

## ST911 Scientist to Sue BBC for Public Deception

Published on Monday, July 16, 2007.



Source: [RINF Alternative News](#) - Mick Meaney

A British scientist and member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, John A. Blacker MSc IMI (Physical Systems), is planning to sue the BBC for mass public deception via their '9/11: The Conspiracy Files?' program, [RINF Alternative News](#) can reveal.

The program which aired on 18 February, 2007, promised to offer a thorough examination of the events of 9/11 and answer many of the questions posed by the 9/11 Truth Movement.

However, the hour long program failed to investigate the tough questions and ignored hard evidence that points towards a deeper conspiracy, while presenting an unfair and unbalanced view of 9/11 research.

Scientist and member of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, John A. Blacker, is taking action against this portrayal on the grounds of 'Total Public Deception?.'

In ongoing correspondence with the BBC, Mr. Blacker is requesting an official apology and a second program to be produced in order to 'set the record straight?.'

Mr Blacker is preparing to take legal action against the BBC and is currently gathering evidence.

Earlier this month, ex MI5 whistleblower, David Shayler, along with Adrian Connock, producer of Mind the Gap which exposed the false flag terrorism in London on 7/7/05, released an [extensive video rebuttal](#) destroying the BBC's attempt to discredit scientific evidence and eyewitness reports.

Speaking to [RINF](#), Mr. Blacker said: 'The BBC is being sued for lying to viewers and a formal apology and a new film correcting the scandalous misinformation is needed.'

'How can 80+ strongest, undamaged and heaviest bottom floors offer only 0.78 seconds of resistance between them - yet were designed and built to withstand 3 times working load and have 'indestructible cores?' when new. This is without considering air resistance and any other slowing effect.'

'This simple maths proves 911 was a demolition,' he said.

In Mr. Blacker's most recent letter to the BBC he provides scientific evidence to support his theory of a controlled demolition.

Here is the letter in full:

[Pre action for damages without prejudice](#)

Your ref: CT/0700108a

[RE: 911 The Conspiracy files Documentary - BBC - Total Public Deception.](#)

Dear Secretary Bruce Vander,

Thank you for your letter dated 4 June 2007 from Colin Tregear.

I do indeed intend to take this matter to the next level for the following reasons and I want at least an apology if not a second program setting the record straight and exposing the true 911 facts as opposed to the official government lies.

I fully accept the Conspiracy files program was only 59 minutes long, so why if time was so short, was copious time spent exploring the work of a weird science fiction writer who was not even there on 911 - as opposed to evaluating the merits of the recorded Physics Evidence (FACTS) of which are the core concerns of the 'Government account?' sceptics such as myself?



Below are the science facts, which clearly, conclusively, prove that 911 was a Deliberate Controlled Demolition.

Only a controlled demolition can collapse a 3 times working load, 47 massive steel core column steel framed building at freefall speed.

Physics Proof showing 9/11 was a Demolition.  
by J A Blacker MSc IMI (Physical Systems) (Lancaster England)

First we must Identify what we already know as FACT:-

Twin towers 1 & 2 were 1,368 ft and 1362 ft respectively. Let us take the taller to be conservative.

We know near the surface of the earth at sea level we can use  $g = 9.82 \text{ m/s}^2$  (metres per second per second), which is a scientifically accepted approximation.

We know the towers fell in 10 Seconds due to the seismic records and the copious video evidence.

Secondly we must convert to SI units:  $g$  is measured in metres per second per second,  $d$  must be measured in metres,  $t$  in seconds.

Distance fallen  $d = 416.9664 \text{ Metres}$ .  $g = 9.82 \text{ m/s}^2$ .  $t = 10 \text{ Seconds}$

Let us find out how much time it would take to fall the actual height 417 m in an ideal vacuum.

We know that air resistance always slows a falling body, we will disregard air resistance & other slowing effects so as to keep the maths simple whilst at the same time giving a realistic accurate conservative value.

$$d = \frac{1}{2}gt^2$$

(Not counting air resistance)

We want to identify a value for  $t^2$ . We know that  $t = \sqrt{t^2}$ . Then we can make our comparison and see how many seconds of resistance the bottom 80+ Heaviest, Undamaged and Strongest floors actually offered. Remember - the officials state both towers were designed and constructed with 3 times working load in mind. Each tower had an "indestructible core" we were told at the time of construction.

$$\frac{2(417)}{9.81} = t^2 = 85.02 \text{ (2dp)} \rightarrow t = 9.22 \text{ seconds. (Ideal vacuum conditions)}$$

Comparing the actual 10 seconds to the 9.22 seconds we can clearly see that 80+ floors of the Heaviest Undamaged and Strongest lower floors offered less than 1 second of resistance for all of them, and that is without counting air resistance and other slowing effects.

