Introduction To An Interview With Dr. Judy Wood Conducted At The National Press Club in Washington, D.C. on January 10, 2007 Regarding The Use Of Directed Energy Beams In The Demolition Of The World Trade Center Towers.

Letter, by Dr. Gregory S. Jenkins, Ph.D., Physics, submitted February 6, 2007

> In order for the viewer to clearly assess the interview with Dr. Judy Wood, I would like to preface the video with two fundamental concepts which guided my questions as well as two pertinent photographs. I will submit a more comprehensive analysis in the very near future regarding the implausibility of directed energy beams demolishing the world trade center towers.

The Associated Massive Energy Scale

My first two questions in the interview pertain to the method and energy scale associated with the demolition of the World Trade Center towers. I will postpone the analysis pertaining to method for a later publication, and discuss here the massive amounts of energy required to vaporize steel.

It is a simple matter to calculate the amount of energy required to vaporize the steel in the upper 110 floors in one of the WTC towers. I will leave the details for later, but suffice it to say that the energy is approximately 4×10^{14} Joules. If you consider that this amount of energy was pumped into the towers during a time span of roughly 10 seconds, then the power necessary to vaporize the steel would be 4×10^{13} Watts. This is four times the total power output of the entire earth, including all carbon combustion, nuclear power, wind power, hydroelectric power, etc.. This is with *no loss*. If you take into account losses from scattering and absorption in the atmosphere, reflection off aluminum and steel in the building, and inefficiencies from storing this huge amount of energy and generating photons, then the power required would swell to at least thousands of earths worth of power. The scenario becomes more bleak when considering beams of particles that have mass since the ionizion energies required to generate such beams would require additional massive amounts of energy in conjunction with the aforementioned inefficiencies.

Most of the energy required to vaporize steel is contained in the term relating to the latent heat of vaporization. This is the amount of energy required to vaporize steel once it is already at the boiling point. Since this is the dominating factor in the energy scale, this can be thought of as the energy required to break all the bonds which hold the steel together. Any magical method which hypothetically could be used to 'dustify' (a word evidently invented by Dr. Wood) the steel would necessarily involve breaking the bonds

holding it together. In short, the energy required to 'dustify' steel, if such a thing were possible, would be about the same as the energy required to vaporize steel.

What Missing Debris And How Was It Measured?

In the interview, I reference the controlled demolition of the Kingdome, a sports stadium. I do this since Dr. Wood should be very familiar with it. She used this as an argument supporting the idea that massive amounts of debris appear to be missing from the WTC tower collapse site. In her analysis published on her website, she compares the Kingdome height after collapse to the before collapse height, and concludes that the ratio is 12%. The Kingdome fell into its own footprint, and the after collapse height was taken at the rim of the stadium which was primarily structural concrete. The amount of concrete in structural concrete buildings occupies a large volume compared to the steel in steel framed buildings, a testament to the strength of steel compared to concrete. If we compare to a more suitable steel framed structure like WTC building 7, the collapse ratio was about 5.3% (a result I will detail in a future publication), and WTC 7 fell approximately into its own footprint.

However, neither of the WTC towers fell into their own footprints. A conservative estimate of the radius of the falling debris is at least 2.5 times the radius of the tower or, equivalently, a debris field 6 times the footprint of the building. Using Dr. Wood's analysis, but using the WTC building 7 collapse ratio of 5.3% and considering that the debris was spread out over 6 times the footprint, yields an average debris height of 11' for one WTC tower. Partial collapses of the sublevels could fully account for any amount of 'missing' debris.

Pictures Of Smoke Versus Debris

Figures 1 and 2 are briefly analyzed in the opening introduction of the interview. Both figures show roughly the same instant in time. Figure 1 is a west view which clearly shows the distinction between the southward blowing smoke and falling debris from the collapsing south tower.

Figure 2 captures roughly the same instant as viewed from the south. The smoke, which is now blowing above and toward the camera, is observed above the falling debris generated from the south tower collapse.

Recall that figure 2 is taken directly from Dr. Wood's website. It is her data that she "uses to emphasize" that the south tower debris "went up into the upper atmosphere". She points at the smoke to accentuate her point to the viewers. However, from figure 1, we can see clearly that smoke from the north tower is blowing over the south tower towards the south, so that the smoke in figure 2 only appears to be going straight up, at least to some people.

Watch The Interview

Figure 1: A view from the west of the collapsing south tower.

Figure 2: Photograph from Dr. Wood's website of the south tower collapse viewed from the south. The north tower is obscured by smoke and debris behind the south tower, but smoke predominantly from the north tower can be seen blowing south over the south tower (compare with Figure 1).