

## **The way forward through published papers and letters**

### **James Gourley**

I concur with the idea that the best way forward regarding scientific 9/11 Truth research is through published technical papers and letters. Written debates are much more intellectually honest than live debates for several reasons.

First, not all scientists are adept enough with debating skills (e.g., thinking on your feet) to do well in a live debate, regardless of their command of the material. However, most intelligent people can get their ideas down coherently on paper if given enough time.

Second, during a live debate, the participants can potentially say anything they want without necessarily citing to a source. If a source is cited during a live debate, it would have to be checked after the debate by the audience members. This is not a task many live debate audience members will undertake. Instead, they will probably judge the outcome of the live debate more on who has the better presentation skills (which, again, does not necessarily correspond to who has better command of the material or who has better support for their position). In written debates, by contrast, sources can be clearly cited and checked at the reader's leisure, which is much more intellectually honest.

Third, written debates allow more than one set of individuals to participate. Many interested parties can follow a written debate and contribute in written form when they feel they have something to contribute, which means the debate will necessarily encompass more points of view and perspectives than a limited, one time only, live debate. Anyone refusing to engage in a written debate in favor of a live debate likely lacks an adequate scientific foundation for their positions or hypotheses, and, by choosing to rely more heavily on presentation skills, is favoring form over substance, which is intellectually dishonest.

Written debates are actually quite simple: one person or team of people writes a paper (as Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds, and Steven Jones, and I have done) espousing their ideas, positions, hypotheses, supporting data and reasoning, and let the readers judge whether the paper is valid. If a particular reader thinks the paper is invalid for any reason, he/she is more than welcome to respond in writing and let other readers look at the papers side by side and decide who to believe. This is not a crazy or unprecedented concept.