**Sadly in Conclusion → 911 was a demolition. PROVED!**

It is physically impossible for the strongest, heaviest and (3 times working design load) bottom 80 floors to offer near zero resistance to the falling floors except when there is a controlled demolition. Period!

How on earth can you claim the Conspiracy Files Documentary had anything to do with detail or forensic examination of the evidence if you totally avoided all of the Physics ? which is in itself helping to fuel the many ?conspiracy theories? - YET not once was there even a whiff of even any first hand accounts from key witnesses such as William Rodriguez (The Last Man Out) or any of the other first hand witnesses on 911?

William Rodriguez states quite categorically in an interview with the BBC - BOMBS went off even before the first plane hit and continued to be set off - yet you spent ages interviewing 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> hand witnesses such as a distressed grieving sister & some weird science fiction writer who were simply not present on 911.



*Caption above: William Rodriguez states quite categorically in an interview with the BBC ? A large BOMB went off even before the first plane hit and took out the sub basement level 002.*

If the BBC had been concentrating properly on detail and forensic examination as you claim to me in your letter then you would not have omitted the following key 13 items: -

- 1 No mention of US government history of total deceit, using Standown orders and fake events as pretexts for war, in which on one occasion alone over 50,000 US troops and 1,000,000 + Vietcong died during the following Vietnam war.
- 2 No mention of published US government documents which set out how to invade Cuba using a pretext of fake hijacked planes, terrorist attacks on Americans, deliberate horrific murder of US civilians so as to cause the invasion of Cuba hence start nuclear war WW3. (Operation Northwoods)
- 3 No interviews with key high witnesses such as police officers, fire fighters or National 911 hero William Rodriguez (Last Man Out) and other key 911 event witnesses. (See your own BBC archive) No mention of key witness testimony, radio traffic, and other key video evidence, which clearly demonstrates many explosions from within the twin towers prior to planes hitting or collapse.
- 4 No mention that all three buildings fell at freefall speed and that no steel framed building had ever collapsed due to fires prior or since 911. Yet many fires were much hotter and much longer. You made no attempt what so ever to explain why all 3 buildings fell at freefall speed - You simply deliberately avoided the Physics.
- 5 No mention of the omission of many high witness testimonies from the 911 commission's final report. No mention of the interpreter who testified she had translated documents which gave key specific 911 details to the authorities. No mention that Mossad, UK, French and other intelligence agencies had warned the US weeks prior of immanent attack by Arab terrorists using Jumbos to launch at buildings ? yet airport security was not stepped up. You failed to mention building 007 was completely omitted from the official 911 Commission's final report.
- 6 No mention that Bush, Rumsfeld & Condi lied claiming they had no idea or even suspicion terrorist would ever use planes as terrorist weapons. (Yet were doing a terrorist/plane exercise on the morning of 911)
- 7 No mention that Bush, ?the Commander in Chief? when told: -  
?America is under Attack?

Kept on reading a stupid goat story ? this in itself is a total dereliction of duty hence a treasonable offence. Its worse than if an on duty paramedic answers a distress call that children have just been mowed over by a wagon - then calmly finishes their morning tea & toast. Hello!

- 8 No mention the Pentagon had missile batteries which should shoot down any aircraft that is unauthorised entering its airspace, and that both the outer and inner systems failed to activate ? yet you interviewed the actual transport plane pilot who knew full well the Pentagon was missile armed and mentioned nothing of this when referring to what he claimed he observed.
- 9 No mention that two planes were reported by two independent sources as landing at Cleveland Hopkins Airport due to two separate bomb threats, not just one, and that flight 93 was one of those reported to have landed by locals.
- 10 A 757 simply cannot fly at ground level due to what is known as ?Ground Effect?. You show a so called independent computer animator who suggests that jet fuel caused most of the damage at the Pentagon, yet failed to mention his animation omitted the two 9 ft, 6 tonne engines from the animation and also the clear fact his animation totally contradicts photographs of the Pentagon prior to collapse. Hello! What sort of BBC Deceit is that? Also, his animation failed to account for the fact 6 reinforced concrete walls were penetrated ? they omitted the 6 reinforced walls completely. Indeed, the official image of the hole in the inner wall of the C block shows this animation to be total and utter fiction, yet the BBC gave it raving credibility. Question: Why did you fail to mention these key contradictions? Answer: Because you were trying to make the truth movement & its members including myself look stupid, fruitcake and unworthy of measured consideration

and the BBC was deliberately deceiving the British Public. Period.

