Issues not directly supporting thesis

This paper addresses some issue that do not directly support the NBB thesis. Some of these are:

- the Osama Bin Laden "fiction"
- other government operations suggesting fraud such as Operation Northwoods, Gulf of Tonkin, etc.
- the existence or identity of the alleged hijackers
- status of various FBI investigations

Osama Bin Laden may be a fiction and the alleged hijackers may never have existed and the buildings may still have been struck by large Boeing aircraft. These issues should be separated out and at most only used as examples of government misdeeds. In a perfectly clean paper they would not need to be mentioned as the NBB thesis would stand or fall on its own merit.

Recommendation

=====

I recommend that this paper not be accepted for publication without a major rewrite that addresses the points given above. I would like to emphasize again that I believe that a good paper worthy of publication and ongoing discussion can be written on this topic. I hope that the authors will pick up the challenge and fill the void with a more deeply researched work that carefully builds its case free from the rhetoric that mars the current work.
