




9/11

Finding the Truth

A Compilation of Articles by Andrew Johnson

Focused around the research and evidence compiled by Dr. Judy Wood



Cover graphic © Nick Buchanan, 2008-2009

Text Copyright, Andrew Johnson © 2009.

1st Edition – June 2009

Please analyse, discuss and share.

“A study of history shows that civilizations that abandon the quest for knowledge are doomed to disintegration.”

-Bernard Lovell, British astronomer and writer.

What Reviewers Have Said

“An excellent piece of research by an Open University Associate Lecturer! I hope it is read by the many scientists, who think it normal that steel frame buildings simply turn to dust and vanish. We live in dangerous times when anyone asking honest questions is called a ‘conspiracy nut,’ or an ‘Enemy of the State.’ Let the evidence quietly persuade us all to Its conclusion, rather than the media domineer us to its misrepresentation. As Robert Owen once said – ‘the truth, openly stated, is omnipotent.’”

-Nick Buchanan, BA(Hons), Cert. Ed., NLP Master Practitioner(INLPTA)

“Andrew Johnson is rapidly becoming the man when it comes down to unravelling what really happened in New York City and Washington DC on that monolithic, traumatic date of September 11, 2001. Several researchers have already thankfully taken us to the brink of winning “round one” of the combat against the cover-up, amply showing that it was an inside job. It “only” remains for the mainstream media to take notice and carry the story. But now we are discovering that there is actually a “round two” to the combat, a second tier in the cover-up: the realization that a highly-sophisticated black-ops weaponization of free energy technology, intimately involving something very similar to the Hutchison effect, was responsible for the bizarre, low-temperature pulverization of the Twin Towers. Dr. Judy Wood has pieced together the physical evidence and Andrew Johnson has highlighted who is working to silence or smear whom, as the powers that be rush to impede or at least contain the dissemination of these startling findings. Hence I am very glad to see Andrew’s very meritorious web articles now compiled and edited in this handy book for your investigative pleasure. Pass the word and we will put an end to the global police techno-state, whose only power, as Adam Curtis aptly said in his BBC documentary, is the power of (manufactured) nightmares.”

- Conrado Salas Cano, M.S. in Physics

Historically, news media have covered up conspiracies (like self-inflicted mass murder) by their own governments. (Always to protect the power structure of the ruling elite. Also, the truth reveals too much about the destructive capacity of their agents.) However, 9/11 has another very important aspect. It is the secret advanced physics/technology used by their agents! Thanks to Andrew Johnson and Dr. Judy Wood, we now understand why they must prevent us from realizing the existence of this secret physics/technology.

- Daniel Johnson, USA - Wisconsin

Dedication

This collection of articles is dedicated to all those people who have made these same articles possible – this includes my wife and children, my parents and my family, my friends – old and new, researchers and curious people around the world, as well as those who have invented and developed the technology that makes your reading of this possible.

A special dedication must be made to Dr. Judy Wood, for much of the key 9/11 research, understanding and most of the pictures collected here – please see her website <http://www.drjudywood.com/>

In considering this dedication, I hope there is a realisation of how we are all connected – in a “pool” of human consciousness. What we each do affects what the rest of us are able to do.

Author Biography



Andrew Johnson grew up in Yorkshire and graduated from Lancaster University in 1986 with a degree in Computer Science and Physics. He has mainly worked in Software Engineering and Software Development, for most of the last 20 years. He has also worked full and part time in lecturing and tutoring (at a College of Adult Education). Now he works for the Open University (part time) tutoring and assessing students, whilst occasionally working freelance on various small software development projects.

He became interested in “alternative knowledge” in 2003, soon after discovering Dr. Steven Greer's Disclosure Project. Andrew has given presentations and written and posted a number of articles on various websites about 9/11, Mars, Chemtrails and Anti-gravity research, whilst also challenging some of the authorities to address some of the data he and others have collected.

Andrew is married and has two children.

His own website is www.checktheevidence.com.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Brief Summary of Key 9/11 Evidence to Be Explained	8
3.	Synopsis of Articles	14
4.	The “New 9/11 Hijackers”?	21
5.	Dr. Greg Jenkins’ “Directed Debunking Energy” and Prof. Judy Wood.....	38
6.	“Micronukes vs Thermite/Thermate at WTC”	44
7.	A Touch of “The Hidden Hand”?.....	73
8.	Going In Search of Planes: Re-visiting NYC 9-11 First-Responders’ Accounts	78
9.	A “Lengthy” Discussion of The Steel in the Debris of the WTC	87
10.	Press Release - Scientists See WTC - Hutchison Effect Parallel ..	96
11.	The Hutchison Effect and 9/11 – “An Ace in the Hole?”	101
12.	9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - The Chips Have Fallen	115
13.	9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - Handling the Truth.....	129
14.	9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - An Ace in the Hole – Part II ...	136
15.	Press Release - New Study by former Professor Examines Hurricane Erin on 9/11/01	144
16.	Mike Rudin’s BBC Conspiracy File	150
17.	9/11 Truth Seekers and Campaigners... “It’s Your Lucky Day!”	157
18.	9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - An Ace in the Hole – Part III ..	168
19.	Perception Management of 9/11 Evidence	175
20.	Alex Jones and "September Clues"	189
21.	9/11, Directed Energy Weapons and HAARP “...without Referring to Dr. Judy Wood”	192
22.	The Baker Effect - A Rift and Disruption System.....	227
23.	9/11 Mystery – Sofia Smallstorm, Fluorine/Fluoride and The Destruction of the WTC.....	230