- 11           3 floors only were pancaked, yet your film suggested the discredited 60 seconds pancake theory had validity when in fact it has already been discredited as totally implausible. You deceived the public into thinking such implausible official theory stacked up and made any sense ? yet the animation failed to account for the actual NIST reported and videoed 10 seconds freefall speeds and also the utter collapse of all building cores to DUST. In other words, this was a deliberate clear case of total deception on your part. Your film was totally deceitfully & factually false.
- 12           Re flight 93: Your film claimed it was alleged by ?Conspiracy Theorists? to be an 8-mile debris field, but when you investigated the claim it turned out to be about 8 miles by road but only 1 mile as the crow flies. This is yet further total, absolute deceit on your part. Flight 93 had, according to local official police and fire/rescue sources who actually did the search ? an 8-mile debris field.
- 13           Your film clearly states: ?the evidence points to a conspiracy after 911 - not before. You stated, ?The other 911 conspiracy theories are just that, theories, the evidence does not support them?. This is blatantly a false misleading statement. Even your own report stated that Government agents attempted to action protection for the US prior to 911. Indeed, failing to act on intelligence is a treasonable offence.

Obviously you now need a second attempt to put the record straight seeing as you did not have enough time in the first 59 minutes. Why do you not improve your reputation and credibility as a stickler for ?detail or forensic examination? of the evidence and actually do a second more in-depth documentary incorporating some or all of the omission of your other ?detailed and forensic examination??

This time perhaps you could cover the real Physics and also interview actual first hand police and fire rescue officers - asnot once did your previous ?detailed and forensic analysis? include any actual Physics or any such first hand witness accounts yet your journalist had spoken to said witnesses but deliberately chose to omit these reports from the final documentary.

Can I once again point out that I am not a ?Conspiracy theorist? ? I am a Physicist proposing credible Physical Hypothesis based solely upon the Indisputable Physics facts, Maths & Physical Evidence.

I would very much like to be in your next film explaining why buildings simply cannot collapse at freefall without the use of explosives to destroy the foundations first. Better still, why not interview my senior Professor Steven Jones and he will no doubt explain it even better than I with my Physics Masters degree & Mechanical Engineering Qualifications. Indeed, pit us against the likes of your Popular Mechanics Crew in a 911 WWF style tag team punk out!

In your last attempt at obtaining the facts without even the whiff of any proof you let Popular Mechanics claim Building 007 was not a demolition, quote: -

? I understand why people might think that, uh rm, and I see what they are saying, but when you learn the facts about the way the building was built, and about the way that it supported itself and the damage that was done from the collapsing towers that proceeded it ? the idea that it was a demolition just holds no water.?

I have a safe seafront villa in Baghdad with a bomb crater in the rear yard I will sell you real cheap if you are willing to buy such utter diatribe!

Both the above statements could not be further from the truth and you know it, notice how the Popular Mechanics guy never once mentions the piddly little fires in building 007 sexed up to be towering infernos by the media, or the alleged exploding gas tank as claimed by official sources for being the cause of collapse. More importantly - Also notice how Building 007 is not mentioned once in the ?911 Commission Final Report? at all!

The omission of any mention of Building 007 is because it could be nothing other than controlled implosive demolition and they know so, so they deliberately ignore it. If you look at the very top of Building 007 as it starts to collapse you notice a crimp to the side of the penthouse, then the penthouse which is housing the air-conditioning units etc, collapses entirely, and only then does the rest of the building collapse at freefall speed onto its own footprint with the outer walls on top. The fires and damage were over 20 floors below the penthouse, how could fire and lower level damage collapse the penthouse on the roof and not the floors in-between? Hello!

The dust cloud from the base of the building is caused because the basement is explosively blown and hence you see a large rising dust cloud of super heated pulverised concrete dust. The building, despite its damage on one side from the fall of other building debris ? falls straight down at freefall ending up filling the previously blown basement and with the outer walls pulled on top because the central column which caused the initial crimp folds the building inwards due to the lack of interior and basement structural support as the building accelerates to earth under only GRAVITY.

If Building 007 had fallen slower than freefall and toppled over there may have been the likelihood of fire or structural damage causing the failure. But, as with the twin towers, Building 007 fell at freefall onto its own footprint hence for this to happen the basement and lower floor supports have to be eliminated prior to the top collapsing ? hence ? timed video evidence alone supplies absolute categorical proof of a controlled and implosive deliberate demolition to building 007 and the twin towers on 911. Of course the seismic data merely reinforces what the videos show.

Your Film did not show any of these points ? hence is verging on Treasonous Media Deception which requires investigation; an apology to me as a viewer, and better still a new program encompassing all of the omissions of key evidence not shown in the first program.

