

On the 30<sup>th</sup> of December, 2007, I received this email from a Shane Geiger.

Hello from Austin, TX.

You seem to feel pretty strongly about the 9/11 issue. I'm just curious about what you are planning to do with the AE911Truth.info site. I would like to help you sort through their info to find what may be misleading or incorrect in the presentations that Richard Gage or their Web sites provide.

I have met Richard Gage, and I feel he sincerely is trying to be factual at all times. I know from experience that he does make mistakes in his presentations. (I know not everything he says is on a script that he has looked over multiple times.) I believe he is sincere, though.

Furthermore, I have looked at the 9/11 issue for some time, and I have seen some things which are irreconcilable with the official story. The molten metal that John Gross claims he knows nothing about has not been explained by NIST or any of the unofficial defenders of the official story--such as, Popular Mechanics. Even the FEMA Appendix C document has a picture of melted steel. Steel melted. This is the Achille's heel of the official story, as I see it.

Anyway, I always appreciate talking with people who are interested in spreading the truth, even if they don't agree with me. If Richard has an information which is in error and we can fix this, we would definitely appreciate your help in finding that.

Sincerely,

Shane

--

Shane Geiger  
IT Director  
National Council on Economic Education  
[sgeiger@ncee.net](mailto:sgeiger@ncee.net) | 402-438-8958 | <http://www.ncee.net>

Leading the Campaign for Economic and Financial Literacy

Finally, someone from the AE911Truth organization had noticed my presence on the Web!  
Unfortunately for me, I wasn't ready with the site. Whose fault is that? Mine.

I'd discovered that Richard Gage's organization had not secured all domains that bore their chosen phrase. The dotInfo site was the one that most pleased me. What better place to put a debunking for this group of people than a site that would come up in every search for them?

So out came the credit card in September, 2007, and the domain was mine. I designed the pages and began producing content as soon as I could afford to purchase a hosting plan. But life took over and I began dawdling. I had made my way through Gage's two-hour presentation with copious notes, and had gotten through about 27 slides of his 300+ Powerpoint presentation presented online.

And the state of the thing was not surprising me. Richard Gage includes no original material that I've been able to determine. The best I can say is that Gage resists the temptation to posit nuclear devices and doesn't deny that the actual hijacked planes hit the buildings. But every shoddy argument and every misunderstood fact ever conceived by the mind of any conspiracy theorist seems to have found its way into Gage's presentation.

Slogging through so much drivel and inanity takes it out of you. In fact, I'd almost convinced myself that AE911Truth wasn't really all that important in the scheme of things.

And then the fundraising of this organization hit a Phase Two. Gage is asking for monthly contributors. He continues to do whatever speaking gigs possible to him, and he is literally asking for a free meal at times.

Gage, of course, is not the real problem here. What do I care about how he lives his life? The problem is not him but the misinformation he is dedicated to pumping out at every opportunity.

So Mr. Geiger's letter was the final straw. They've seen the site (note the final "we" used in the last sentence), and the die is cast.

So I responded, as follows.

What I plan on doing with the site: finishing it one day! LOL. It's a labor of love, and there's only so much I can do before I get distracted by life. Still, it's something I'm doing as a personal project, but thanks for your offer.

**I have met Richard Gage, and I feel he sincerely is trying to be factual at all times. I know from experience that he does make mistakes in his presentations. (I know not everything he says is on a script that he has looked over multiple times.) I believe he is sincere, though.**

After working my way through as much of his slides and his presentation as I have, I'm sad to say that I cannot agree. He is far too duplicitous in his use of material and his points. Perhaps he has fooled himself in that way best described by the military term incestuous amplification.

The choices for Gage's personal motivations, in my opinion, are sincerity (in which case he's a bleeding idiot) or malice (in which case his errors are actual lies). The amount of manipulated evidence I've seen in his presentation makes me think snake-oil salesman, and his continuous cries for money do nothing to alleviate this impression.

**Furthermore, I have looked at the 9/11 issue for some time, and I have seen some things which are irreconcilable with the official story. The molten metal that John Gross claims he knows nothing about has not been explained by NIST or any of the unofficial defenders of the official story--such as, Popular Mechanics. Even the FEMA Appendix C document**

**has a picture of melted steel. Steel melted. This is the Achille's heel of the official story, as I see it.**

John Gross was parsing his words there. He claimed to have heard no credible claims of molten "steel." He's rather clear about that, although I personally think the statement was unwise. The temperatures beneath the Pile could have melted all kinds of metals, and probably could have melted steel as well. None of that is evidence of conditions in the buildings before they fell.

