

Email: July 5, 2012 – Bill Willers to NCSEA

To: Jeanne M. Vogelzang, Executive Director, National Council of Structural Engineers Associations

Dear Ms Vogelzang:

I am writing with regard to a website titled "Debunking 911 Conspiracy Theories"
<http://www.debunking911.com/pull.htm> .

With its 20 submenus it is such an elaborate site that it would take many hours to read carefully. I am a zoologist, so the engineering detail is, of course, beyond my ability to judge, but it seems clear that the website owners, whoever they are, seek to give the reader the impression that they represent the expertise of the community of engineers. Do they? It is odd that such a detailed website would not offer a list of staff and board members or any contact information.

With regard to Building 7, which some 1,700 physicists, architects and engineers are convinced is a controlled demolition, this website in question, which seeks to discredit the 1,700, relies almost exclusively on a November, 2007 article from your magazine
<http://www.structuremag.org/Archives/2007-11/SF-WTC7-Gilsanz-Nov07.pdf>

As you see, this is not a peer-reviewed article, and its tentative nature, as revealed in the "... may have led to ..." in the title, leads me to wonder if this is surmise rather than assertion. Would you say that those representing Structure Magazine would consider the presentation of these authors a valid argument beside the data presented by the 1,700 architects, engineers and physicists who maintain demolition as the cause of collapse of Building 7? (<http://www.ae911truth.org/>).

As a scientist and university professor, I have learned to respect the expertise of those in the professions. In the case of this Building 7 issue, I must confess I am at a loss as how best to evaluate this conflicting information. It is astonishing that such an event as the collapse of Building 7 was never even mentioned in the 9/11 Commission's report.

So I am asking you to let me know the prevailing view within the engineering profession regarding such an event as to be difficult for any engineer to simply overlook. If you are unable, please aim me in the right direction within your community of professional organizations. As you see, I am Cc'ing Heather Talbert of the Council of American Structural Engineers and James Rossberg of the Structural Engineering Institute, which organizations, along with yours, publish Structure Magazine. I ask for their help as well in my understanding this event and the position of the community of structural engineers.

Sincerely,

William B. Willers, Emeritus, Department of Biology, University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh

Email: July 10, 2012 – Tom DiBlasi (NCSEA) to Bill Willers

From: Jeanne Vogelzang <execdir@ncsea.com>
Date: Tuesday, July 10, 2012 12:03 pm
Subject: Response to your questions
To: "willers@uwosh.edu" <willers@uwosh.edu>
Cc: "tomd@dibiasi-engrs.com" <tomd@dibiasi-engrs.com>

Professor Emeritus Willers:

You have written to the three associations that represent most of the structural engineers in the United States; and they did not develop the “Debunking” site. You will have to judge the site on its merit.

ASCE and NIST work was done by independent Professional and (mostly) Structural Engineers. Many of the structural engineers involved are experts in failure analysis and do that kind of work in their normal practice.

The NIST work was facilitated by NIST but done by outside contractors. The reports WERE PEER REVIEWED by independent reviewers many of whom are professors and have no obligation to anyone. We highly recommend that you READ the peer reviewed reports.

You will need to decide for yourself if peer reviewed reports are more credible than unsupported (and often misrepresented) speculation. Given your comment about the article in Structure Magazine and your own stated lack of expertise, we would think that you would believe only the peer reviewed materials. In other words, follow your instincts and “As a scientist and university professor, ... respect the expertise of those in the professions.” You came to the right place with your question(s).

Summarized, our statement is as follows: We are confident in the FEMA/ASCE and NIST studies, and the total lack of evidence of any demolition of the buildings, other than by crashing 767s into them.

Sincerely,
Tom

Thomas A. DiBlasi, PE*, SECB, NCSEA President
DiBlasi Associates, P.C.
500 Purdy Hill Road
Monroe Connecticut 06468-1661
(203) 452-1331 x108 FAX (203) 268-8103
Cell (203) 988-2523

Email: July 13, 2012 – Tom DiBlasi (NCSEA) to Bill Willers

From: Jeanne Vogelzang [mailto:execdir@ncsea.com]
Sent: Friday, July 13, 2012 4:00 PM
To: willers@uwosh.edu
Subject: Response to query

Dear Bill Willers:

I think you may have misunderstood. I am suggesting that you read the reports, not the peer reviews.