24.	Questioning "Active Thermitic Material Discovered in dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe"	239
25.	Free Energy, 9-11 and Weather Control – Ongoing Cover Up, Muddle Up and Censorship of Evidence	242
26.	The Mysterious \$5000 Bet Sent to Andrew Johnson.....	251
27.	Press Release - 9/11 Qui Tam Case Will Have Its Day in Court.	267
28.	Manufacturing The Apocalypse	269
29.	A World of Abundance or a World of Scarcity	274
30.	Letters Sent to UK Authorities in 2008 Concerning 9/11 and Other Evidence	282
31.	References	292

Use of Images in this Work

A number of the images here are of unknown origin, therefore it is difficult or impossible to ask for permission to use them. Some photos were taken by Dr Judy Wood and some by John Hutchison. Two pictures were taken by Andrew Johnson.

The author’s intent here is to inform and enlighten and this work is sold either at cost price or very close to it. The author concludes that, based on the evidence, the material herein is of profound importance and as no personal gain is sought from the use of photos, then “fair use” of images applies throughout.

1. Introduction

For students progressing through academic studies and disciplines, one of the key skills that is developed is the one of critical thinking. In order to develop our understanding of a subject, we should question what we are being told and, sometimes, how the information is being presented. Only when we can answer questions we have about a subject to our satisfaction can we say that we *understand* that subject. However, perhaps we should pause and consider, can we usefully apply similar critical thinking skills more widely?

For example, when considering daily news reports, how often do we stop and think "How accurate is this information? What is the source?" or "How has this or that conclusion been drawn?" "Is the information complete?" There are two expressions that are pertinent to the thrust of what I am saying: "Don't believe what you read in the papers!" and "Never believe anything until it's been officially denied." The latter saying is attributed to the writers of "Yes Minister", Jonathan Lynn & Antony Jay.

In recent years I have found I have to apply critical thinking much more widely to news reports, following a realisation I had, some time in 2004, that the Official Story of the attacks on 9/11 could not be true. A video I watched clearly showed how the World Trade Centre Towers in New York could not have been destroyed solely as a result of jet impacts and burning jet fuel. It seems strange to some people that anyone should question any of the essential elements of the official story of 9/11, which is now widely recognized as the trigger for the global "War on Terror" - a basis for many significant elements of foreign policy, and even domestic laws.

Discussing the topic of what really happened on 9/11 is not an easy task – not least because of the trauma it caused for the people who were killed, injured or affected by it. The profoundly troubling nature of the event alone is a powerful deterrent to people who wish to re-examine the official accounts of what happened, and question the conclusions the official enquiries have drawn. To date, no criminal prosecutions have been successfully brought against anyone – in relation to the crimes committed on 9/11 or the crimes committed in its cover up.

As an event, 9/11 is mentioned almost daily in news reports, though in reality we have not really had all that much analysis of *what* actually happened. The "run up" to 9/11 *has* been the subject of a significant BBC documentary series called *The Power of Nightmares*, which first aired in

2004. This BAFTA award winner, made by Adam Curtis, exposes the real history of Al Qaida and concludes that stories of this group's ability to commit acts of terrorism on a large scale have been grossly exaggerated, if not completely fabricated.

In this book, readers who are unhappy with the official account and have questions about how and why certain things happened on 9/11 should find many threads to follow. These threads will lead them to a wider understanding of what happened then, and those same threads may ultimately lead them to an understanding of a much, much larger tapestry of reality.

The articles herein are more concerned with the criminal cover up of 9/11, rather than trying to identify the real perpetrators of atrocities committed on the day itself. Readers, therefore, who are comfortable with the “Al Qaida did it” story need not read any further than this paragraph.

Scope of 9/11 Evidence Concerned

This work is mainly concerned with the evidence related to what happened at the World Trade Centre Complex – as exposed through the research (primarily) of Dr. Judy Wood. Therefore, matters related to what happened at the Pentagon, at Shanksville and the details of what happened to WTC 7 are not discussed here. It is therefore primarily aspects of *physical* evidence that are covered (inasmuch as the very presentation and most likely explanation of this physical evidence is what has been the target of attacks on this research).

Who is Covering Up 9/11?

