

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نیاشد تن من مباد بدین بوم ویر زنده یک تن مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

[http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global\\_Economy/ND06Dj02.html](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global_Economy/ND06Dj02.html)

## Revisiting the science behind 9/11

### Interview with Victor Fic

4/6/2012

*Even as the blood-stained dust of the World Trade Center was still smoking, the events were triggering one of history's most enduring "whodunit" mysteries. In this interview with Asia Times Online contributor **Victor Fic**, Australian scientist Frank Legge indicts the United States. A second, future interview will present other perspectives.*

*After graduating with a PhD in chemistry in 1983, Legge worked as a research officer for the Australian Department of Agriculture for a number of years. Since the September 11, 2001, attacks he has written articles such as "9/11 - Acceleration Study Proves Explosive Demolition" and "The Pentagon Attack on 9/11: A Refutation of the Flyover Hypothesis Based on Analysis of the Flight Path".*

**Victor Fic:** What is your personal and professional background?

**Frank Legge:** The first qualification I obtained was a Diploma of Agriculture from Longerenong Agricultural College, Victoria. Then I worked in the cattle industry, first as a stock hand then as a contractor. I then acquired a Conditional Purchase block of virgin bush of about 2,700 acres. I completed the purchase, then operated the farm producing grain and wool. It was greatly satisfying, from the "feeding the starving millions" concept, but I eventually realized that increasing farm production did not solve their problems.

**VF:** But you are also trained in science, correct?

**FL:** I moved to the city and enrolled at the University of Western Australia where I earned a PhD in Chemistry. I then worked at the Western Australian Department of Agriculture as a research officer. Next, I started a company making tracking devices to rotate solar panels to face the sun using a concept we patented. After a period of consulting, I have virtually retired. All my time now goes into 9/11 research and writing papers. [1]

**VF:** Where were you when 9/11 occurred?

**FL:** At home in Perth, western Australia.

**VF:** What were your first thoughts?



**FL:** My initial thought was puzzlement. How could the top of the towers fall so rapidly and vertically. But I quickly accepted the media assertions that the collapses were properly explained - the planes' impact and fire. I am inherently not a suspicious person and it did not occur to me for a long time that anything underhand happened.

**VF:** What drew you in to the truth movement?

**FL:** I became aware of the debate on the Internet but took little notice as the information seemed unreliable. Then I heard it said that the buildings fell too fast. I immediately thought I could check that for myself. I used Frame Shots software, free on the Internet, to study the collapses, one frame at a time. In the case of World Trade Center Seven - or building three - I found the collapse rate was so close to free fall that only complete severance of all columns could account for it. The videos also showed an almost exactly vertical fall. So all columns were severed simultaneously. Only explosives could do that. I have been working on 9/11 ever since. [2]

**VF:** Why a journal? [www.journalof911studies.com]. Whose ideas was it? Who funds it? Who controls it?

**FL:** As you must realize, censorship is all powerful. You ask where? Consider how difficult many find it to address this topic. It is much harder in an organization that is not skeptical. Consider how rarely a mainstream newspaper writes about the peer reviewed papers from scientists discussing the fact that global temperature now is considerably lower than during the Medieval period, and the Roman period in Europe. That is blatant censorship.

It is virtually impossible to get a skeptical paper published on 9/11.

**VF:** Who conceived creating a journal so that alleged censorship could be overcome?

**FL:** It was Professor Steven Jones working at Brigham Young University in Utah at the time doing high-level research into nuclear physics who initiated the Journal of 9/11 Studies. Because of his published views on 9/11, which he would not recant, he was forced to retire in January 2007. Wikipedia gives a good account of his activities. [3]

The first papers were published in June 2006. It is not funded by anybody. Its creation and operation has been entirely performed by voluntary labor. Control is in the hands of the editors. Initially these were Professor Jones and Kevin Ryan. Kevin was one of the first to raise public awareness about 9/11 when he wrote a letter to his employer, Underwriters Laboratories, pointing out that their statement that they had not tested the steel used in the twin towers was false. He was forced to resign. He has become notable for his ability to search out connections between various individuals and events of 9/11. [4]

Then I joined and for a while there were three editors. Now Professor Jones has retired. Papers to the journal keep arriving and so it continues.

**VF:** Who are your most credible writers?

**FL:** All papers are peer reviewed, so they all are credible. If you scan the papers, you will find a range of topics and will see that the writers are skilled in certain fields. They only write in their fields of expertise.

**VF:** What was the motive for 9/11 as you see it?

**FL:** The motive is easily discerned by reading the Project for a New American Century [PNAC] papers. In short, the PNAC group proposed that America should assert itself as a dominant force, particularly in the Middle East. To achieve this they said would require a large increase in military spending, sufficient to enable multiple wars to be fought and won simultaneously.