Dr. Gene Corley, who served as the lead investigator on the FEMA WTC Building Performance Study, said that he would be willing to correspond with you, if you like, after you read the reports. Dr. Corley said, via email: I never had possession of a list of reviewers. ASCE might know the names, but their policy is normally that names of reviewers are not disclosed. ASCE would have to respond to that. Of course, the New York Times got a draft copy and reviewed the report before release. They might know the reviewers.

http://www.nist.gov/el/disasterstudies/ncst/ncstac_members.cfm

Sincerely,

Tom

Thomas A. DiBlasi, PE*, SECB, NCSEA President
DiBlasi Associates, P.C.

Email: July 16, 2012 – Gene Corley to NCSEA and Bill Willers

Subject RE: Response to query
From "Corley, Gene" <GCorley@ctlgroup.com>
Date Monday, July 16, 2012 8:53 am
To 'Jeanne Vogelzang' <execdir@ncsea.com> , "willers@uwosh.edu"
<willers@uwosh.edu>

Good response.

Email: July 16, 2012 – Dwain Deets to Tom DiBlasi (NCSEA) and to Bill Willers

From: Dwain Deets <dwain769@mac.com>
Subject: Re: DiBlasi email
Date: July 16, 2012 1:38:43 PM CDT
To: Bill Willers <reuben13@tds.net>

Bill,

This will be your copy. The letter went out today.

Dwain

[Deets letter is available through a separate link in the Scientists for 9/11 Truth article “Scientists' Members Open Up Dialog with Engineers Involved in Official 9/11 Story,” January, 2013, www.scientistsfor911truth.org]

Email: July 27, 2012 – Bill Willers to Gene Corley

July 27, 2012 10:16 AM

WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>
To: GCorley@ctlgroup.com
NIST Report

To: Dr. Gene Corley

Dear Dr. Corley:

Below are email exchanges between myself and NCSEA President Tom DiBlasi. They regard two radically different opinions from engineering professionals regarding the collapse of WTC 7. Both cannot be correct; one must be wrong.

I find the website "Debunking 9/11 Conspiracy Theories" (link below) unusual in that no names and contact information for that very detailed website are given. The site relies on material (not peer reviewed) published by Structure Magazine (link below), which represents your profession, so that I wonder if a relationship might exist between the website and Structure Magazine. Is that the case?

In any event, that material is seriously at odds with the 1,700 at Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth (link below) whose information also appears to derive from professional expertise. As a zoologist with a science background, such radical incompatibility indicates to me the possibility of some form of professional fraud. After all, engineering in the 21st Century is not some off-the-charts theoretical field. It is firmly based on

Newtonian physics, so the answer as to which side is correct, and which faulty, should be quickly resolved.

If there were a similar situation within the biological sciences, all within that fold would understand that the integrity of the entire profession was at stake. I therefore contacted Mr. DiBlasi, as you see, and in his response he wrote that the NIST report regarding WTC 7 was "PEER REVIEWED" (caps in original), said reviewers included "many professors", that "We" (indicating those within NCSEA) are confident in the FEMA/ASCE and NIST studies", and that there is "a total lack of evidence of any demolition" at WTC.

This effectively accuses those in A&E for 9/11 Truth of being liars perpetuating a fiction that itself disputes the honesty of such as the NIST reporters. It was then that I asked Mr. DiBlasi for a way in which I could see the peer reviews. His answer that ASCE policy is not to reveal the names of reviewers is, of course, absurd, as the very reason for the peer review process is that it be open for all to see.

It was in that last email (all correspondences referred to here are below in their entirety for your review) that DiBlasi mentioned that you would be willing to correspond with me. Thank you. As it happens, I have an interest in the philosophy behind the scientific method (I favor the approach that attempts to disprove a theory), and I ask that you help me to gain access to the peer reviews mentioned, if such exist. I am fortunate in having contact with some physicists who can help me to understand technical terminology.