Gage uses pictures of slag from cleanup torches as evidence of melted steel on columns. It's another one of his untruths.

**Anyway, I always appreciate talking with people who are interested in spreading the truth, even if they don't agree with me. If Richard has an information which is in error and we can fix this, we would definitely appreciate your help in finding that.**

Well, that sound less like you've met him, and more like you are working with him. Is that the case? You aren't listed on his website as a supporter. How exactly would giving you information about his mistakes get to his hands so that he could correct it?

He's been made aware of the manipulation of sound on his Oslo, Norway CD clip for some time. It's still right there on his website. I don't hold out any hopes for his correcting of any mistake. I expect him to continue to literally ask for a free lunch until his misinformation is exposed fully.

And then he can get back to designing grocery stores.

Do send him my regards.

Joseph

The email that followed:

bolo boffin wrote:

```
> What I plan on doing with the site: finishing it one day! LOL. It's a
> labor of love, and there's only so much I can do before I get
> distracted by life. Still, it's something I'm doing as a personal
> project, but thanks for your offer.
>
>
>
> I have met Richard Gage, and I feel he sincerely is trying to be
> factual
> at all times. I know from experience that he does make mistakes
> in his
```

> presentations. (I know not everything he says is on a script  
> that he  
> has looked over multiple times.) I believe he is sincere,  
> though.  
>  
>  
> After working my way through as much of his slides and his  
> presentation as I have, I'm sad to say that I cannot agree. He is far  
> too duplicitous in his use of material and his points. Perhaps he has  
> fooled himself in that way best described by the military term  
> incestuous amplification.  
>  
> The choices for Gage's personal motivations, in my opinion, are  
> sincerity (in which case he's a bleeding idiot) or malice (in which  
> case his errors are actual lies). The amount of manipulated evidence  
> I've seen in his presentation makes me think snake-oil salesman, and  
> his continuous cries for money do nothing to alleviate this  
> impression.  
>  
>  
>  
> Furthermore, I have looked at the 9/11 issue for some time, and I  
> have  
> seen some things which are irreconcilable with the official  
> story.  
> The  
> molten metal that John Gross claims he knows nothing about has  
> not  
> been  
> explained by NIST or any of the unofficial defenders of the  
> official  
> story--such as, Popular Mechanics. Even the FEMA Appendix C  
> document  
> has a picture of melted steel. Steel melted. This is the  
> Achille's  
> heel of the official story, as I see it.  
>  
>  
>  
> John Gross was parsing his words there. He claimed to have heard no  
> credible claims of molten "steel."

Whether John Gross knows about any steel is actually irrelevant to whether or not melted steel exists. Melted steel was there. This cannot be explained by the official story.

FEMA BPAT Appendix C: [http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_apc.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_apc.pdf)

Can you explain that using the official story or some derivative of the official story?

Note what Gross, who was involved in the investigation for three years, says about the high temperatures:

-----  
JOHN GROSS:

I know of absolutely nobody--no eye witnesses who have said so, nobody who has produced it. I was on the site. I was on the steel yards. So, I can't...I don't know that that was so.

FIRST QUESTIONER:  
"There's video of it."

GROSS  
**\*gross talks over the questioner\***  
2600 degrees Fahrenheit.

I think it is probably pretty difficult to get those kinds of temperatures in the, uh, in a fire. So, i don't know the basis--so I can't address your question if I don't know the basis.

FIRST QUESTIONER:  
Well, NASA pictures--thermal images showed those sorts of temperatures in the basement.

JOHN GROSS:  
Would you send them to me?

FIRST QUESTIONER:  
Okay.

-----

NOTE: That person later tried to trade email addresses with John Gross, but Gross would have nothing to do with him. (This person is interviewed in the newest version of the film "Loose Change Final Cut.")

Are you aware that John Gross and six other people from NIST who are working on the NIST WTC reports also worked on the FEMA WTC report?

That would mean that seven people who wrote the Twin Towers report for NIST did not address what was previously called the deepest mystery of the investigation:

"Perhaps the deepest mystery uncovered in the investigation involves extremely thin bits of steel collected from the trade towers and from 7 World Trade Center, a 47-story high rise that also collapsed for unknown reasons. The steel apparently melted away, but no fire in any of the buildings was believed to be hot enough to melt steel outright. A preliminary analysis of the steel at Worcester Polytechnic Institute using electron microscopes suggests that sulfur released during the fires -- no one knows from where -- may have combined with atoms in the steel to form compounds that melt at lower temperatures."

