

Todd J. Zinser
U. S. Department of Commerce
Office of the Inspector General
1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20230

Dear Inspector Zinser:

I am writing to urge immediate investigation of Shyam Sunder and John Gross of NIST for possible violations of the following in their investigations of the destruction of the 3 WTC towers in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001: (1) waste, fraud and abuse, (2) making false and/or incompetent statements, (3) mismanagement, and (4) possible misprision of felonies.

NIST noncompliance & incompetence:

NIST is well aware that their appointment to investigate 9/11 and the World Trade Center included investigation of the actual destruction of the WTC towers. NIST writes:

One of the four main objectives of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) investigation of the collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) towers ... to determine why and how the two towers collapsed. The specific objectives were 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. [1]

However, NIST excluded from its work the evidence pertaining to how the three towers collapsed. NIST indicates explicitly it studied **only collapse initiation**, grossly neglecting its charge to explain the actual collapses.

a) NIST admits "...we are unable to provide a full explanation of the total collapse."

Notably, NIST uses an interesting but anti-scientific "appeal to authority" in trying to defend certain of its more controversial claims, by citing not its accuracy but rather the magnitude of its manpower and tasks:

Some 200 technical experts—including about 85 career NIST experts and 125 leading experts from the private sector and academia—reviewed tens of thousands of documents, interviewed more than 1,000 people, reviewed 7,000 segments of video footage and 7,000 photographs, analyzed 236 pieces of steel from the wreckage performed laboratory tests and sophisticated computer simulations of the sequence of events that occurred from the moment the aircraft struck the towers until they began to collapse. [2]

It is odd that - despite these well-trumpeted measures - it failed to fulfill its mandated duty to address the actual collapses. Meanwhile, citizens including family members of 9/11 victims, professors and researchers are, even without vast support staff, having success in finding important scientific data neglected by NIST.

Incompetence is indicated by NIST's sharp reversals of view regarding:

b) The non role of diesel fuel in the collapse of WTC 7. [3]

c) The non role of debris (from larger towers) in the collapse of WTC 7. [4]

Initial NIST reports suggested that diesel fuel played a role in the collapse of WTC 7, a theory it later rejected, but not before the myth spread widely. How did such a wildly false theory come to be embraced in the first place? NIST pointed to diesel fuel despite FEMA's explicit doubts about its role. [5] Given the vast resources available to NIST, this reversal suggests a corrupted investigation process. Was NIST grasping at straws to compensate for having neglected other very important evidence?

Another sharp and unexplained reversal of view arose with respect to explicit, and in retrospect stunning, claims about massive damage to WTC 7 from the debris of the larger towers. It seems clear such claims never had credible empirical evidence in their support, suggesting a corrupted institutional process.

Without explanation, NIST statements & reports ignore and/or contradict:

- d) Indications of extremely high temperatures in FEMA & USGS reports.^[6]
- e) Scores of reports of explosions in oral histories of first responders.^[7] NIST's neglect of the very important data source of these oral histories is shocking and incomprehensible. Equally stunning is NIST's conclusion that evidence for explosions was not found, a claim it defended later on the absurd and otherworldly justification that it did not look for that evidence.^[8]

This is nothing other than the “logic of the ostrich” that refuses reality by shading its view.

NIST statements and reports are dubious due to their:

- f) Contradictory views on the free fall descent of WTC 7 for over 100 feet.^[9]
- g) Failing to provide thorough explanatory scientific rationale for how its own conclusions are favorable to FEMA's pancake model, a view widely spread in popular media.^[10]

NIST models include the clearly false assumption:

- h) That steel had no capacity to disperse and radiate heat.^[11]

Incompetent (or deliberately false) statements by John Gross:

- i) Mr. Gross is on record making shockingly misleading statements about not knowing of witnesses of molten steel.^[12] Was he delivering spin regarding national security by indicating a “lack of knowledge”, despite NIST vast resources? Or was he suggesting (falsely) an actual lack of witnesses?

Molten steel or iron is testified to in the reports of many first responders & experts, as is obvious in news footage and the NYT.^[13] How was he unaware of data that now countless Americans are privy to?

Shyam Sundar's negligent avoidance of evidence

- j) Mr. Sunder is on record stating he will revisit criticisms of his claims only in effect if they are first published in reviewed academic journals (while ignoring evidence that meets that standard).^[14] Knowledge of published research is essential, but is nonetheless not sufficient.

NIST was not charged to produce merely reviews of academic papers, a method that would have no hope of yielding concrete answers useful to national security. Coroners examine dead bodies and police investigate crime scenes. Similarly, NIST had the charge to analyze **primary data** of the WTC attacks.

Mr. Sunder's refusal to deal with new findings is a gratuitous evasion of his responsibilities. It is all the more stunning that he invokes his tendentiously restrictive standard of accountability in this context where he is facing many pressing questions about his work. The questions raised provide Mr. Sunder an opportunity to address signs that he may be guilty of waste, fraud, abuse, and/or misprision of felonies.

