

**WE NEED
ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS FOR NANOTHERMITE TRUTH
aeNtruth.org**

PROPOSED MISSION STATEMENT

This group supports unrestrained inquiry and sound science in all areas of 911 research, with a special focus upon the evidence and its interpretation for nanothermitic material found in WTC dust samples. It is of the utmost importance to have solid scientific evidence to present in the event of a future investigation.

We encourage open dialogue between all groups in the 911 truth community, including between those who currently embrace the explosive nanothermite theory and those who do not. Membership is open to all who seek the truth, not just architects and engineers.

BACKGROUND

In April 2009 the paper "Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe" by Harrit et al. came out.

The authors of this paper did not have enough confidence in their research results to say that the red layer of the chips they found were definitely an explosive, so they said it was found to be a "highly energetic pyrotechnic OR explosive material." (emphasis added)

Yet this article from AE911Truth of the same month as the Harrit et al. paper was released says, "A ground-breaking scientific paper confirmed this week that red-gray flakes found throughout multiple samples of WTC dust are actually unexploded fragments of nanothermite, an exotic high-tech explosive." <http://www2.ae911truth.org/info/51> In the same article they add a further exaggeration that nanothermite can be formulated as a high explosive. "Ordinary thermite burns quickly and can melt through steel, but it is not explosive. Nanothermite, however, can be formulated as a high explosive." Common examples of high explosives are TNT, HMX, and RDX.

Although it is not clear who exactly wrote this description of the Harrit et al. paper on the SRIBD site, it reflects the exaggeration of the findings of the paper that is so common and encouraged by nanothermite advocates. "The famous and historic international research paper that fully confirms the existence of highly-explosive, military-grade Nano-thermite residual within the dust from the debris of the WTC demoliti..." <http://www.scribd.com/tag/richard%20gage>

It is interesting to note that the extensive article in the Rock Creek Free Press of May 2009 was more reserved in its view of the potential explosiveness of nanothermite. Quoting from page 5, lower left corner, of the Rock Creek Free Press article.

"By creating particles of iron oxide and aluminum thousands of times smaller than normal thermite, much smaller than can be achieved with simple grinding techniques, and intimately mixing and binding them together, the reaction speed can be dramatically increased. The increased rate of reaction makes these super-thermites potentially explosive, but to be actually explosive some ingredient must be added to the formulation to produce gas as a reaction product. It is the rapid expansion of hot gases that does the work of an explosion. To be a high explosive the reaction speed must exceed the speed of sound in the material, which is unlikely in the case of thermitic materials but nano-thermitic material may act as a low explosive, in a manner similar to gun powder."

MY MAY 1, 2011 PAPER

I released a paper challenging nanothermite orthodoxy entitled “How indeed can nanothermite be explosive?” on May 1, 2011. I made sure to direct the attention of Richard Gage, Steven Jones, and others in the nanothermite camp to this paper. I ended up having some exchanges with Frank Legge, one of the co-authors of the Harrit et al. paper via Facebook. To his credit he is at least willing to engage in dialogue on the topic, although he thinks that I am either a shill or just someone who is trying to be clever. He thinks that it is OK to use the word “explosive” to describe what they found in the dust, since everybody uses the term. Steven Jones responded not to my paper directly, but to a subsequent email I sent to Kevin Ryan and many others in response to Kevin Ryan's email to me criticizing my paper and attacking me. Jones response was a post on 911 blogger.

Below I have pasted 3 sections from Jones 911 blogger reply.

<http://911blogger.com/news/2011-05-10/responses-questions-regarding-thermite-nanothermite-and-conventional-explosives-used-wtc-destruction#comment-249562>

“Where is the line between low explosives and high explosives? Rather than getting mired into ad nauseum debates, I will use the term 'explosive' in conjunction with superthermites/nanothermites IF the national defense laboratories which developed these materials use the term. Here we go.”

“Recent experiments by Jon Cole demonstrate that thermite with sulfur added ('thermate') can indeed cut through steel and do pressure-volume work; sulfur makes a huge difference (as I also pointed out in my first 9/11-research paper)! Very exciting work, especially starting around the 11-minute mark:<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qamecech9m4>”

“4. Do you agree that “ Jones is putting 'superthermite' in the same category of explosiveness as HMX and RDX” as claimed by Mark Hightower? (Email to Jones and numerous others from Mark Hightower, 8 May 2011).”

“No, I do not. While the Los Alamos developers note that superthermite can be tailored for use in 'explosive devices' as cited above, specifics are not given, evidently because of 'military' applications.”

With Jones' very loose use of the word explosive, he implies that even Jon Cole's experiments with ordinary thermite (thermate) would fall within the meaning of the word explosive, because it cut through steel and did pressure volume work. Clearly Jones is stretching the meaning of pressure-volume work to an absurdly low level as a characteristic of an explosive in order to make his point. I leave it to the reader to do a google search to find how many nouns that the adjective “explosive” is commonly used to modify. I will simply cite one example I had the misfortune of becoming familiar with recently, “explosive diarrhea,” which clearly does pressure-volume work.



T. Mark Hightower
Conspiracy Con 2011
June 4-5