It is difficult to accept how deep and wide the cover up of 9/11 actually is. The very magnitude of this cover up is enough to make many people scoff, roll their eyes or utter a sentence including a phrase such as “conspiracy theorist”. Typically, they may then dismiss, deny or simply ignore any evidence presented which proves the official story of 9/11 cannot be true. Some people, whilst acknowledging that the official story cannot be true, then assume that not enough information is available to say anything else with a sufficient degree of certainty.

However, we must remember that US Government bodies and private contractors took public money to fund research which was supposed to explain what happened on 9/11. As informed citizens, I think we should try to be sure that what they are telling us in their official (and very lengthy) reports is true.

NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology), was tasked with analysing the cause of the destruction of WTC towers 1,2 and 7. When studied objectively, their report for WTC 1 & 2 fails to answer how the “pancake” collapse theory explains the evidence observed on the day – such as the complete pulverisation of most of the towers - *including* hundreds of steel girders – in about 10 seconds each. Readily available photos also illustrate the glaring lack of any “pancakes” in the WTC rubble pile.

Elements of the final NIST WTC reports have been the subject of a Legal Challenge by Professors Morgan Reynolds (Emeritus, Texas A & M University) and Professor of Mechanical Engineering Judy Wood (formerly of Clemson University, South Carolina). Their challenge was first made as a “Request for Correction” and then in two “Qui Tam” cases. These cases, unsealed in 2007, outlined how, as it is framed, the NIST study of the WTC collapse was fraudulent and deceptive. Indeed, the very title of the main report “The Collapse of the World Trade Centre Towers” is itself misleading, because the towers did not collapse, *they turned to dust*.



How is it that the World’s media chose to completely ignore Press Releases, which described the initiation of legal cases against NIST’s contractors by two American Professors?

A Layered Cover Up

The bulk of these articles have been written in the period 2007-2009, in an attempt to document the history of what may become known as the “Second Layer” of the 9/11 Cover Up. The first layer of the 9/11 Cover Up is the official and *physically impossible* “Al-Qaida-centred” fantasy,

accompanied by the significantly fraudulent NIST reports. The second layer of the cover up includes supposedly more scientific analysis by some researchers/scientists which suggests that bombs and/or thermite (or some variant thereof) were placed in the WTC. A number of higher profile “9/11 Sceptic” figures claim there is good evidence for the use of thermite and/or bombs (but those same researchers have failed to compile any of this evidence into a legal case against NIST or anyone else). The same figures typically still go-along with the TV-reality of real Boeing planes hitting the WTC towers, even though this story is demonstrably impossible (largely because of Newton’s third Law). The difficulty for most people here is that it takes time to digest the evidence - and undo the effects of years of media/TV programming. In my own case, even though by about August 2004, I knew the official story of 9/11 was false, it was not until about 2 years later that I realised the plane crashes at the WTC could not have been real (even though it seems that *something* hit the WTC towers). Articles in this work discuss and explain this conclusion more fully.

On the internet, I have posted a report detailing the previous 2 years of campaigning effortsⁱ – completed before I realised there was an ongoing effort to discourage and discredit certain threads of 9/11 research.

Finding the Truth

So, what is the truth? How do you find it? Can anything be proved? Well, before becoming too philosophical, let me offer you something – evidence. My own way of establishing what is true and what is not is to constantly examine evidence – and try to re-evaluate my own conclusions whenever new evidence appears (and at the same time, we must be wary of falsified evidence and even the timing of its revelation). I might point out that court cases, investigations etc. are sometimes re-opened and appeals are initiated when *new evidence* comes to light.

The Importance of Establishing What Did Not Happen on 9/11

By studying the evidence carefully, we can have a better chance of saying with certainty what did *not* happen even if we cannot always say exactly what *did* happen.

In some cases, laws of physics can be used to establish what *can* and *cannot* have happened – we can check the consistency of a set of evidence. This includes the use of things like the Law of Gravity – and also the properties of materials (hardness/softness) and limits of their behaviour.

People who *are not* familiar with physical laws and how they dictate what is and is not possible in our “3D Physical reality” can more easily be fooled by illusions.

People who *are* familiar with physical laws can also be fooled (as I was for 3 years) when they can’t see a motive for an illusion being created, or they don’t take time to look at evidence or don't want to accept the implications. They may then resort to evidence denial or other forms of cognitive dissonance.

The Importance of Studying History and People’s Behaviour

As well as evidence of physical events, witness testimony and behaviour is also important. In relation to the development of 9/11 research, I have tried to watch carefully for instances of “attacking the messenger” rather than explaining the data, discouraging study of certain topics or evidence, mis-direction, inconsistent or false statements, reluctance to answer questions relating to evidence (when relevant). My goal in the majority of this work is not necessarily to “judge” those people who are helping the 9/11 cover up. I am trying to illustrate how the “psychology of the cover up” has unfolded and how subtle (and not so subtle) tactics are used to influence people’s views and conclusions.

Truth, Authority, Power and Corruption

Presentation, discussion and analysis of evidence is (or should be) the guiding principle behind real scientific progress and discovery. It should also be the guiding principle behind a fair legal/justice system. However, it can be strongly argued that both these systems are only as fair and honest as those who become figures of “authority” within them. When people are given authority, they have power over others (by definition). And therein is the rub – power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Perhaps it is true that only when some entities have *absolute power* do operations like 9/11 – and its successful cover up – become possible.