Source:

<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C04E0DE153DF931A35751C0A9649C8B63&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=3>

Then John Gross later claimed that he knew nothing of the melted steel.

Nobody that he knows knew anything about it. But you can simply google "wtc steel melted" and see all sorts of evidence of it.

NIST's response concerning this molten metal was that it was likely aluminum, which does not explain the existence of other evidence of melted steel: [http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs\\_8\\_2006.htm](http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm)

Furthermore, you can see for yourself in numerous videos that molten aluminum has a silverish look:  
<http://www.google.com/search?q=molten+aluminum+site%3Ayoutube.com>

Nevertheless, melted steel was found at both the WTC7 and Twin Towers sites by the FEMA researchers.

AE911Truth is submitting a copy of the FEMA BPAT to NIST. The "deepest mystery" of the previous investigation really should have found its way into discussions by NIST.

In November 2007 I found John Gross' phone number on the Web. In light of a conversation with someone shortly beforehand I was trying to help see 9/11 for the cover-up that it is, I was thinking of adding John Gross' phone number to the Web document I am putting together so that people can call and talk to him themselves to find out whether he was ever given the evidence of the molten steel. ;-) Before doing that, though, I thought I would see whether his number still works. I called the number and got a surprise. (I should have been recording it.)

That

afternoon's conversation with John Gross went something like this:

JOHN GROSS: Hello, this is John.

ME: Is this **\*John Gross\***? (I was surprised, but I think I hid it pretty well.)

JOHN GROSS: Yes, this is John.

ME: Hi. My name is Shane Geiger. I saw a video online of a presentation you gave in Austin, Texas. I was just wondering whether anyone gave you evidence of the molten metal underneath the WTC towers.

JOHN GROSS: Who are you affiliated with?

ME: I'm just doing some research on my own about 9/11. Some friends of

mine told me about these 9/11 conspiracy theories. So, did those people

in the video ever give you the evidence of the molten metal?

JOHN GROSS: Who are you affiliated with?

ME: I'm just an independent researcher looking into these 9/11 conspiracy theories. Did you get the evidence of the melted steel?

JOHN GROSS: Where are you calling from? Where's this 402 area code?

ME: Oh, it's from Nebraska

JOHN GROSS: You will have to talk to our public affairs office.

ME: I was just wondering whether you got evidence of the molten metal. Did you?

JOHN GROSS: You will have to talk to our public affairs office.

ME: Okay. What's that person's number?

JOHN GROSS: 301...

ME: Wait one second. I'm not at my computer. Okay, what was the number?

JOHN GROSS: 301 975 3025

ME: Okay, thank you. Goodbye

I wish I had recorded it.

Did you notice that he said neither "yes" nor "no." Hmm. Answering in the affirmative or in the negative would have been easy, wouldn't it have been? I wonder why that was so difficult. :-)

It is worth noting that the "public meetings" that NIST does have allow the public to make comments. However, the public is never allowed to be in a question-answer session with the researchers.

I would appreciate your viewpoint on this physical evidence that is, as far as I can tell, impossible to refute.

How else can this be interpreted?

> He's rather clear about that, although I personally think the  
> statement was unwise. The temperatures beneath the Pile could have  
> melted all kinds of metals, and probably could have melted steel as  
> well. None of that is evidence of conditions in the buildings before  
> they fell.  
>  
> Gage uses pictures of slag from cleanup torches as evidence of melted  
> steel on columns. It's another one of his untruths.  
I understand that some evidence could be interpreted in more than one way.

>  
>  
> Anyway, I always appreciate talking with people who are  
interested in  
> spreading the truth, even if they don't agree with me. If  
Richard has  
> an information which is in error and we can fix this, we would  
> definitely appreciate your help in finding that.  
>  
>  
> Well, that sound less like you've met him, and more like you are  
> working with him. Is that the case? You aren't listed on his website  
> as a supporter. How exactly would giving you information about his  
> mistakes get to his hands so that he could correct it?  
A friend of mine has been working with him for some time. I am in contact with him via email regularly, and I even took part in a conference call with his "board members" this morning. They may "adopt me."

Some of the much evidence he provides is not strong as other evidence. Without a doubt. I see a fair amount of this on both sides. In fact, I can see how some bits of bad evidence would serve to make people dislike

all of the presentation. After all, would you like to eat something if you knew that it has little poison or a little bit of an insect in it? Few people would, even if they were also told that this undesirable stuff was in such a small amount that it would not hurt them at all. Probably this is the biggest weakness of a presentation that tries to show an amazing assortment of evidence of controlled demolition.