I ask that all of my previous letters be sent to the new investigating department forthwith and for a formal investigation into my allegations of BBC journalist deception are investigated thoroughly and honestly.

Kind regards

Mr J A Blacker MSc IMI (Physical Systems) (Lancaster England)

ENC: Physics paper describing ?Demolition 911? and also the political deception.

**Draft 6: J. A. Blacker MSc IMI (Physical Systems) (Lancaster England) June 07**

**Physics Paper: The Alternative 911 Hypothesis Encompassing Witnessed, &/Or, Indisputable Recorded Physical Evidence (facts).**

**Key characteristics of 911 building demolition events: Straight Down Motion - Sudden Structural Failure - Buildings Collapsing At Free-Fall Speed - Total Collapse Of The Entire Load Bearing Cores - Many Examples of Cleanly Sliced Heavy Girder Steel Core Supports - Dust Clouds Containing Heavy Girders In Highly Energetic Horizontal Motion - Horizontal Ejections Of Heavy Girders And Pulverised Concrete Onto The Tops And Embedded Into Surrounding Buildings - Rescuers Reported And Seismic And Other Detectors Recorded Energy Dissipation Produced By Many Explosions (Recorded in real time by several different independent sources) In addition: Pools of molten Steel recorded over 1 week after collapse in the sub-basements (Refer to paper written by Physics Professor Steven Jones) Closer inspection of original video evidence shows heavy steel core columns turning to dust within seconds ? question: - was a novel ?StarWars type? energy directed beam weapon used in conjunction with explosives to undermine the integrity of the twin tower complex? (Refer to work by Dr Judy Wood and Professor Jim Fetzer) To date the steel dust creating mechanism has not been formally identified & understood ? however - Muslim Terrorists do not possess such advanced metal to dust creating technology ? only the US military.**

### **Physics Facts & Conclusions**

All three buildings at ground zero in New York on 9/11, buildings 001, 002 & building 007 - came down at or about freefall speed onto their own footprint thereabouts, with outside walls on top. (Recorded) Free-fall speed of decent is caused because the supports for the lower floors are destroyed by metal shattering or cutting explosives and/or thermate - so that when the upper floors are brought down onto the lower floors, no resistance is encountered and therefore the entire building & its components accelerate towards the earth under the force of gravity at or about freefall speed. **Only Controlled Demolitions can collapse steel framed buildings at free-fall speed and have all the above-recorded indisputable characteristics.** As no plane hit building 7, yet that also came to ground in the late afternoon, this is yet further evidence of Controlled Implosive Demolition to building 7 - because had fuel tanks exploded inside building 7 as was the official claim, it would certainly not have collapsed on to its own footprint (more or less) with the outer walls on top. Rather, exploding debris and fireballs would have been recorded on video shooting from the building, indeed only large clouds of dust from the basement area and then straight down motion of the entire structure in less than 7 seconds was in actual fact recorded. **Summary - A careful physical analysis clearly demonstrates that, the fall of the buildings cannot be due to the aircraft impact and/or Jet fuel fire damage alone, or any pre-existing weakness in the 3 buildings.**

### **Political Conclusion based upon the Recorded 911 Physical Evidence.**

The Physics evidence shows 911 was a clear case of deliberate plane crashes followed by lies, deceit & treason combined with Controlled Implosive Demolition as part of the United States & UK Government's cover-up and total deceit. Most Media have played their roll in said hideous regime type deception due to vested interests. A Muslim terrorist could not stop or confuse NORAD air defence so as to prevent NORAD fighter jet interception. A Muslim terrorist could not order the non-forensic removal and destruction of the 911 Plane/building wreckage evidence. A Muslim terrorist could not remove and keep from the world public; Pentagon CCTV, Radio communications audio and other key video evidence, and also continue to do so some 5 years hence, including gagging orders of fire fighters, police and local officials - who claim many bombs went off within the 3 buildings (Seismic data does not lie). A Muslim terrorist could not, and did not stop the 911

Commission from investigating & answering 70% ? 90% of the questions posed by the victims & their relatives or omitting umpteen high witness testimony from the 911 Commission's ?Final Report?, including omitting ALL references to the free fall speed destruction of Building 007. The real 911 ?terrorists? did the steel evidence destruction to cover-up their false flag ? Inside job? treason of which gave a pretext for never ending ?profitable war on terror? whilst reducing civil liberties & human rights.

[Check Out Our Friends and RogueGovernment.com](#)



[Fair Use Notice](#)

[Home](#) [News](#) [Categories](#) [About BLN](#) [Search](#) [Articles](#) [Contact](#)

Copyright © 2006-2007 BlackListedNews.com

00653791