Education and “Academic Excellence”

It is said, by some, that going through the educational system hampers one’s ability to think freely (though this seems to be in contradiction to the idea of being able to think critically) – perhaps this is due to the process of being “spoon fed” information. Most students, especially in their formative years, either implicitly assume the information is truthful and/or valid, or they are chastised if they persistently question or

challenge the “prevailing view” about a topic. In higher (university level) education, however, one is expected to be able to think freely – to perform research, to analyse, compare and contrast information and to draw conclusions. The problem is, perhaps, not so much the educational system itself, but the interests it serves – and the institutionalisation of the system itself, as well as the system of awards – both in the form of grants and for “academic excellence” and the various prizes that are given. Relying on sources of funding creates a vested interest and it was this that President Eisenhower seemed to be referring to in his landmark 1961 final address to the American Nation, before he left office. He said

Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded.

Also, winning awards tends to build up egos and it can constrain the boundaries in which those award-winners feel comfortable operating – and perhaps makes them less willing to challenge established paradigms. I would argue this, therefore, makes them more dogmatic and unwilling to review new evidence. Again, I would contend that President Eisenhower wanted to highlight this issue in the same speech...

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

For this reason, I included audio segments of this speech at the beginning of a presentation I compiled which summarises some of the main research and evidence discussed in this collection of articles. This presentation can be found online using this link: <http://tinyurl.com/911ft>.

Oh, What a Tangled Web has Been Woven!

One of the things which I have found, since I started to “pull the thread” of what some people call “alternative knowledge”, is that the many topics it encompasses cannot really be understood in isolation. For example, the energy cover up which arguably, in the 20th Century, started with the marginalisation and manipulation of Nikola Tesla, is inextricably linked to the 9/11 cover up.

Social pressures and norms, as well as media repetition of misrepresentative information or conclusions all tend to discourage the curious mind from researching for themselves. The furnishings and time constraints of most people’s everyday lives also inhibit or prevent a detailed investigation of important issues. Added to that, with certain

experienced researchers, it seems to be the case that they reach a point and formulate their own views or conclusions - and at some point these views become dogmatic and intransigent – and they are unwilling or unable to review and digest new evidence when it comes to light.

Finally, in writing these articles, I have concluded that most of the “alternative knowledge” community is infiltrated and controlled by the same group or groups that perpetrated 9/11.

A Message

In all of this, my prime message and statement would be “Don’t let anyone give you your opinion – check and validate as much as you can and continually question authority”. Questions should be asked of both recognized authorities (such as a scientific, governmental or non-governmental institutions) and of “unofficial authority” such as an experienced researcher or research group, speaker or author.

I strongly contend that because no organised institution of any significant size (such as the Church, The Legal System, any Major Government etc), after over 7 years, has publicly spoken out to significantly disagree with the official story of 9/11, it is clear the institutions cannot “handle” the truth of what really happened on 9/11. Therefore, the future is in our hands – yours and mine - we have the power to create and transform our future – with every action we take and every word we say.

2. Brief Summary of Key 9/11 Evidence to Be Explained

Thanks to Dr. Judy Wood for highlighting the very basic and important evidence from the WTC disaster. Please see her Website for references for these pictures, and much more evidence.

What caused the towers to turn to dust?



Why was there almost no debris after the destruction?



On the afternoon of 9/11/01 the "rubble pile" left from WTC1 is essentially non-existent. WTC7 can be seen in the distance, revealing the photo was taken before 5:20 PM that day.

How did the inflated tire survive the WTC “plane crash” fireball?



This is an official photograph of WTC plane wreckage!

How did this WTC beam get bent into a “Horseshoe” Shape with no obvious stress, heating or buckling marks?



Why does the car, *parked about 1/2 a mile away from the WTC* (on FDR drive) look so burned that the door frame has wilted, yet the rear tyre is still inflated?




What Turned these Cars Upside Down?



What caused this girder in the Banker's Trust/Deutsche Bank Building to "crinkle up", When FEMA reported there was no fire in that building?



Why was Hurricane Erin closest to NYC at about 8am on 9/11?



Why wasn't this hurricane reported as a potential risk to people living on the East Coast of the US, and in New York?

Why was hosing down of the site – including some equipment, still ongoing in Mid January 208?



NYC WTC Site, 17th Jan 2008. Still image from Samsung MX10 Video Camera. (Andrew Johnson)

3. Synopsis of Articles

It is worth mentioning again here that these articles span a 2-year period, where my knowledge and understanding of how the 9/11 cover up has been engineered has changed and grown. Some may think that many of these articles are too focused on individuals. This may be a fair criticism, but weighed against that, I felt it important to use specific information about and statements made by these people to clearly illustrate their role, whether intentional or accidental, in the suppression of knowledge about 9/11 and weaponised free-energy technology.

