

A Rebuttal of a few of Gordon Duff's more Outrageous Statements

by Anthony Lawson

On March 18th *Veterans Today* published the following Item:

9/11 Interview with Gordon Duff, Sahar University Just the Facts, Maam by Gordon Duff with Sahar English Service

Never before broadcast interview with Gordon Duff on the subject of 9/11. Interview date, 11/9/2012:
<http://www.veteranstoday.com/2013/03/18/911-interview-with-gordon-duff-sahar-university-video/>

I used to be a contributor, mostly of videos, to *Veterans Today* but I ceased being one when it became clear that the absurd **No-Planes-In New York** brigade had taken control of the editorial department. The item in question isn't really a video, it is a series of stills with someone from the Sahar University, who was not named, interviewing Gordon Duff. Here are some excerpts.

Gordon Duff at 1:20 The World Trade Centre Towers had as much steel in them as three super-carriers. That steel turned to powder in 1/1000ths of a second.

Author's comment: All except the steel shown in the following pictures, that is:





Gordon Duff at 1:33 The kerosene or materials that were in the supposed planes that crashed into the Towers wouldn't have put out enough BTUs (British Thermal Units) to have warmed a single rivet. Much less had done what is said.

Of course this is hyperbole, the fuel from a Boeing 767 lookalike would have melted a whole lot of rivets, had they not been embedded in the steel. Most intelligent people realize that the Twin Towers were not destroyed by aviation fuel and fires as claimed in the official story so the comment is meaningless.

Gordon Duff at 10:01 It's very simple every nation in the world has airliners. We've all flown on them or many of us have and an airliner cannot fly at 500 feet above the ground at 500 miles an hour. It will disintegrate.

This is not true. Dwain Deets, a former NASA Flight Director has addressed this issue.

Dwain Deets *The possibilities as I see them are: (1) this wasn't a standard 767-200; (2) the radar data was compromised in some manner; (3) the NTSB analysis was erroneous; or (4) the 767 flew well beyond its flight envelope, was controllable, and managed to hit a relatively small target.*

Reference: http://pilotsfor911truth.org/911_Aircraft_Speed_Deets.html

Deets's Option 1: *this wasn't a standard 767-200;* Anyone who has spent a little time looking into these issues knows that the planes have never been identified, but they certainly were real, as can be seen from the videos and photographs that show an engine core falling out of the South Tower and the damage it did to a building on its way down to impact at the corner of Murray and Church streets. An irrefutable photo-montage of this damage can be seen here: <http://www.davidicke.com/forum/showthread.php?p=1060754522>

Deets's Option 4: *the 767 flew well beyond its flight envelope. . .* It should be remembered that a *flight envelope* is agreed between a manufacturer and the FAA and takes into account all kinds of factors having to do with flight safety and recovery possibilities. ***It does not represent an aircraft's actual flight capabilities.*** Manufacturer rarely publishes such details. Boeing certainly has not.

Gordon Duff 10:16 They can fly at 500 miles an hour and they do so at 30,000 feet in air that is so thin that it has no oxygen. In heavy air an airliner will simply fall apart.

Clearly aircraft engines would cease to function in an oxygen-free atmosphere. So much for Mr Duff's knowledge of physics.

But, nothing daunted, he plows on and compares an aircraft hitting a building at 550 mph with throwing a ping pong ball at a truck and "having the truck disappear". But listen yourself to that little gem.

Gordon Duff 10:39 When we watch two of the largest buildings in the world disintegrate when hit by planes it's the equivalent . . . they physical equivalent of picking up a ping-pong ball and throwing it at a large truck and having the truck just disappear. The physics here is absurd. It' utterly unbelievable and we've sold this theory and so many other theories. . .

Of course they did not disintegrate immediately, like his *large truck* wouldn't have. They stayed standing until the people who brought them down were ready to commit their murderous acts.

There's not a lot more to say except that this man, who knows nothing about the Earth's atmosphere that we all breath, or kinetic energy that affects everyone in some way, is passing his *knowledge* on to the students of an Iranian University. It is only to be hoped that they are more knowledgeable about such things than is the senior editor of *Veterans Today*.

But where does he get this *knowledge* from, I hear you ask? Why, from another non-physicist whose addition to the contributors of *Veterans Today* caused me to cease being one of them: Dr James Fetzer.

This is what I wrote when I told *VTI* I was no longer interested in their publication:

Dr. Fetzer has never answered my repeated calls for him to provide a peer-reviewed paper, written by an expert who is qualified in the area of impact physics in support of his theory that laws proposed by Sir Isaac Newton would have prevented a plane weighing about 150 tons and travelling at a velocity of about 550 mph from entering the lattice-like construction of the WTC Tower walls, as depicted in many 9/11 videos, expending what I have calculated to be around 1,189,068 kilojoules of kinetic energy.

I do not want my output hosted by a website alongside the work of people who have such little understanding of physics, but who claim that they do and who are supported by that website's editorial team, without question.

Anthony Lawson — lawson911@gmail.com — March 20th, 2013