Please, though, demonstrate your willingness to seek truth by addressing the melted steel evidence, which NIST has yet to do. This is a "deep mystery" only if you ignore the fact that sulfur is a melting accelerant and that thermite is a thermal accelerant...and that, without a doubt, sulfur was mentioned in FEMA BPAT Appendix C and that perhaps thermite's signature is also there in the XEDS diagrams. (The absence of aluminum in the XEDS graphs in the FEMA BPAT might simply be explained by the fact that during an aluminothermic reaction of thermite the aluminum becomes a white gas that looks a lot like what people refer to as the "white smoke" that was witnessed in several instances on 9/11.) According to the NFPA 921 Guide Section 12-2.4 ([http://www.interfire.org/res\\_file/92112m.asp](http://www.interfire.org/res_file/92112m.asp)), finding just one accelerant allows a fire researcher to label a fire as caused by malfeasance...even without finding the cause of the fire.

According to the latest public meeting in December, NIST is now claiming that WTC7's collapse was due to fire. They also state that they aren't looking for the cause of the fire.

I would appreciate it if you could try to explain all the physical evidence to me. It just does not jive with the official report.

>  
> He's been made aware of the manipulation of sound on his Oslo, Norway  
> CD clip for some time. It's still right there on his website. I don't  
> hold out any hopes for his correcting of any mistake. I expect him to  
> continue to literally ask for a free lunch until his misinformation  
is  
> exposed fully.  
>  
> And then he can get back to designing grocery stores.  
>  
> Do send him my regards.  
>  
> Joseph  
>

--  
Shane Geiger  
IT Director  
National Council on Economic Education  
[sgeiger@ncee.net](mailto:sgeiger@ncee.net) | 402-438-8958 | <http://www.ncee.net>

Leading the Campaign for Economic and Financial Literacy

Over five pages.

One of the fun things about conspiracy theorists, especially ones that pretend to be “on the fence” the way Mr. Geiger represented himself, is that they love to vomit a whole lot of garbage over their debate partners. It’s an interesting technique: to silence your debate opponent with so much crap that it would take hours of their time to respond.

Now to be honest, my email which reproduced his email in full is in that page. But my email is a little over a page long *with* his included.

Unfortunately for me, I was at work at the time that letter came to me. I work at night, and I’d left my home computer on with my email program running. So I missed that email when Mr. Geiger sent it at 12:26 am. When I got home and saw it (2:30 am!), I groaned, did my nightly errands, and went to bed at 4 am.

Mr. Geiger had not:

Joseph,

I have been thinking more about Richard's methodology. I actually like the huge amount of evidence, although the PowerPoint format doesn't allow me to easily verify all the information in his document. I would liken Richard's approach of showing a lot of controlled demolition evidence to that of someone trying to place dots in a Venn diagram:  
You

try to place dots in there to show that some of these dots can be explained only by controlled demolition. Which dots (or facts) are persuasive depends on the person. Very few people will look at one aspect of the destruction of these buildings and be very persuaded.

I am very curious to have your input on my last email.

Shane

That was at 4:26 am! Just over four hours later!

What’s worse, Shane was quite happy to tell me about his harassing of John Gross. Oh, joy, oh, rapture divine. I was his latest victim.

So I composed a second email to try and correct some of his errors and make it clear that he was being a pest.

**Shane Geiger wrote:**

**Joseph,**

**I have been thinking more about Richard's methodology. I actually like the huge amount of evidence, although the PowerPoint format doesn't**

**allow me to easily verify all the information in his document. I would liken Richard's approach of showing a lot of controlled demolition evidence to that of someone trying to place dots in a Venn diagram: You try to place dots in there to show that some of these dots can be explained only by controlled demolition. Which dots (or facts) are persuasive depends on the person. Very few people will look at one aspect of the destruction of these buildings and be very persuaded.**

That isn't Gage's argument. Since you've been to my website, you should know that. Gage's argument is that all of the information is correct and that all of those things mean controlled demolition. If something doesn't connect, then Gage's argument falls apart.

What Gage is hiding is that he is affirming the consequent. He's throwing a lot of stuff against the wall, and if something sticks, he draws a target around it. Then he goes around to his speaking engagements, bragging about what a good shot he is.

In fact, the worst part of Gage's presentation is that he claims that the buildings exhibit no characteristics of destruction by fire, and they do.

<http://ae911truth.info/aeppt97018.html>

<http://ae911truth.info/aeppt97019.html>

Severe, slow deformations over time -- all three buildings had this.