The articles are in roughly chronological order. All but the last three discuss how people have reacted to the evidence presented. (That is, the evidence presented in brief in Chapter 2.) Their reactions to the proposed explanations for this evidence (which are alluded to in the body of the articles, though summaries of these explanations for the evidence are discussed in Chapters 10 and 15) are also documented.

Getting the Most from the Information Here

In order to get the most from the information, you will need access to the internet with a device which has the facility to play back MP3 files (this sort of functionality is now available on portable devices, as well as larger computers). All the referenced 9/11 - related interviews are available for free download here: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911>.

Also, reference is made to quite a number of e-mails, most of which can only be read in full on the website referenced above. It is important to realize that I have assiduously attempted not to quote anything or anyone out of context. The only way to ensure this is to make available the full text of the communications that are referenced here. In practical terms, this amounts to *a lot* of information, hence it is available on the website and not reproduced in this collection.

The Articles

The “New 9/11 Hijackers”?

This article examines the break-up of a research group called “Scholars for 9/11 Truth”, which I was invited to join in late 2005. There was no membership fee, and no pre-requisites for entry to the group, apart from being associated with a University (which I was, and still am, although only in a part time capacity). It asks questions about the way certain

evidence was discussed and why people in the group behaved and reacted the way they did.

Dr. Greg Jenkins’ “Directed Debunking Energy” and Prof. Judy Wood

This article examines a “surprise midnight interview” at the NPCC in Washington DC, which was headed up by Dr. Greg Jenkins of the University of Maryland. What was his intent behind the interview? Why did he not ask permission before recording the interview and why did he not have permission to use the room?

“Micronukes vs. Thermite/Thermate at WTC”

Professor Steven E Jones and Bill Deagle, MD discuss the supposed use of thermite and/or micro-nuclear devices in the destruction of the WTC. Why do they repeatedly get basic statements about radioisotopes wrong? Why does Steven E Jones suggest people should irradiate themselves?

A Touch of “The Hidden Hand”?

In this article we cover how Ambrose Lane, a popular radio host, was fired from his show on the same day that he was due to host a discussion about recent events and the possibility that a re-use of the Directed Energy Weapon which destroyed the WTC could be disguised with the promotion of a fake “Al Qaida nuke attack” story.

Going In Search of Planes: Re-visiting NYC 9-11 First-Responders’ Accounts

In this summary article, the accounts of New York Emergency Services First Responders are examined primarily to try and find out what they saw at the time of the second “plane crash” at the WTC. A witness sample is taken and a determination made as to who reported hearing and seeing a plane. The results make drawing firm conclusions about the WTC plane stories much more difficult.

A “Lengthy” Discussion of The Steel in the Debris of the WTC

This article seeks to estimate, purely as an illustrative exercise, the total length of steel pieces that should have been present in the debris pile of the destroyed WTC. It attempts, again, to highlight the question – what happened to the WTC debris? *Where did the debris go?*

Press Release Scientists See WTC - Hutchison Effect Parallel

This short article is a copy of the Press Release that accompanied the revelation of Dr. Judy Wood's study entitled "Anomalies at the WTC and the Hutchison Effect". This study compared effects seen in the destruction WTC and its aftermath with effects seen in independent Canadian Research Scientist John Hutchison's experiments. The revelation of this research triggered off an effort to both tarnish and discredit John Hutchison and Dr. Judy Wood.

The Hutchison Effect and 9/11 - An Ace in the Hole?

This article documents the first stage of the reaction to Dr. Wood's "Hutchison Effect" study. It references specific "Podcasts" and e-mails - and how certain people seemed to engage in an exercise of pernicious debunking, where, for example, researcher Ace Baker falsely claimed he had reproduced one or more of John Hutchison's experiments, then admitted he had actually engaged in making a fake video.

9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - The Chips Have Fallen

This documents the reaction, mainly of Prof. Jim Fetzer, to the Hutchison Effect study and his support of the debunking tactics employed by other researchers. It documents his change in attitude to this author, from a position of commendation to one of ridicule. His logic in discussing and explaining evidence related to the Hutchison Effect is probed and analysed.

9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - Handling the Truth

This article documents the circumstances related to Jim Fetzer's thinly veiled threat to Dr. Judy Wood, over her association with John Hutchison and his research.

9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - An Ace in the Hole – Part II

This article documents the circumstances surrounding 9/11 researcher Ace Baker's \$100,000 bet to John Hutchison to prove levitation of a wrench in an experiment to be conducted at John's apartment.

New Study by former Professor Examines Hurricane Erin on 9/11/01

This is a copy of the Press Release which gave an overview of Dr. Wood's study of "Field Effects", Hurricane Erin and the events of 9/11.

Mike Rudin's BBC Conspiracy File

The producer of the BBC documentary series "Conspiracy Files" contacted Dr. Judy Wood asking her to participate in an interview and/or documentary about WTC 7. Read this thread of correspondence to see why I suggested Dr. Wood decline the invitation.

