Revisiting 9/11/2001 --Applying the Scientific Method

Dr. Steven E. Jones

Introduction

In this paper I focus on the application of the scientific method to the study of what really happened on 9/11/2001, particularly in the destruction of the World Trade Center buildings.[1] There is something here to look at in depth: this is serious business. It is not just "nutty fringe science" or "conspiracy theory" that can be rejected without even considering the data. There is need for scientific scrutiny as I hope to demonstrate in this paper. In fact my colleagues and I now feel that we have sufficient data to conclude that the collisions of jets with the two Towers are NOT sufficient to explain the complete and rapid collapses of both Towers and WTC 7. We conclude that the evidence is compelling that the destruction of the WTC buildings involved planted cutter charges (such as explosives and incendiaries). We will consider this evidence.[2]

Background

My first major publication in which I was lead author was a paper on muon-catalyzed fusion.[3] Unlike thermonuclear fusion which occurs on the sun at high temperature, this type of fusion occurs at room temperature. The muon, which is basically a heavy cousin of the electron, pulls hydrogen nuclei of the isotopes of deuterium and tritium closely together so that tunneling occurs through the Coulomb barrier leading to nuclear fusion.

A number of years ago I was on this campus[1] visiting Prof. Louis Alvarez who had observed muon-catalyzed fusion experimentally the first time in a hydrogen bubble chamber. Dr. Alvarez was a Nobel Laureate and very kind to discuss the latest regarding this form of cold fusion. He was a no-nonsense scientist and a very creative fellow. His son and he came up with this idea that the animal population on the early earth underwent a very major change because of an asteroid striking the earth. This theory was very unpopular when it first came out but it has since been verified by means of a number of experimental tests. So it is now widely accepted, but it took a long time to change some scientists' minds – with a lot of data, of course.

Louis Alvarez set that example of not being afraid to voice unpopular hypotheses and then to proceed with experiments and encouraging others to do experiments to get an answer. That's what we do in science, whether it's popular or not. The idea of science is free inquiry, free speech and experiments to determine what is correct, what's true. It is really not a matter of what is popular at any given time.

---

[1] This paper is based on a talk I gave at the University of California at Berkeley on November 7, 2006, with important updates.

[2] See http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse_Jones_Thermite_World_Trade_Center.pdf . Fortunately, there is now a body of extensive research gathered in the peer-reviewed books cited above and in the Journal of 9/11 Studies. That is the way science proceeds, with observations, hypotheses, experiments and published papers. For a more extensive treatment of the study of 9/11 events than can be provided in one paper, I refer the reader especially to http://journalof911studies.com/. Here you will find an ever-expanding set of papers relating to the study of "What really happened on 9/11/2001?" The issue, however, is not just understanding, but also a quest to seek justice based on the findings.

[3] S.E. Jones, A.N. Anderson, A.J. Caffrey, J.B. Walter, K.D. Watts, J.N. Bradbury, P.A.M. Gram, H.R. Maltrud, M. Leon, M.A. Paciotti, "Experimental investigation of Muon-Catalyzed d-t Fusion," **Physical Review Letters** 51: 1757-1760 (1983).