There is nothing in those collapses that requires controlled demolition as an explanation.

**Whether John Gross knows about any steel is actually irrelevant to whether or not melted steel exists. Melted steel was there. This cannot be explained by the official story.**

You were upset about John Gross before, and now he's irrelevant. Whatever.

I told you that I don't have any problem putting molten steel under the Pile. Molten steel under the Pile has no relevance whatsoever to conditions before the collapse. Do you understand why this is? "It had to come from somewhere," you will say. Yes, say I. It came from the fires burning under the Pile, the fires that radiated such extreme heat that they could be caught on thermal imaging pictures.

Molten metals of any sort under the Pile have no information to give us about conditions before the collapse. That's why NIST doesn't care about the reports of molten metals. They were only concerned with collapse initiation. Conditions days or weeks after the collapses can tell us nothing about conditions before the collapse.

**In November 2007 I found John Gross' phone number on the Web.**

I don't see anything more heinous in John Gross' conversation with you than a person being unnecessarily bothered. I thought he wasn't relevant, anyway.

He's rather clear about that, although I personally think the statement was unwise. The temperatures beneath the Pile could have melted all kinds of metals, and probably could have melted steel as well. None of that is evidence of conditions in the buildings before they fell.

***Gage uses pictures of slag from cleanup torches as evidence of melted steel on columns. It's another one of his untruths.***

**I understand that some evidence could be interpreted in more than one way.**

No. Not that evidence. The slag on the column has been proven time and again to be a column cut by torch during the clean up process.

It's from this photo collection.

<http://hereisnewyork.org/gallery/thumb.asp?CategoryID=5&picnum=13>

**I would appreciate it if you could try to explain all the physical evidence to me. It just does not jive with the official report.**

I'm going to finish the website as I have time. If you want the explanation from me, you'll have to wait. If you have further questions, you should try searching the Conspiracy Theory forum at the James Randi Educational Foundation. If you don't find what you're looking for there, I've provided more links to debunking websites.

<http://forums.randi.org/forumdisplay.php?f=64>

<http://wtc7lies.googlepages.com/>

<http://www.911myths.com/>

<http://www.debunking911.com/>

<http://911guide.googlepages.com/>

<http://www.debunk911myths.org/>

Have a great life.

Joseph

That's two pages.

- I dealt with his Achilles heel evidence - melted metal of any kind under the Pile doesn't surprise me with the fires that were burning under there. The melted metal,

yes, even melted steel, doesn't tell us anything about conditions in the buildings before the collapse. Conspiracy theorists want to pretend that it does.

- I alluded to his pestering of John Gross.
- I corrected him on his misrepresentation of Gage's argument. Gage most certainly does claim that ALL characteristic features of controlled demolition are present in the collapse of WTC 7 and that the building demonstrates NONE of the characteristics of destruction by fire. That is his argument.
- I corrected him on the picture of the cleanup slag.
- I made it clear that I was not his personal assistant to get him out of his conspiracy thinking. Much good debunking has already been done on every single point of Gage's mishmash of idiocy. I'm assembling a slide-by-slide rebuttal of it.

Do you think he got the hint? At 6:35 on 1 Jan 2008:

**Joseph Nobles wrote:**

> **Shane Geiger wrote:**

>> **Joseph,**

>>

>> **I have been thinking more about Richard's methodology. I actually like  
>> the huge amount of evidence, although the PowerPoint format doesn't  
>> allow me to easily verify all the information in his document. I would  
>> liken Richard's approach of showing a lot of controlled demolition  
>> evidence to that of someone trying to place dots in a Venn diagram: You  
>> try to place dots in there to show that some of these dots can be  
>> explained only by controlled demolition. Which dots (or facts) are  
>> persuasive depends on the person. Very few people will look at one  
>> aspect of the destruction of these buildings and be very persuaded.**

>

> **That isn't Gage's argument. Since you've been to my website, you  
> should know that. Gage's argument is that all of the information is  
> correct and that all of those things mean controlled demolition. If  
> something doesn't connect, then Gage's argument falls apart.**

If Gage mistakenly includes some evidence which could be interpreted as being something other than evidence for controlled demolition it does hurt his argument. However, does that mean that controlled demolition did not occur? Not necessarily.