9/11 Truth Seekers and Campaigners... "It's Your Lucky Day!"

This article documents some of the Official 9/11 Truth movement's wilful ignorance and negligence in discussing the initiation of legal action against NIST by Drs. Wood and Reynolds. The wider "truth movement's" wilful ignorance of the evidence on which these cases are based is also observed.

9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - An Ace in the Hole – Part III

This article documents attempted smears against this author and the subtle use of spin and misdirection to distract people away from thinking about evidence. Tactics of "playing the man, not the ball" are again illustrated.

Perception Management of 9/11 Evidence

This article documents how Jim Fetzer appears to be carrying out his earlier threat against Dr. Judy Wood.

Alex Jones and "September Clues"

This short article documents the reaction, on air, of Alex Jones (Texas radio show host and alternative media anchorman) to the discussion of 9/11 video fakery research. It also includes related comments made by him and Historian and author Webster Tarpley.

9/11, Directed Energy Weapons and HAARP "...without Referring to Dr. Judy Wood"

This article documents the efforts of Alfred Webre, Leuren Moret on a Show hosted by "9/11 Mysteries" producer Sofia Smallstorm (Shafquat) to deliberately confuse the discussion of what happened on 9/11 by stating they think HAARP is the only thing that could have destroyed the WTC. Even though they provide no (direct or indirect) evidence linking HAARP to 9/11, they conclude it must have been involved – and they do not mention the Hutchison Effect research, nor the presence of Hurricane Erin.

The Baker Effect - A Rift and Disruption System

This is a satirical piece, based on an article by Mark A Solis called “The Hutchison Effect - A Lift and Disruption System”. It attempts to highlight how the discussion of the correspondence of Hutchison Effect and 9/11 Evidence has been deliberately attacked and “muddled up” on internet forums.

9/11 Mystery – Sofia Smallstorm, Fluorine/Fluoride and The Destruction of the WTC

This documents Sofia Smallstorm’s sudden introduction of her own theory suggesting fluoride or fluorine was used to “dissolve” the WTC steel. A discussion of the chemistry related to this is briefly made and the point is again made how Sofia omits any discussion of the Hutchison Effect and Hurricane Erin evidence at any point, even though she had been made aware of it some months prior to her sudden introduction of this theory.

Questioning "Active Thermitic Material Discovered in dust from the 9/11 World Trade Centre Catastrophe"

This article asks a few questions about the supposed peer-reviewed academic paper by Danish Chemist Dr. Niels Harrit, Steven E Jones and others. It was published in the Bentham Open Journal. Questions are asked about why they have not chosen to put this supposedly *conclusive* evidence into a legal framework and challenge NIST or their contractors with that evidence, as Drs. Wood and Reynolds did in 2007. Questions are also raised about the Bentham Journal itself.

Free Energy, 9-11 and Weather Control – Ongoing Cover Up, Muddle Up and Censorship of Evidence

This article again highlights reaction to articles posted about the Hutchison Effect and Hurricane Erin evidence and its implication. Repeated instances of ridicule, misquoting and mis-representation of what has been said are illustrated.

The Mysterious \$5000 Bet Sent to Andrew Johnson

This article shows how a \$5000 bet was presented to this author if there was a successful legal prosecution in relation to the evidence that Dr. Wood has used to challenge NIST. Questions are asked about the motive of the person who is offering the bet and why he targeted someone like me with such a bet. This article includes the person’s responses - to

illustrate the lengths they go to avoid discussing the actual evidence concerned.

Press Release - 9/11 Qui Tam Case Will Have Its Day in Court

This press release was issued to announce the Court Hearing for Dr Judy Wood's Qui Tam Appeal – against NIST's contractors.

Manufacturing The Apocalypse

This article covers more general conclusions about how things like the control of Hurricane Erin around the time of 9/11 would suggest that other advanced weather control and large-scale environmental control technology may be in regular use.

A World of Abundance or a World of Scarcity A Call to Awareness - A Time to Choose

This article summarises other threads of research completed by this author. It tries to present an overall picture that includes a new view of the reality in which we live and suggests the general form of a new reality we could create.

Letters Sent to UK Authorities in 2008 Concerning 9/11 and Other Evidence

This chapter includes 2 separate letters – copies of which were sent to over 100 UK Police and Military addresses, suggesting that “other forces” are at work and those forces have weaponry that makes nuclear arsenals obsolete.

Additional Theoretical Consideration

There is, it seems, to a co-ordinated and deliberate effort to obfuscate the truth about what happened at the WTC, with various people stepping up to the plate to present or even "push" theories which only explain a limited set of evidence.

The best theories explain the most evidence - and this applies to both physical evidence and circumstantial evidence. I can confidently say that Dr. Wood's study and general conclusion explain the most evidence of any set of theories out there. Additionally, Dr. Wood's background is the most suitable of any of the people that have "stepped out of the box" to deal with 9/11 issues.