As of the moment I am assuming that those at A&E for 9/11 truth are charlatans, given that they are only 1,700 in a broad profession (encompassing architects, physicists and engineers) which would certainly contain hundreds of thousands. Please confirm this. And thank you for consenting to correspond and clear things up for me.

Sincerely,
Bill Willers, Emeritus, Biology, UW-O

Email: July 27, 2012 – Gene Corley to Bill Willers

From: Corley, Gene <GCorley@ctlgroup.com>
Date: Fri, Jul 27, 2012 at 11:59 AM
Subject: RE: NIST Report
To: WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>

Prof. Willers:

I will be pleased to correspond with you and try to answer any technical questions that you have.

Let me first say that you and all others have a right to ask questions and seek answers. I will attempt to respond to technical questions you have. I have no knowledge of and cannot respond to the questions you posed about motivations of others. I can only tell you that I am a Civil and Structural Engineer licensed in more than thirty-five jurisdictions. In both my professional association memberships and my licensures I am bound by a Code of Ethics. I am also a lifetime member of the National Academy of Engineering. Anything I have published is based on personal observations and scientific evidence. Please note that the Peer Review of our report took place in April of 2002. We were provided with the comments but not with the names of the reviewers, as is the policy of every publisher I deal with. The reviewers are disclosed only if the individual wishes to be identified. I did not then and do not now know the names of the reviewers. It was my understanding that the Peer Reviews were provided by individuals from both industry and academia. As is the policy of every organization I have published with, any written review material was returned to ASCE.

As indicated, I will be happy to help you understand any of the technical information in the reports.

W Gene Corley

Email: August 01, 2012 – Bill Willers to Gene Corley

From: WILLIAM WILLERS [mailto:willers@uwosh.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, August 01, 2012 12:58 PM
To: Corley, Gene
Subject: Peer reviews of NIST Report

Dear Dr. Corley:

My email to NIST to see the peer reviews has gone unanswered, so if you know of the best means for accessing them, please do help me in that respect.

You probably can intuit my level of frustration. It is just that, although the prevailing viewpoint is that those who find it difficult to accept the official explanation of 9/11 are dim-witted conspiracy theorists, the credentials of many are, for me, very impressive (<http://www.consensus911.org>).

In any case, please do help me to see those reviews. And thanks for your offer to explain terminology that's beyond me.

Bill Willers

Email: August 01, 2012 – Gene Corley to Bill Willers

From: Corley, Gene <GCorley@ctlgroup.com>
Date: Wed, Aug 1, 2012 at 1:51 PM
Subject: RE: Peer reviews of NIST Report
To: WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>

Dear Professor Willers:

As you are aware, I am not employed by NIST and have no control over what they do. My expectation is that they have the same policy about peer reviewers that other engineering organizations have. I assume they will not release names of reviewers unless the reviewer agrees to being identified.

Please note that I do not judge those who offer theories that are not based fact and/or scientific observation. You may judge their credibility for yourself. As I have said previously, conclusions of investigations throughout my career have been based on science and personal on site observations.

Again, if you are interested in understanding technical issues, please read the complete reports as you would in your own field. I am ready to correspond with you to help you with issues that are not in your area of work.

W Gene Corley

Email: October 16, 2012 – Bill Willers to James Quintiere

From: WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>
Date: Tuesday, October 16, 2012 4:22 PM
To: James Quintiere <jimq@umd.edu>
Subject: <no subject>

Dear Dr. Quintiere:

I am a zoologist and emeritus professor of biology at the University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh. I have long been interested in the collapse of WTC7, which collapse many engineers have questioned. I contacted the National Council of Structural Engineers Associations for the prevailing view within the profession and received an email from Thomas DiBlasi, NCSEA President, that included the following:

“The NIST work was facilitated by NIST but done by outside contractors. The reports WERE PEER REVIEWED by independent reviewers many of whom are professors and have no obligation to anyone. We highly recommend that you READ the peer reviewed reports.”

