

FOREWORD

The book you hold in your hands is the most important book of the twenty-first century. Let me explain why I say such a thing. *Where Did the Towers Go?* is a work, assuming that its content and message are properly and fairly heeded, that offers a starting point from which those who genuinely want to do it can begin, first, to rein in and then, perhaps, even end the wanton criminality and destructiveness of a set of American policies that took as their justification and starting point the horrific events of September 11, 2001.

It is now almost a decade since 9/11 took place, and in all that time no *unassailable*, *permanent*, or, in pragmatic terms, *politically influential* progress has been made in determining exactly and irrefutably *what took place* on that day—or what *did not* take place.

But now Dr. Judy Wood, in this unique, powerful, landmark work of forensic scientific investigation, provides us at last with that determination: She shows us *what did happen* on 9/11. Although Dr. Wood's scientific training and understanding are deep and complex, she has the gift of being able, without compromise, to express ideas of the greatest complexity in terms readily understandable to any interested and attentive lay person.

More must be said about these subjects in a minute, but this all-important fact remains: Those who read Dr. Wood's book fairly, openly, and thoroughly will take away with them the gift of *knowing* once and for all what happened on 9/11. They will take away the gift of knowing that they *have at last been shown the truth clearly and plainly*, no matter how different this truth may be from what they have been told for many years by supposedly higher authorities, from the government itself on through newspapers, journalists, progressive radio programs and commentators, even figures from the so-called "9/11 truth movement." Dr. Wood's book will give all those who read it carefully a solid foundation for the courage to believe not what they may have been told by one authority or another on any level and for many years, but to believe instead what their own minds, their own eyes, and their own reason tell them: That is, scientific truth as revealed through close forensic study of *all* of the evidence that has been left behind. As Dr. Wood says again and again, she arrives at truth through the study of *evidence*. The truth is not what anyone, no matter who they are, might say it is. To the place where the evidence leads, and to that place alone—*that* is where the truth is.

Where Did the Towers Go? is not the work of a day. In her first chapter, Dr. Wood tells us that her study of 9/11 really began on that calamitous September day itself, when she "realized that what was being seen and heard on television was contradictory and appeared to violate the laws of physics." This means, as I write these words, that Dr. Wood has been a student of 9/11 for eight-and-a-half years. Yet the *preparation* for that study took even longer. Dr. Wood, after all, holds a B.S. in

Where Did the Towers Go?

Civil Engineering, an M.S. in Engineering Mechanics (Applied Physics), and a Ph.D. in Materials Engineering Science—degrees that speak to nothing less than an adult lifetime dedicated to scientific analysis and observation.

Dr. Wood's areas of special focus within physics and engineering will strike readers also for their obvious suitability to study of 9/11. Dr. Wood's M.S. thesis involved the development of a Fizeau interferometer to study the effects of material defects on the thermal expansion behavior of composite materials. Her Ph.D. dissertation (in words from her web site) "involved the development of an experimental method to measure thermal stresses in bimaterial joints using moiré interferometry." Careful readers of *Where Did the Towers Go?* will quickly understand the remarkable compatibility between the subject of Dr. Wood's dissertation and its applicability to her analyses of 9/11. The same is true of certain of the courses she taught when she was a member of the faculty at Clemson University. These included Experimental Stress Analysis, Engineering Mechanics, Mechanics of Materials (the Strength of Materials), and (though not at Clemson) Strength of Materials Testing.

It's difficult to imagine an academic preparation *more* logically relevant to a study of 9/11 than Dr. Wood's—to a study, that is, not of the history of 9/11, not of the origins of it, not of the motives for it, but, simply, solely, and only to a study of what *happened*, literally, in and to the World Trade Center buildings on 9/11.

There is another element of Dr. Wood's research that qualifies her even more exactly for work of the kind described in this book. Here is a passage from Dr. Wood's web site:

One of Dr. Wood's research interests is biomimicry, or applying the mechanical structures of biological materials to engineering design using engineering materials. Other recent research has investigated the deformation behavior of materials and structures with complex geometries and complex material properties, such as fiber-reinforced composite materials and biological materials. Dr. Wood is an expert in the use of moiré interferometry, a full-field optical method that is used in stress analysis, as well as materials characterization and other types of interference. In recent years, Dr. Wood and her students have developed optical systems with various wavelengths and waveguides. Dr. Wood has over 60 technical publications in refereed journals, conference proceedings, and edited monographs and special technical reports.