It is worth mentioning yet another alternative WTC destruction theory which several internet posters seem to have invested quite a bit of time in

promoting. This is the “nuclear” demolition theory – supposedly employing “micro-nuclear” devices – or some variant thereof. In most of the internet discussions about this theory, the actual devices themselves are neither specifically named or described in much detail (e.g. number used, sizes, power levels, yield etc are not mentioned).

The problems with both the Thermite theory and the "Nuke" theory are that they cannot explain any of the evidence listed below.

- 1) There were no really bright flashes as the towers turned to dust.
- 2) There were no loud explosions as the towers turned to dust.
- 3) There was little or no heat in the dust cloud.
- 4) To my knowledge, there is no publicly viewable research on small, concealable nuclear explosives.
- 5) Nuclear explosives cannot account for the 24-foot circular holes seen in the buildings and in the street.
- 6) The nuke or "large explosive/incendiary" does not explain the flipped cars and vehicles.

So, for those saying “nuke explosions did it”, they aren't like any other type of nuke seen - they are almost silent, give off no light and almost no heat. When I have pointed out this list above, supporters of this theory have typically become abusive towards me and seemed unable to provide any further clarification or specific details about the devices used. Further information about this can be found on www.checktheevidence.com .

4. The “New 9/11 Hijackers”?

Feb 2007

9/11 – It Controls Our Lives

After 5 years, many many aspects of domestic and foreign policy in both the USA and UK are based on a false premise – that the 9/11 attacks were committed by Islamic fundamentalist hijackers in a plot to “attack the freedom” enjoyed by people living in Western Democratic Societies. 9/11 Truth Campaigners, like me, now know that this story is false and that we must, as quickly as possible, make as many people as possible aware of the depth of this falsehood, and its implications.

We know that WTC Towers 1, 2 and 7 were not destroyed by jet fuel and jet impacts. More and more people are beginning to realise the official story is a gigantic lie. We are now battling to get the truth out to people who need to understand that they are being spoon-fed a diet of fear and misinformation. Mainstream media will not treat the issue seriously, and the language they use to describe our efforts to expose the truth is usually tainted with ridicule and/or disbelief, though recently, in the USA, things have begun to take a slightly different direction.

For those of us engaged in this battle, it is sometimes easy to think that we now know enough about the realities of what happened on 9/11 to campaign and we should focus on that and keep our momentum going. However, perhaps we should remember, too, that the 9/11 perpetrators (“perps”) are still at work – they didn’t just “disappear” or “go underground” when the 9/11 Truth Campaign began to get some traction (more so in the USA than the UK). We should realise that the perps’ tactics are to infiltrate, decoy, distract, trash and ridicule and those tactics will be applied to 9/11 Truth Campaign groups in exactly the same way as they are applied to other protest groups such as Amnesty International and Stop The War. (These groups, for example have not, to my knowledge, yet made any public statements about the proof that 9/11 was an Inside Job.)

When we join a campaign such as the one for 9/11 Truth, perhaps there is an expectation that all fellow campaigners – especially those who become prominent – are involved for the same reasons we are. Also, because of the particularly fundamental nature of 9/11 truth, we possibly assume fellow campaigners will be open-minded enough to dispassionately evaluate pertinent evidence regarding the events of 9/11 in an effort to determine what really happened. This expectation is

perhaps brought about by our change in attitude from “believing what the media spoon-feeds us” to an attitude of looking more critically at evidence, from different sources, and deciding why and how this evidence is being brought to our attention, and what its meaning is. One of the key phrases that we come across is “Cui Bono?” – “Who Benefits?”. Additionally, we learn to “follow the money” - i.e. an unfolding agenda can often be seen to be orchestrated by bodies with a large amount of cash.

A Personal Perspective

Recently, I seem to have found myself to be involved in what I think are pivotal matters in the 9/11 Truth Arena. I am not entirely sure how this happened - I did not actively seek to be involved, nor do I have any desire to gain any recognition for this involvement, other than as someone who is honest, tries to be balanced and who dislikes conflict. To be frank, I would rather get on with my own life and I wish that there wasn't a need to campaign vigorously for these matters to be exposed. As Korey Rowe has been heard to say “I had a nice life before this.”

A number of laughable allegations have been made against me on the UK 9/11 Forumⁱⁱ, which only upset me to the extent that those making them could have spent their time more productively (for example, in completing activities which they accuse me of “distracting” others from doing – by writing articles like this!). In order that the risibility of the allegations can be appreciated, let me describe my background - I am now 42 and was born in Skipton, North Yorkshire, UK - in (essentially) a working-class family and I am the youngest of 9 children. My Dad had no formal education and was an orphan at 12 years old. My Mum also had little formal education but has always had an interest in science, the arts, and literature and has a very active and open mind. I was educated at Ermysted's Grammar Schoolⁱⁱⁱ (Skipton) and left in 1983 with ‘A’ Levels in Maths, Physics, Chemistry and General Studies. I went on to Lancaster University^{iv} do a degree in Computer Science (with a minor module of Physics) and graduated in 1986. I then worked in Software Engineering (real-time software – process control and telecommunications) for about 6 years. I developed an interest in teaching and education and ended up spending 2 years as a lecturer on BTEC National and Higher National Diploma Courses at West Notts College^v. Dissatisfied with working conditions, I then moved back into industry (1995-1997) working in the field of Mobile Data^{vi}. Following an attractive offer of work from a friend, I started to work at home^{vii}, just before my daughter was born. I now do a range of part time jobs, earning most of my income from assessing disabled students for access to assistive technology for higher