- k) Mr. Sunder's statements and work nakedly fail to meet even his own most favored standard of accountability; the reports he has failed to deal with include **published peer-reviewed papers** that plainly contest his claims.^[15] Further, as noted above, NIST statements & reports ignore and/or contradict even data found in FEMA & USGS reports.^[16]

Mr. Zinser, many problems other than these were found in NIST work pertaining to the horrible terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, but due to limited space, just the above can be noted here. We urge you to study the NIST and FEMA reports and form an impartial assessment. We urge you to examine also reports that are not paid for in government funds.

Many such non-public-sector studies show that salient evidence has been omitted and/or distorted in reports drafted by staff working for government officials. Independent studies are available from **9/11 Truth Europe** and **Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth** and **Intelligence Officers for 9/11 Truth** and **Scholars for 9/11 Truth & Justice** which now count thousands of members worldwide, collectively forming among the largest bodies of researchers studying any public affairs issue.

We challenge you to prove that the Office of the Inspector General is truly independent and above politics, and we challenge you to declare your independence from the many “politicized” and misleading claims of the executive branch in recent years (described ably by former Press Secretary Scott McClellan).

Show Americans of conscience that your office is not enabling abuses that weaken national security.

By neglecting their charge, NIST officials may be elevating the risks of terrorism. The victims of the 2001 attacks no longer have a voice. Citizens of honor must speak for them and blow the whistle on waste, fraud, abuse and possible misprision of treason that may elevate danger to our nation.

Yours,

Your Name

[1] NIST NCSTAR1-2.pdf, page xxvii (29 of 462 in PDF)

[2] NIST: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions (August 30, 2006) http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm

[3] The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak, by Kevin Ryan http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html

[4] The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak, by Kevin Ryan http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html

[5] Steven E. Jones presentation on nanothermite.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OQjLRnKl_Kw&feature=Playlist&p=1BA16A673C07ED1E&index=5&playnext=6&playnext_from=PL

NYT: A NATION CHALLENGED: THE SITE; Engineers Have a Culprit in the Strange Collapse of 7 World Trade Center: Diesel Fuel

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/29/nyregion/nation-challenged-site-engineers-have-culprit-strange-collapse-7-world-trade.html?sec=&spon=&pagewanted=all>

The NIST WTC 7 Report: Bush Science reaches its peak, by Kevin Ryan http://911review.com/articles/ryan/NIST_WTC7.html

[6] FEMA http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_apc.pdf USGS http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1165/table_1.html

[7] Oral histories http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/html/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/met_WTC_histories_full_01.html

[8] Steven E. Jones presentation on nanothermite Sacramento, California, April 30, 2009.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OQjLRnKl_Kw&feature=Playlist&p=1BA16A673C07ED1E&index=5&playnext=6&playnext_from=PL

(at 9:19) and Blueprint for Truth <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-4617650616903609314>

[9] WTC7 in Freefall--No Longer Controversial <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gC44L0-2zL8>

[10] NIST: Answers to Frequently Asked Questions (August 30, 2006) http://wtc.nist.gov/pubs/factsheets/faqs_8_2006.htm

[11] Steven E. Jones presentation on nanothermite.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OQjLRnKl_Kw&feature=Playlist&p=1BA16A673C07ED1E&index=5&playnext=6&playnext_from=PL

[12] Gross Negligence with NIST Denial of Molten Metal on 9/11

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fs_ogSbQFbM&feature=player_embedded

[13] NYT: A Nation Challenged: The Site

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/11/29/nyregion/nation-challenged-site-engineers-have-culprit-strange-collapse-7-world-trade.html?sec=&spon=&pagewanted=all>

NYT: A Search for Clues In Towers' Collapse

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/02/02/nyregion/search-for-clues-towers-collapse-engineers-volunteer-examine-steel-debris-taken.html>

Chronicle of Higher Education <http://chronicle.com/free/v48/i15/15a02701.htm>

[14] Richard Gage of AE911Truth at NIST <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tmG2iEzM8TQ>

[15] FEMA http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_apc.pdf

USGS http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1165/table_1.html

Fourteen Points of Agreement with Official Government Reports on the World Trade Center Destruction pp.35-40 (6) Authors: Steven E. Jones, Frank M. Legge, Kevin R. Ryan, Anthony F. Szaboti, James R. Gourley

Active Thermic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe. p.7-31 (25) Niels H.

Harrit, Jeffrey Farrer, Steven E. Jones, Kevin R. Ryan, Frank M. Legge, Daniel Farnsworth, Gregg Roberts, James R. Gourley,

Bradley R. Larsen <http://www.bentham-open.org/pages/content.php?TOCPJ/2009/00000002/00000001/7TOCPJ.SGM>

[16] FEMA http://www.fema.gov/pdf/library/fema403_apc.pdf USGS http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2005/1165/table_1.html