A word used here—"interferometry"—will become familiar to readers as they move into Dr. Wood's book. When preceded by "moiré," the word refers to "a full-field optical method that is used in stress analysis." The web site adds that Dr. Wood is also an expert in the use of "other types of interference." Their applicability to the study of 9/11 is made clear, again, in this description, from Dr. Wood herself, of her special areas of research:

The main focus of my research has been in the area of experimental mechanics and optical interferometry, which is referred to as photomechanics. That is, all of my graduate work and research has been in the area of interferometry to study material behavior. Photomechanics, an area of experimental mechanics, is the use

Foreword

of optical images and optical interferometry to determine material characteristics. So, it is second nature for me to see anomalies in material behavior when looking at photographic images. Also, being an experimentalist using interferometry, I have occasionally encountered unexpected phenomena that presented themselves as puzzles. Solving these puzzles has provided me with a wide range of experience with anomalous material characteristics and the interference of electromagnetic energy.

It's safe to say that less than a majority of Americans know very much about Nikola Tesla (1856-1943), the historic figure whose story must be introduced at this point. Tesla is under-recognized in the United States partly because of his victimization by profit-driven interests opposed to his work—and opposed especially to his development of a way to harness free energy.¹ Though little known in the United States, Tesla was the world's greatest pioneering genius in the early harnessing of electricity, the development of alternating current, the study of field effects—interferometry—and, as mentioned, the development of access to free energy—that is, access to and the harnessing of energy drawn from force fields or even from the plasma present everywhere in the cosmos.

Mentioning Tesla at this point is necessary for the very good reason that Dr. Judy Wood, in *Where Did the Towers Go?*, shows that the power used to destroy the WTC buildings on 9/11—a power sufficient to turn more than 1,000,000 tons of building material into dust—is power derived from force fields, or directed energy, power of the kind that was pioneeringly studied by Nikola Tesla and that now, obviously, has been advanced by others for the most destructive of purposes rather than for the benevolent, socially meliorative uses for which it is equally well suited.

In short, Tesla's energy, imagined by him as something useful for the nurturing or even the saving of human society, has instead, since his death, been weaponized. The simple fact is that 9/11 was planned and staged as a demonstration to the world of the enormity of that power in its weaponized form.

Over the past six years, as she revealed to the public the details of her research piece by piece,² Dr. Wood often found herself the subject of extreme abuse from every quarter of the so-called “9/11 truth community.” I have followed Dr. Wood's work over those six years, and I would like to say a few words about what she has been doing and, implicitly, about the way her work has been received.

Dr. Wood is not, in actuality, herself a part of the “9/11 truth community.” Even if at one time she may have naturally considered herself to be so, this is no longer the case. The “movement”—something I have been a student of since mid-2003—has itself grown so politicized, so thoroughly infiltrated by figures and forces whose aim is to generate internal division in order to generate not progress but paralysis and stasis; that, as I said earlier, this “movement” has been made incapable, over almost a decade, of producing any *unassailable*, any *permanent*, or any *politically influential* evidence of *what really happened* on September 11, 2001.

Dr. Wood herself has been regularly and sometimes spectacularly victimized, smeared, attacked, marginalized, and misrepresented by figures and groups putatively “inside” the 9/11 truth movement. It is even the case that a student of Dr. Wood's, a

Where Did the Towers Go?

gifted young man dedicated to the purpose and progress of her work, was murdered in cold blood, as also was another similar person before him. In spite of these crimes, violations, and attacks, however, Dr. Wood remained devoted unflinchingly to her research, and here, now, with its completion and with the publication of *Where Did the Towers Go?*, she brings the paralysis and bloody in-fighting of the truth movement to an end.

She has been able to bring about this enormous achievement—for which the entire world must certainly be grateful—by refusing to speculate in “opinion” or “belief” and by refusing to argue about (or even to *raise*) subjects or questions of the sorts that for years have led to paralysis and logjam, questions such as *who* planned and executed the attacks of 9/11, or *why* they did so, or who *knew* about this or that aspect of the operation, or *when* they knew, or *where* someone was and *when* they were there, and on and on.

On the contrary, Dr. Wood has worked and works now solely and only as an observing scientist. She comes to no conclusions whatsoever other than those that emerge logically, in accordance with the scientific method in which she is trained, conclusions that cannot be logically escaped or avoided after close and objective study of *all* available evidence. At the same time, such conclusions are *never* allowed by Dr. Wood, again in accordance with scientific method, to be in excess of what is supported by the evidence.