> **What Gage is hiding is that he is affirming the consequent. He's  
> throwing a lot of stuff against the wall, and if something sticks, he  
> draws a target around it. Then he goes around to his speaking  
> engagements, bragging about what a good shot he is.**

> **In fact, the worst part of Gage's presentation is that he claims that  
> the buildings exhibit no characteristics of destruction by fire, and**

> **they do.**

>

> <http://ae911truth.info/aeppt97018.html>

> <http://ae911truth.info/aeppt97019.html>

>

> **Severe, slow deformations over time -- all three buildings had this.**

An hour is a relatively short amount of time for the Twin Towers to be burning. Some debate exists about whether some bowing occurred in the Twin Towers' walls before collapse. The illusion of this could have been caused by the heat coming out of the building. It certainly seems to me that we cannot prove definitively why the walls appeared from some angles to bow. In any case, I would tend to agree with Richard on this one--that the deformations were rather quick. I agree with you, too, though, that this statement of Richard's is open to interpretation.

> **There is nothing in those collapses that requires controlled demolition as an explanation.**

Nothing? So if I provide a counter-example, I have proven your whole argument about Gage wrong.

Please explain this evidence: Appendix C:

[http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403\\_apc.pdf](http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_apc.pdf) That is evidence of steel-melting temperatures and even melted steel. It is only a few pages but well worth the read.

You must be able to account for this evidence if you will be seen as correct.

This can be explained by controlled demolition.

>>> **Whether John Gross knows about any steel is actually irrelevant to >>> whether or not melted steel exists. Melted steel was there. This >>> cannot be explained by the official story.**

>

> **You were upset about John Gross before, and now he's irrelevant.**

> **Whatever.**

>

Read my statement again. Whether a human being (John Gross) knows about something (melted steel) does not mean that this thing does/did/will not exist (melted steel at the WTC on 9/11). My statement was correct.

> **I told you that I don't have any problem putting molten steel under  
> the Pile. Molten steel under the Pile has no relevance whatsoever to  
> conditions before the collapse. Do you understand why this is? "It had  
> to come from somewhere," you will say. Yes, say I. It came from the  
> fires burning under the Pile, the fires that radiated such extreme  
> heat that they could be caught on thermal imaging pictures.**

That is one explanation. How can you know that you are correct?  
Another explanation could be that steel melted before the collapse due  
to a controlled demolition.

We certainly saw some sort of orange metal flowing out of the South  
Tower before it collapsed. As such, Peter Jennings' live broadcast on  
ABC of molten metal flowing out of the South Tower provides much  
credibility to the many amateur videos of that same event minutes before  
the building's collapse:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OP6MlrfbCvQ&feature=related>

You can see for yourself in numerous videos that molten aluminum has a  
silverish look:

<http://www.google.com/search?q=molten+aluminum+site%3Ayoutube.com>

Nobody has demonstrated that aluminum can look orange when mixed with  
something, so I have reason to think this was not aluminum.

Furthermore, iron-rich spheres were found to be characteristic of the  
WTC dust. This is more evidence of steel-melting (+2800F)  
temperatures. More importantly to our discussion: This is evidence of  
these temperatures above ground.

>From a Government source comes this iron-rich sphere of the type  
described by Steven Jones, RJ Lee Group and others. This is evidence of  
melted steel at the time of some force that could have propelled this  
liquid through the air, causing surface tension to shape the liquid into  
a sphere. The melted steel seen flowing from the WTC South Tower  
minutes before its collapse and the explosive forces witnessed during  
the destruction of the Twin Towers would have provided just the right  
circumstances in which such iron-rich spheres to create such iron-rich  
spheres.

<http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1165/graphics/IRON-04-IMAGE.jpg>

RJ Lee Group, WTC Dust Signature Report, Composition and Morphology,  
December, 2003, available here:

<http://www.nyenvirolaw.org/WTC/130%20Liberty%20Street/Mike%20Davis%20LMDC%20130%20Liberty%20Documents/Signature%20of%20WTC%20dust/WTC%20Dust%20Signature.Composition%20and%20Morphology.Final.pdf>

That is the most exhaustive report on the WTC dust. It refers to the spheres as being "characteristic" of the dust.

Search for "Fe Sphere" and "spherical iron particle"

These iron-rich spheres were listed as one of the 13 types of items studied that were characteristic of the WTC dust. (These 13 types of items were split into Class A, which was building materials, and Class C, which included skin and hair--yes, there was a lot of pulverized people. As much as we want to ignore that, it was so:

"The statistical analysis was conducted for each of thirteen particle types as well as for composites of Class A and Class C particles. Eleven particle classes were derived from major building products or were influenced by high temperature (Class A particles). An additional two particle types included carbon-rich particles and flakes and carbon-rich fibers such as skin, cellulose, and hair (Class C particles). A summary of the results obtained for this analysis is provided in Table 3." (source: page 23 of the report or page 27 of the PDF)

On page 18 of the report (page 22 of the PDF file) they have a picture of the "spherical iron particles."

