

## **The Semantics of Deception and the Significance of Categories**

*by C. Thurston*

11/04/06

I would like to raise and attempt to bring into focus a semantics issue that I believe may be compromising the vision of those who are still unable to see what happened to the WTC Towers. I'm trying to understand why anyone would ever say that the Towers "collapsed", or "fell", since there's absolutely no evidence for this that I can see.

N. J. Burkett, an ABC News correspondent, was standing *more than a block away* from the WTC Towers on 9/11 when the South Tower destruction begins. He interrupts his live TV commentary by shouting as everyone runs for cover: "...A HUGE EXPLOSION NOW — RAINING DEBRIS ON ALL OF US! WE'D BETTER GET OUT OF THE WAY!" By now, anyone who has looked into 9/11 issues has probably seen compilations of news clips from early in the day with numerous commentators and eyewitnesses all talking about the sights and sounds of explosions going off in the buildings.

After the first few hours of spontaneous reporting had passed, all talk of explosives seemed to mysteriously vanish from mainstream media channels and instead we were told over and over again about how the Towers had "collapsed" and why they "fell". The NOVA and Discovery Channel specials that soon appeared on America's TV sets continued this campaign of emphasizing that the Towers had "collapsed". Using grave authoritative language and seemingly sophisticated computer simulations, these programs "explained" to a traumatized and gullible audience why it was "inevitable" that the Towers would "fall".

This then became not only the starting premise for the various official investigations, but it also became common usage among ordinary folks and many 9/11 researchers for describing the destruction of the Towers.

There's a problem with this, however. "Falling" and "collapsing" are both categories for gravity-driven events. Everyone knows what it means to "fall", and according to Merriam-Webster, the word "collapse" means: "to cave or fall in or give way <the bridge collapsed>". But the leading hypothesis coming from bona fide scientific analysis that attempts to explain ALL the evidence, is that the Towers DIDN'T cave in, fall or give way — they were systematically and progressively EXPLODED from the top down, starting from the impact zone in each Tower.

If one compares the meanings of the words "collapse" and "explosion" outside of the confusing context of the destruction of the Towers, it becomes clear that they are in fact opposites, and represent entirely different categories of events. Collapses "pull things down", whereas explosions "blow things up". A true collapse, like falling, is by its nature, once triggered, a self-fulfilling event that needs only the help of gravity to reach its completion.

Imagine for a moment a hypothetical world where, upon the first noticeable appearances of air pollution, leading atmospheric scientists and weather professionals were enlisted (with adequate incentive) to insist publicly that this was simply part of the weather. The same message was put forward repeatedly and consistently through the media. A government agency was even assigned to look into the problem and they arrived at the same conclusion after conducting a multi-million dollar study that included interviewing hundreds of people and looking at thousands of documents, videos and photographs.

Over a period of years, the idea that the brown stuff in the air was a weather phenomenon became generally accepted by the population. The occasional brave researcher who tried to say that it was actually something else — pollution introduced by industry and auto emissions — was immediately branded as a conspiracy theorist and ruthlessly discredited and marginalized.

Since the general public tended to trust the media and their government, they were content to believe that the brown stuff was part of the weather. But, in so doing, they became effectively disabled from thinking that anything could be done about it, because everybody knows you can't control the weather.

This would be an example of a strategically engineered category error, cleverly designed to intellectually disenfranchise the general public from the possibility of an effective understanding — or even a true perception — of the event in question (the brown stuff in the air).

While this may seem like a wildly improbable scenario, it is not so different from the situation we now face, with a large portion of the general public still believing that the Towers "collapsed" and that they "fell". Remember the titles of those two highly produced PBS specials that came out shortly after 9/11? "*Anatomy of **the Collapse***" and "*Why the Towers **Fell***". I do not believe the highly funded promotion of this use of language was merely incidental.

As long as the destruction of the Towers is firmly planted (even unconsciously) into a person's mental category for gravity-driven events, that person will be effectively disabled from "seeing" that total destruction was NOT inevitable. They cannot "see" the explosions, because explosions belong to a different category of events, and the categories represented by the very language they use to think about the question do not include this possibility.

From looking at the videos and photographs we can see plenty of falling *debris*, but it is shattered and pulverized, and it only begins to fall straight down AFTER it has been propelled out beyond the original perimeter of the structure. While debris may include the material from a FORMER building, "falling debris" and "falling building" obviously have *entirely different meanings*.

As the wave of destruction moves down each Tower, it encounters stronger and heavier structural materials (the perimeter and core columns were much heavier in the lower part of the building) and the power of the explosives very likely also increased progressively in order to guarantee total destruction.



The falling debris from above blankets over the continuing explosions to some extent, but the building structure below the advancing wave is intact. I don't see any part of the structure "falling" or "collapsing" prior to the arrival of the wave of explosive destruction and there's nothing left afterwards. I also don't see any part of the building "imploding" or folding in — I only see an ever-expanding cloud of dust and debris.

When the air clears, allowing a look at the scene, there are no heaps of *identifiable* "collapsed" structure that "fell" within the footprints where the buildings once stood — we find only smoking ruins with debris scattered for blocks in all directions.



For those who want us to imagine that the Towers "collapsed", the assumption that they simply "fell" on their own is a critical part of the story. But it should be intuitively obvious to anyone equipped with some fairly basic information that it is IMPOSSIBLE for an intact steel frame structure to simply collapse on its own, with or without an office fire, or even from the impact of a falling portion of the same building. If "pounded on" from above, either one of these well-designed Towers would have behaved more like a huge nail than a house of cards. It might bend or distort, but it wouldn't just fall apart.

Anyone who's ever played with an Erector Set knows that as long as the structural members remain well-connected, a framework may become twisted and distorted if you throw it to the floor, but it will never just collapse into pieces under any scenario involving self-related and self-proportional forces. Like a "theme with variations", you sometimes even hear someone say that the Towers "crumbled" — steel may twist and bend, but it never crumbles!

Even if a giant came along and stomped on one of the Towers, the continuous vertical strength of the specially fabricated multi-story core columns, with their welded connections and dense cross-bracing, would cause the building to split out over a multi-floor region, much like pushing down on a bundle of archery bows. The vertical spacing of the office floors did not correlate to periodic points of weakness in the column assemblies.

The official theories have all been based on the a priori assumption that the Towers "fell", so NIST is left only with the task of trying to explain how each building became "poised for collapse". I've been amazed that they have been able to get away with such an egregious example of "cart-before-the-horse" analysis. Before jumping ahead to formulate hypotheses for "collapse initiation", they first must prove that the Towers DID indeed "collapse"! But since this has already been pre-established by category placement, few seem to notice that they have "overlooked" this step.

Unfortunately, whenever anyone talks about how the Towers "collapsed" or why they "fell", they are unwittingly giving credence to these unproven assumptions and perpetuating the incorrect categorization of these events. The authors of the NIST report would no doubt prefer that we all join them in their assumption that the Towers "collapsed", but this is, in fact, the crux of the matter and the REAL question. I therefore believe that we should not allow our choice of language to obscure this point.

By questioning whether OR NOT a collapse (properly speaking) even occurred, we can significantly reframe this important debate and finally begin to cultivate a competing mental image *and a proper category* for what actually happened. The sooner we openly and aggressively challenge the imaginary assumptions that are bundled with this false use of language, the sooner we can break its hold on the minds of those who are convinced that they saw something that never actually happened.

(Note: when a neutral, all-inclusive category is needed, the word "destruction", or "destroyed", substitutes well for "collapse" or "fell" in most cases.)