Let us make a list of the things that Dr. Wood proves in *Where Did the Towers Go?*—proves not just beyond reasonable doubt, but beyond *any doubt whatsoever*:

- 1) That the “official” or “government” explanation for the destruction of the World Trade Center on 9/11 is, scientifically, false through and through.
- 2) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by heat generated from burning jet fuel or from the conventional “burning” of any other substance or substances.
- 3) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by mini-nuclear weaponry.
- 4) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by conventional explosives of any kind, be they TNT, C4 or RDX, nor were they destroyed by welding materials such as thermitite, thermate, or “nano-thermitite.”
- 5) That there was in fact no high heat at all involved either in bringing about the destruction of the buildings or generated by the destruction of them.

And now let us turn to what Dr. Wood proves *beyond any reasonable doubt*.

She proves that the *kinds* of evidence left behind after the destruction—including “fires” that emit no high heat and have no apparent source (“Weird Fires”); glowing steel beams and molten metal, *neither* of them emitting high heat; the levitation and flipping of extremely heavy objects, including automobiles and other vehicles; patterns of scorching that *cannot* have been caused by conventional “fire” (“Toasted Cars”); the sudden exploding of objects, people, vehicles, and steel tanks; the near-complete absence of *rubble* after the towers’ destruction, but instead the presence of entire buildings’-worth of *dust*, both airborne and heavier-than-air (“Dustification”)—

Foreword

Dr. Wood proves that these and other kinds of evidence *cannot* have been created by conventional oxygen-fed fire, by conventional explosives, or by nuclear fission. At the same time, however, she shows *that all of them are in keeping with the patterns and traits of directed-energy power*, of force-fields directed into interference with one another in ways following the scientific logic of Nikola Tesla's thought and experimentation—and in ways also paralleling the work of contemporary Canadian scientist and experimenter John Hutchison, who, following Tesla's lead, has for many years produced again and again and again “the Hutchison Effect,” creating results that include weird fires (having no apparent fuel); the bending, splintering, or fissuring of bars and rods of heavy metal; the coring-out, from *inside*, of thick metal rods; and the repeated *levitation* of objects.³

These same effects, similar to the Hutchison effect⁴ but on an exponentially massive scale, are what occurred at the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. The implications of this fact, however unbelievable they may seem initially, are of a powerful and obvious importance to every living being in the world. That a power of this magnitude and intensity, a power drawn from other energy already *existing*—that a power of this enormity has been demonstrated to the world for the first time and on this scale *not* as a force potentially advantageous to human life, planetary health, and social well-being but, instead, as a *weaponized* force capable of unprecedented and incalculable destruction and ruin—this is a fact undeniably sobering to every thinking and feeling human being.

Thanks to the painstaking and unflagging work of Dr. Judy Wood—and thanks to her book, this book that you are about to read—the long debate about *what* happened on 9/11 will now end. The next step is to decide how to respond to the truth that, here, we have once and for all been shown. The implications of Dr. Wood's work are every bit as world-embracing and absolute in their importance as was the introduction of weaponized nuclear fission over half a century ago, and in fact even more so. Dr. Wood herself has referred to 9/11 as *The New Hiroshima*. To follow the now-known implications of directed energy weaponry with the greatest of care, to do so with expedience, clarity, justice, and, above all, with the aim of doing only the highest service to the well-being of mankind, the earth, and the future of both—these are the tasks laid out for us by Dr. Wood's magisterial, humane, paradigm-changing work. It is up to us—who else, after all, is there?—to take these matters up now that Dr. Wood has shown us the immensity of their importance.

She herself, near the end of her book, says something of a similar nature. It's appropriate that I close not with my words, but with hers:

He who controls the energy, controls the people. Control of energy, depending on what that energy is, can either destroy or sustain the planet.

We have a choice. And the choice is real. We can live happily and fruitfully and productively, or we can destroy the planet and die, every last one of us, along with every living being on this planet.

—Eric Larsen

—March 2010

Where Did the Towers Go?