Although he stressed the peer reviews (caps are his), he did not include any information as to where one could find such peer reviews. But I did run across this from your website <http://www.fpe.umd.edu/faculty/quintiere> :

Prof. Quintiere questions NIST investigation of 9/11 WTC disaster
Professor Jim Quintiere questions the NIST investigation of the 9/11 collapse of the World Trade Center Towers.

See the attached article published in the Proceedings of a 2007 NATO Advanced Research Workshop on Urban Structures Resilience under Multi-Hazard Threats: Lessons of 9/11 and Research Issues for Future Work

Attachment (pdf)
February 4, 2008

I have not been able to see the pdf file indicated. Instead, I get ...and this is showing at the Department of Fire Protection Engineering website ... the following:
Error 404: Requested URL Not Found

So I am asking you to send me the mentioned pdf attachment so that I may open it. Also, would you be able to make any of the NIST peer reviews re WTC7 available to me?

Sincerely,
William B. Willers

Email: October 17, 2012 – James Quintiere to Bill Willers

From: James G. Quintiere <jimq@umd.edu>
Date: Wed, Oct 17, 2012 at 9:55 AM
Subject: Re:
To: WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>

I know of no peer review of the NIST work on WTC. They had a Advisory Committee, and even some of them did not agree with the NIST work and conclusions.

Here is my paper.

James Quintiere
Emeritus, U of MD
Cell: 240 472 2016

Email: October 17, 2012 – Bill Willers to James Quintiere

From: WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>
Date: Wednesday, October 17, 2012 5:32 PM
To: James Quintiere <jimq@umd.edu>
Subject: Re:

Dear Dr. Quintiere:

Thank you for your email. I am floored by the fact that the director of an organization representing the profession of structural engineering would tell me that peer reviews exist when, in fact they do not, and who summed up the views engineers with

"Summarized, our statement is as follows: We are confident in the FEMA/ASCE and NIST studies, and the total lack of evidence of any demolition of the buildings, other than by crashing 767s into them."

On the strength of his assertion I FOIA'd NIST for those (nonexistent) "peer reviews", which FOIA has in process. I will have to terminate that effort but would like to know the findings of the Advisory Committee mentioned in your email. If you are able ... and so that I can avoid going through a FOIA request yet again could you make the Committee's conclusion or its abstract available to me?

Sincerely,
William Willers

Email: October 18, 2012 – James Quintiere to Bill Willers

From: James G. Quintiere <jimq@umd.edu>
Date: Thu, Oct 18, 2012 at 11:05 AM
Subject: Re:
To: WILLIAM WILLERS <willers@uwosh.edu>

I do not have a formal Committee report, only anecdotal information.

James Quintiere
Emeritus, U of MD
Cell: 240 472 2016

Email: November 5, 2012 – Bill Willers to Gene Corley

Dear Dr. Corley:

Since your email to me it has become clear that a preponderance of now available evidence reveals that WTC 7 did, in fact, collapse through its having been wired. Moreover, there was no "peer review", as such, as Tom DiBlasi asserted so strongly with his use of capital letters (seen in his letter shown below).

Below your kind offer to correspond with me is a self-explanatory letter from engineer Dwain Deets to Mr. DiBlasi and Cc'd to me. In it he includes a list of just a few of the experts questioning the official governmental account of the collapse of WTC 7. The list is impressive by any standard, and, as you know, there are many hundreds of other such experts with the same mass of evidence.

Officially, and to quote from Deets' letter, "Dr. Sunder had explained in August 2008 it was impossible to come down at free fall due to fire alone, that is, without use of explosives". How can such as that be a final word where final words are supposedly based on scientific evidence?

Understanding within many of the finest, most highly credentialed members of the engineering profession that WTC 7 was purposely destroyed moves the discussion from one of physics (that having been adequately answered) to one of ethics. Certainly any Code of Ethics worthy of the title would demand that those bound to it would pursue answers to the obvious questions presented by the fact of purposeful demolition.

So, I ask you, what do you consider to be the most ethical path forward given the scientific evidence now being presented?

Sincerely,

William B. Willers