**> Molten metals of any sort under the Pile have no information to give  
> us about conditions before the collapse. That's why NIST doesn't care  
> about the reports of molten metals. They were only concerned with  
> collapse initiation. Conditions days or weeks after the collapses can  
> tell us nothing about conditions before the collapse.**

The evidence I showed above sidesteps the need to discuss molten melts under the WTC wreckage.

I would like to avoid making assessments about the motivation of NIST for doing various things. They may claim to do things for a particular purpose, I would rather not take them at their word or to speculate on my own why they are doing things they do.

>>>

>>> In November 2007 I found John Gross' phone number on the Web.  
> I don't see anything more heinous in John Gross' conversation with you  
> than a person being unnecessarily bothered. I thought he wasn't  
> relevant, anyway.

>>>  
>>>> He's rather clear about that, although I personally think the  
>>>> statement was unwise. The temperatures beneath the Pile could have  
>>>> melted all kinds of metals, and probably could have melted steel as  
>>>> well. None of that is evidence of conditions in the buildings before  
>>>> they fell.

>>>>  
>>>> Gage uses pictures of slag from cleanup torches as evidence of melted  
>>>> steel on columns. It's another one of his untruths.

>>>>  
>>> I understand that some evidence could be interpreted in more than  
>>> one way.

>>>  
> No. Not that evidence. The slag on the column has been proven time and  
> again to be a column cut by torch during the clean up process.

>  
> It's from this photo collection.  
>  
> <http://hereisnewyork.org/gallery/thumb.asp?CategoryID=5&picnum=13>

If we had a Venn diagram with two overlapping circles, I would put the angled cut evidence into the middle circle. I would not say it has been "proven" to all parties involved that the evidence is either in the right or the left circle--the circles that represent the "official story" and the "controlled demolition story." I don't think I would show that evidence. However, your assertion is also suspect--it has not been "proven" to be one thing or the other. How can we prove it? This evidence was destroyed.

>>>  
>>> I would appreciate it if you could try to explain all the physical  
>>> evidence to me. It just does not jive with the official report.

>>>  
>>>  
> I'm going to finish the website as I have time. If you want the  
> explanation from me, you'll have to wait. If you have further  
> questions, you should try searching the Conspiracy Theory forum at the  
> James Randi Educational Foundation.

I do not see how accounting for physical evidence requires me to look into "conspiracy theory." Are all physicists and other scientists "conspiracy theorists?" No.

I already sent you another message with a lot of information that you apparently chose not to respond to. If you choose not to respond to evidence, you should give a reason why. Otherwise it looks very dishonest. If you were to merely respond to the physical evidence mentioned in this message I feel you would be doing an adequate job of responding to important evidence. I have already looked at the Web sites you mentioned below and even the articles and papers of the more prominent defenders of the official story, and not one of them has adequately addressed the issue.

Waiting for your response,

Shane

> **If you don't find what you're looking for there, I've provided more  
> links to debunking websites.**

>

>

> <http://forums.randi.org/forumdisplay.php?f=64>

> <http://wtc7lies.googlepages.com/>

> <http://www.911myths.com/>

> <http://www.debunking911.com/>

> <http://911guide.googlepages.com/>

> <http://www.debunk911myths.org/>

>

> **Have a great life.**

>

> **Joseph**

>

--

Shane Geiger

IT Director

National Council on Economic Education

[sgeiger@ncee.net](mailto:sgeiger@ncee.net) | 402-438-8958 | <http://www.ncee.net>

Leading the Campaign for Economic and Financial Literacy

Five and a half pages.

And man, the woo IS strong with this one. No wonder AE911Truth wants him on their board.

Deformations in the towers the result of heat mirages? We don't have to talk about the molten metal under the pile even though it's the Achilles heel evidence? Gage's all-or-nothing argument doesn't collapse because... Actually I didn't really get the reason why for that. He feels that it's all about connecting the dots that do stick from Gage's argument, I guess.

And Mr. Geiger, when you read this, as I'm sure someone so needy for attention like you will be, you have to look under "conspiracy theory" to find the information you need because *you are a conspiracy theorist*. OK, let me put this into language that you have no excuse for not listening to. People consider your questions to be conspiracy theorizing, and most rebuttals for your questions and Achilles' heel evidence are found under those headings. If you were interested in the truth, you would seek those places out.