¹ For an excellent introduction to the story of the maligning of Tesla and the suppression of his work, see Rand Clifford's excellent "From Reptiles to Humans: A Three-Brain Odyssey" <http://www.starchiefpress.com/articles/article42.html>

² <http://drjudywood.co.uk/>

³ <http://www.thehutchisoneffect.com>

⁴ Although the two, the Hutchison Effect and the phenomena seen on 9/11, share parallel origins in physics and produce results that are similar in some observable ways, there is no question of their being accurately or fairly called the same thing. Just as Tesla never developed *his* ideas with the thought of weaponization, neither has John Hutchison worked with such a thought in mind.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

*Faced with intolerable ideas, or with intolerable acts, people in very large numbers have begun simply denying them, declaring them “unreal” and thus with a word striking them out of existence. . . . But the pattern itself of not seeing is inescapable, evident to anyone who looks. —Eric Larsen, *A Nation Gone Blind*¹*

For the record, I do not believe that our government is responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01 – nor do I believe that our government is not responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01. This is not a case of *belief*. This is a crime that should be solved by a forensic study of the evidence. Before it can be determined *who* did it, it must first be determined *what* was done and *how* it was done.

The order of crime solving is to determine

- 1) *WHAT* happened, then
- 2) *HOW* it happened (e.g., by what weapon), then
- 3) *WHO* did it. And only then can we address
- 4) *WHY* they did it (i.e. motive).

Let us remember what is required to convict someone of a crime. You cannot convict someone of a crime based on *belief*. You cannot convict someone of a crime if you don't even know what crime to charge them with. If you accuse someone of murder using a gun, you'd better be sure the body has a bullet hole in it.

And yet before noon on 9/11/01, we were told *who* had done it and *how* it had been done, this before any investigation had even been conducted to determine *what* had been done. As of this publication only one person²—myself, Dr. Judy Wood³—has conducted a comprehensive investigation to determine *what* happened to the World Trade Center (WTC) complex, a question that is part of a federal case I filed⁴. It might be surprising for readers to learn that The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) did not analyze *what* happened to the WTC, the very first step in any scientific forensics investigation. That is, NIST did not analyze the *collapse* of the World Trade Center towers, *despite* the fact their report is entitled, *NIST NCSTAR 1—Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*. NIST's mandate from Congress was to

1. Determine why and how WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed following the initial impacts of the aircraft and why and how WTC 7 collapsed.⁵

Yet two pages later, in a footnote, the NIST report says that

The focus of the investigation was on the sequence of events from the instance of aircraft impact to the initiation of collapse for each tower. For brevity in this report, this sequence is referred to as the “probable collapse sequence,” although it does not actually include the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached and collapse became inevitable.⁶

The NIST report,⁷ that is, merely offered a probable [hypothetical] ‘collapse sequence’

Where Did the Towers Go?

purporting to explain the sequence of events leading up to the ‘collapse’ of the WTC towers. Yet NIST did not “determine *why and how* WTC 1 and WTC 2 ‘collapsed’ following the initial impacts of the aircraft,” which was their mandate. Had NIST determined “*why and how*” the towers were destroyed, they would have first determined *what* happened by dealing with phenomena that are empirically confirmed to have occurred. As is glaringly evident, they did not do this.

I challenged NIST⁸ on their scientifically-flawed report,⁹ noting that the images presented in their report, as well as their “probable [hypothetical] ‘collapse’ sequence” violated the laws of physics. In their written reply to me they openly acknowledged that they had not analyzed the collapse.¹⁰

As stated in NCSTAR 1, NIST only investigated the factors leading to the initiation of the collapses of the WTC towers, not the collapses themselves.¹⁰

That is, the NIST personnel admitted their report to be a fraud. Their position is that if they did not analyze the “collapse,” they need not address why their “probable [hypothetical] ‘collapse’ sequence” in fact violates the laws of physics. They are willing to accept responsibility only for saying that the building obeyed the laws of physics *before* it was destroyed. This document, in which NIST states that it did not analyze the “collapse,” is part of my legal case and is available in documents posted on my website.¹¹

A large portion of the sub-report, NCSTAR1-6, contains information that *appears* to be the product of a detailed analysis of what happened after the building’s destruction was initiated. But in response to my informing them that their *apparent analysis* violated the laws of physics, NIST, as said, stated that they had not analyzed the collapse, despite thousands of pages giving the *appearance of an analysis*. It is incongruent for NIST to report on something that they acknowledge they did not analyze. The entire NIST report, including its title (*NIST NCSTAR 1—Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*), is a deception.