They said the people would not support such expenditure without another "Pearl Harbor". When president George W Bush came to power, many members of the PNAC group, eg [former US vice president] Richard Cheney, [former US defense secretary] Donald Rumsfeld, [former deputy secretary of defense] Paul Wolfowitz, [US political advisors] Richard Perle and Scooter Libby obtained positions of power. So 9/11 was the needed Pearl Harbor. [5]

## **Revisiting the science behind 9/11**

**VF:** You say the US seeks empire, but US President Barack Obama is retreating from Iraq and Afghanistan.

**FL:** That looks good but perhaps he wants to consolidate his forces for an attack on Iran.

**VF:** Who flew the planes?

**FL:** I don't know. Half the named hijackers are still alive so clearly stolen identities were involved. There is no proof that any of the named hijackers were on board as the cameras in the boarding areas were apparently not working.

**VF:** Where are the live hijackers?

**FL:** If there were hijackers, which I think is likely, they are all dead of course. It is not the real hijackers but the "named hijackers" who are still alive. This comes about due to identity theft. Where the live ones are is of no consequence. [6]

**VF:** What about your idea that ground control can land planes if hijacked?

**FL:** It is certain that the technical ability to do this existed in 9/11 as it had already been demonstrated. That, however, is not proof that it happened that way. The one flight that I have studied is that of AA77, into the Pentagon. The behavior of the plane looked more like inexperienced human control than machine control.

**VF:** How were the twin towers actually dropped?

**FL:** These were clearly highly skilled demolition operations. The twin towers came down from the top to create the illusion that it was caused by the planes and fire. So the demolition had to be done about 30 times for each tower, with explosives used on about every third floor, detonated in a descending sequence. There is evidence that nanothermite was used.

**VF:** What is that?

**FL:** Nanothermite is a form of thermite in which the particles are very small, enabling much faster reaction. Thermite is a mixture of an oxidizing reagent and an easily oxidized metal. Commonly it is a mixture of iron oxide and aluminum.

Other explosives may also have been used but there is no proof. WT 7 was the third building felled that day and was brought down from the bottom up in the conventional manner.

**VF:** What is the evidence for the nanothermite?

**FL:** There are two proofs for some type of thermite reaction. The first is the discovery of small spheres, largely iron in the dust. That they are spherical is proof they were once hotter than the

melting point of iron, 1,500 degrees, far hotter than burning fuel or office materials can produce. That they are small is proof that something violent happened to scatter them so that they would solidify in air before they hit the ground. [7]

**VF:** Why do you insist that the Pentagon really was hit by that plane when other truthers say there is no wreckage?

**FL:** Well it is just so bloody obvious. [8] There was little debris outside the Pentagon because the plane was going so fast that most of it went inside. Several observers mentioned seeing little debris outside. Some people spread the idea that something was wrong about this. Whether they were initially honest I do not know, but I strongly suspect some troublemakers have joined in. The amount of debris outside was ample for the lighter parts that would not penetrate. How much debris fell outside the twin towers? Not much.

**VF:** Why smash the Pentagon after the twin towers were demolished?

**FL:** To strike fear into the public by pretending that al-Qaeda could penetrate the US defenses and strike at the headquarters of the military.

**VF:** You say that the planes hit a recently reinforced part of the Pentagon - why there?

**FL:** Due to the renovation program this section was sparsely occupied. It was occupied by auditors investigating huge discrepancies in military expenditure.

**VF:** Why do you think that building three fell?

**FL:** Obviously it fell as a result of a perfectly performed controlled demolition. The rate of fall was equal to free fall, a fact now acknowledged to be true by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), for 2.25 seconds. This is enough time for a collapse of eight floors. Why did it fall? Don't ask me. It was occupied by certain organizations that would have a lot to hide. They also say evidence was lost for many corruption cases that were being investigated. I don't go into that. To each his own.

**VF:** Why did the officials insist that it was a fire?

**FL:** It took them seven years to think of an explanation based on fire that would be halfway plausible. Once you look into their explanation it is still not plausible. My specialty is the scientific proof of controlled demolition. [9] See papers at the Journal.

**VF:** Who released the Osama bin Laden tapes claiming victory?

**FL:** You are off track there. Bin Laden said that killing innocent women and children was not proper for Muslims. I believe all the later videos were faked. He looked fatter, then younger.



*Dr Legge suspects certain Osama videos - like this from March 2003 - are fake.*

**VF:** Who killed Bin Laden and why?

**FL:** Did anybody kill him? Did he die of natural causes like kidney failure long ago? Where is the body? I know some US Navy SEALs supposedly killed him. But I read those SEALs died in a helicopter crash soon after. Is that true? Probably not. Who knows? What is the truth? You won't find it in the media unless the powers that be want you to find it. And it will only be when it suits them. Why did the apparent killing happen when it did? I suspect there are two reasons. Obama needed a boost in the eyes of the public at the time and there was a plan forming to get the troops out of Afghanistan. This would seem more logical if Osama was dead.

**VF:** How do people react to your charges?

**FL:** Polls show that about 40% of the US population suspects that they have not been told the full story on 9/11.

**Notes** 1. See here

2. See "9/11 - Acceleration Study Proves Explosive Demolition" and "Controlled Demolition at the WTC: a Historical Examination of the Case".

3. See here.

4. See here.

5. See here.

6. See here.

7. See this paper written in January 2008. The second proof is in this report on the finding of red chips in the dust which were shown to be unreacted fragments of nanothermite.

8. See here.

9. See here.