After I got up, I responded at 2:31 pm:

Mr. Geiger

You are not having a conversation with me. You are sending me diatribes that have little to do with my actual statements.

Please desist.

Then I went to a party. Then I went to I Am Legend. Good movie. I liked the ending OK, but I understand the book is much better. Then I got home to this:

**Joseph Nobles wrote:**

> **You are not having a conversation with me. You are sending me**

> **datribes that have little to do with my actual statements.**

>

> **Please desist.**

>

If apologies are necessary I would be glad to make them. However, I would invite you to read what you wrote previously. Your statements did seem to be part of an ad hominem attack against Richard Gage. I merely defended against that, and showed that your charges were unfounded.

If you meant to use the word "diatribe" in the archaic sense of a long discourse: I have amply shown factors which contradict your view of 9/11 and support that of Richard Gage. This is not only pertinent to the discussion of Richard Gage but, more importantly, to the discussion of the criminal act of 9/11. To ignore facts of the nature I presented you (from multiple official sources that verify each other) is to be dangerously close to denying reality. As mentioned previously, I enjoy discussing 9/11 with people who do not agree with me if they are people who seek truth. You refuse to respond to the points I have made, so I

question your motives, but, more importantly, you have provided me with no reason to think your view of 9/11 is totally inaccurate. As someone creating a Web site to attack 9/11 Truthers, it would seem you would readily have some information on hand to refute my evidence.

In light of your apparent distaste for independently verifiable factual, hard evidence and in light of the very public attacks you are making on Richard Gage and in light of just how important it is to tell the 9/11 Truth, I may start a Web site of my own to show how poorly people who have your position are able to maintain it during a discussion like this with me. I hope you do not mind that I demonstrate that you have been unable to refute the physical evidence I explained thoroughly in previous messages. I do welcome you to come to grips with the evidence I have provided you with and to explain its existence. You have already made it clear, however, that you are ending this conversation. I wish you were open to the same sort of corrections that you expect Richard Gage to be open to.

Good luck with your Web site.

Shane

--

Shane Geiger  
IT Director  
National Council on Economic Education  
[sgeiger@ncee.net](mailto:sgeiger@ncee.net) | 402-438-8958 | <http://www.ncee.net>

Leading the Campaign for Economic and Financial Literacy

That was sent at 3:04 pm, thirty minutes after mine.

Sigh.

So I made it absolutely, crystal-clear that I was ending the conversation, just to make sure the troll knew that we were over.

**Shane Geiger wrote:**  
*Joseph Nobles wrote:*

*You are not having a conversation with me. You are sending me diatribes that have little to do with my actual statements.*

*Please desist.*

**If apologies are necessary I would be glad to make them. However, I would invite you to read what you wrote previously. Your statements did seem to be part of an ad hominem attack against Richard Gage. I merely defended against that, and showed that your charges were unfounded.**

**If you meant to use the word "diatribe" in the archaic sense of a long discourse: I have amply shown factors which contradict your view of 9/11 and support that of Richard Gage. This is not only pertinent to the discussion of Richard Gage but, more importantly, to the discussion of the criminal act of 9/11. To ignore facts of the nature I presented you (from multiple official sources that verify each other) is to be dangerously close to denying reality. As mentioned previously, I enjoy discussing 9/11 with people who do not agree with me if they are people who seek truth. You refuse to respond to the points I have made, so I question your motives, but, more importantly, you have provided me with no reason to think your view of 9/11 is totally inaccurate. As someone creating a Web site to attack 9/11 Truthers, it would seem you would readily have some information on hand to refute my evidence.**

**In light of your apparent distaste for independently verifiable factual, hard evidence and in light of the very public attacks you are making on Richard Gage and in light of just how important it is to tell the 9/11 Truth, I may start a Web site of my own to show how poorly people who have your position are able to maintain it during a discussion like this with me. I hope you do not mind that I demonstrate that you have been unable to refute the physical evidence I explained thoroughly in previous messages. I do welcome you to come to grips with the evidence I have provided you with and to explain its existence. You have already made it clear, however, that you are ending this conversation. I wish you were open to the same sort of corrections that you expect Richard Gage to be open to.**

**Good luck with your Web site.**

**Shane**

This will be my last email to you, Mr. Geiger.

I grant you full permission to publish the entirety of this email exchange, as long as you do so IN its entirety.

I assume the same permission from you.

Tell Richard Gage that the truth is coming for him, and it is not happy.

Joseph Nobles

It's sad when Internet romances end so badly.

Joseph Nobles

1/1/08