Dr. Morgan Reynolds, in the case he filed,¹¹ addressed how this crime was *not* committed with airplanes. Remember, to convict someone of a crime, you need to prove *how* the crime was committed. It may surprise you to learn that there is no actual, verifiable evidence confirming that airplanes crashed at any of the four locations on 9/11/01. However, as Dr. Reynolds shows, there is an abundance of evidence to the contrary.¹¹ That does not mean there were no airplanes. It only means that no evidence of the alleged airplanes was found at the crime scenes. It also does not mean that eyewitnesses were dishonest or did not see what they believed were airplanes. But what this does mean is that there is a significant contradiction between the physical evidence and the story we were given. You cannot legally convict someone of murder using a gun if the body has no bullet holes in it, no matter how many people thought they saw the accused shoot the gun. Once again, you cannot convict someone of a crime based on *belief*. Otherwise magic tricks could be used to convict anyone of a crime, and we end up in a similar situation to the original Salem witch hunts, where people were tried and executed without there being any evidence of the accusations made against them.

Author's Preface

Many people have speculated as to *who* committed the crimes of 9/11 and/or *how* they did so. But without addressing *what* happened, speculation of this kind is nothing more than *conspiracy theory*, a phrase that also describes the box-cutter story we were given before noon on 9/11/01. My own research, *not* speculation, is a forensics investigation of *what* happened to the WTC complex on 9/11/01. I don't address *who* did it, nor am I concerned with that question. Before issues of that kind can be addressed, we must first determine *what* happened, and that is the objective of my research. By definition, research that is purely empirical cannot be about and has nothing to do with *conspiracy theory* of any kind. The fact that others (in the mainstream media, the alternative media, and the so-called "9/11 truth movement") promote various theories about 9/11 is irrelevant to my research. On the other hand, to determine *what* happened, we must address *all* of the available evidence. Anyone declaring *who* did what or *how* they did it before they have determined *what* was done is merely promoting either speculation or propaganda. The popular chant, "9/11 was an inside job," is, scientifically speaking, no different from the chant that "19 bad guys with box cutters did it." Neither one is the result of a scientific investigation supported by evidence that would be admissible in court. Neither identifies *what* crime was committed or *how* it was committed.

So let us consider the body of empirical evidence that must be explained in order to determine *what* happened.¹² What is presented here is not a theory and it is not speculation. It is evidence. Here, then, is the evidence of *what* happened on 9/11/01.

¹ Eric Larsen, *A Nation Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit*, <http://www.ericlarsen.net/nation.excerpt.html>

² Only non-classified documents in the public domain are considered.

³ B.S. (Civil Engineering, 1981) (Structural Engineering), M.S. (Engineering Mechanics (Applied Physics, 1983), and Ph.D. (Materials Engineering Science, 1992) from the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia, http://drjudywood.com/articles/a/bio/Wood_Bio.html

⁴ United States District Court, Southern District of New York, Docket Number: (07-cv-3314), United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Docket Number: (08-3799-cv), Supreme Court Docket Number: (09-548), <http://www.supremecourt.gov/Search.aspx?FileName=/docketfiles/09-548.htm>. But this case presents a dilemma for the courts as it involves *someone's* classified technology, no matter whose classified technology it was. A civil case involving classified technology cannot be held behind closed doors without publicly acknowledging this fact. Perhaps this is why the United States Court of Appeals, in their written decision, respectfully acknowledged that the law (FERA) applied to this case, but "for the ease of" dismissing the case, they were ignoring this law. See: http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.shtml

⁵ NIST NCSTAR 1 – *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*, September 2005, E.1 Genesis of this investigation, p. xxxv (p. 37), http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm

⁶ NIST NCSTAR 1 – *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*, September 2005, E.2 Approach, p. xxxvii (p. 39) footnote[!], http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm

⁷ NIST NCSTAR 1 – *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*, September 2005, http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm

⁸ http://ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619

⁹ To my amazement, I was the first person to challenge NIST on their report's absence of an analysis to "determine *why* and *how* the WTC 'collapsed,'" which qualified me to file a qui tam case for science fraud. http://ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619

¹⁰ Response to Request for Correction from Dr. Judy Wood, dated March 16, 2007, http://ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/ssLINK/PROD01_004161, <http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/>

Where Did the Towers Go?

Qui_Tam_Wood.html

¹¹ *http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.html*

¹² *<http://drjudywood.com/wtc/index.html#index>*

If you listen to the evidence carefully enough, it will speak to you and tell you exactly what happened. If you don't know what happened, keep listening to the evidence until you do. The evidence always tells the truth. The key is not to allow yourself to be distracted away from seeing what the evidence is telling you.¹

Empirical evidence is the truth that theory must mimic.²

¹ My own motto.

² A powerful statement by someone who has taught me well.