



Ted Walter [redacted]

Discussion of Le and Bažant's 2022 Technical Paper on WTC collapse mechanism

van de Lindt, John [redacted]
To: Ted Walter [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]

Fri, Jul 14, 2023 at 5:01 PM

[redacted]

Dear Mr. Walter,

In general the Editorial Board does not (and should not) communicate with anyone except the contact author regarding a specific manuscript, discussion, or closure. However, I can state generically that all discussions (including the one you mentioned) are handled consistently by the Editorial Board and if deemed to not have sufficient technical content are not accepted for closure.

Professor van de Lindt

John W. van de Lindt, Ph.D., F. ASCE, F. SEI
Harold H. Short Endowed Chair Professor
Co-Director, Center for Risk-Based Community Resilience Planning
Chief Editor, Journal of Structural Engineering
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523-1372 USA
Email: [REDACTED]
Web: [REDACTED]
Twitter: [REDACTED]
Pronouns: he/him/his

On Jul 13, 2023, at 2:46 PM, Ted Walter [REDACTED] wrote:

**** Caution: EXTERNAL Sender ****

Dear Professor van de Lindt and Associate Editors,

We are writing to you on behalf of the *Journal of 9/11 Studies*, which is the flagship publication of the International Center for 9/11 Justice.

Yesterday, we published a new Discussion of a Technical Paper by Jia-Liang Le and Zdeněk P. Bažant that appeared in the *Journal of Structural Engineering* in April 2022 and was titled "Spontaneous Collapse Mechanism of World Trade Center Twin Towers and Progressive Collapse in General." The new Discussion can be found at the link below:

<https://ic911.org/journal/articles/discussion-of-spontaneous-collapse-mechanism-of-world-trade-center-twin-towers-and-progressive-collapse-in-general-by-jia-liang-le-and-zdenek-p-bazant>

This Discussion, written by civil engineer and ASCE member Jonathan Cole, was rejected by the *Journal of Structural Engineering* last September on the basis of having "insufficient technical content."

We disagree with that assessment. Mathematical models such as the one proposed by Dr. Le and Dr. Bažant must match basic observations of the event to be valid. Mr. Cole's Discussion provides straightforward observations that Dr. Le and Dr. Bažant's mathematical model fails to match. Thus, the technical content in Mr. Cole's Discussion is more than sufficient for publication.

Specifically, Le and Bažant's model fails to account for and is incompatible with the portion of the core structure that was readily observed to have remained standing after the first stage of each tower's collapse. This is shown in the photo below as well as in many other photos and videos.

<image.png>

Put simply, the fact that a portion of the core structure stood for several seconds after the rest of the building came down proves that the top section did *not* remain intact until reaching the ground and did *not* crush the structure beneath it along the way.

Below, a schematic in Dr. Le and Dr. Bažant's Technical Paper is juxtaposed with a schematic in Mr. Cole's Discussion. The former ignores the still-standing core structure, whereas the latter quite accurately depicts the actual collapse process. This juxtaposition should make abundantly clear why the "crush-down crush-up" theory is invalid.

<image.png>

[Quoted text hidden]