education^{viii}. I got into this work through the Open University^{ix} - I tutor part time on a course called T224 (Computers and Processors)^x. I began actively campaigning about 9/11 (writing letters, speaking to people in the street^{xi} etc) in about September 2004.

In approximately December 2005, I received a surprise invitation from Steven E Jones to join a loose association called "Scholars for 9/11 Truth", which had several types of membership – "Full", "Associate" and "Student". As I wasn't a full-time academic, I requested to join as an associate, but surprisingly Steve suggested I join as a full member (I thought at the time this may have been because I had previously posted a "challenge" on a popular Physics forum^{xii} for people there to explain the freefall collapse times of WTC 1 & 2.)

As I had been privately campaigning for about 1 year, I was greatly encouraged, at the time, that the academic community might finally be waking up to the serious flaws in the Official 9/11 Story – what with the likes of Prof. David Ray Griffin, Prof. Jim Fetzer, Prof. Kevin Barrett and others beginning to speak out. The fact that Jim Fetzer and Steve Jones seemed to be bringing these people together seemed to be a super development – giving real hope. I was prompted to write to my own University^{xiii} to ask for permission to give a presentation at the Main Campus in Milton Keynes (the request was denied).

At around the same time, Prof. Jones had discovered (or been advised of) some unusual footage from the Camera Planet Archive (posted on Google Video) which apparently showed Molten Metal^{xiv} flowing from the South Tower prior to its collapse. He had asked for help in extracting this from Google Video format to one that could be used on a Web Page or PowerPoint presentation (so it could be shown side-by-side with a staged thermite experiment as a comparison^{xv}). I had the software to make this a relatively simple task, so I was happy to help out. I was pleased to see that Steve Jones originally referenced this in his paper ("Why Indeed did the World Trade Center Towers Collapse?")^{xvi}

And so, at the time, it seemed that thermite played a role in the destruction of the WTC towers – we seemed to have an answer to part of the mystery – the use of thermite was enough to prove it was an Inside Job. Even at that time, though, it seemed clear that the thermite could only have been used to cut the steel beams and that something else must have been used as an explosive (as seen in the squibs, for example). Indeed, Prof. Jones does mention the use of "other explosives" in the destruction of WTC 1 & 2. He also mentions the Controlled Demolition of WTC 7 – again enough to show that 9/11 was an Inside Job.

However, more than a year after the publication of Steve Jones paper, we are still (apparently) no further forward in engaging other members of the academic community with the evidence.

During the discussion of Steve Jones’ paper, I learned of Prof. Judy Wood’s “Billiard Ball” example paper^{xvii} – much shorter and simpler than Steve Jones paper, which focused on the freefall aspect of the collapse of the towers (the same evidence I had focused on in my “physics forum challenge”, but using a more basic and less complete analysis). Later I learned from Dr. Wood that Steve Jones had disclosed her name in a lecture he gave when she had requested that he did not do this. This seemed an unfortunate oversight – perhaps a simple slip of the tongue?

Sometime later, I read the article by Morgan Reynolds and Rick Rajter “We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories^{xviii}” which, in an evidence-based manner, raises serious questions about what really hit the WTC buildings. I had already read the heated debates on our UK forum about the so-called “No-planes” issue and I hadn’t really studied the evidence before reading the Reynolds/Rajter article, therefore hadn’t come to any conclusions other than “well, I find it really hard to believe that big jets didn’t hit the WTC!!” I couldn’t ignore Morgan Reynolds highly significant credentials, nor those of Rick Rajter – a Materials Science graduate. Also, there were many posts on various forums that were characteristically dismissive, rude and included remarks about the poster’s intelligence when the ideas that there were indeed some serious problems with the video evidence for the WTC plane impacts. (The “delayed fireball” of the 2nd impact being, to me, the most obvious, which has nothing to do with interpolated frames, frames rates or video compression artefacts.) Once I had seen this evidence for myself, like understanding that the WTC had undergone explosive demolition, it was so obvious that I was surprised I could have missed it for 3 or more years. However, some people think “the delayed fireball” is perfectly normal and does not break any laws of physics^{xix}.

The Reynolds/Rajter article later lead me to another – by Profs Reynolds and Wood - originally entitled “The Trouble With Steve Jones” (now re-titled “Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Disintegrate?”^{xx}) Whilst I found some of the language a little abrasive, and perhaps desultory in places, I could not ignore the facts and evidence presented. Indeed, a realisation that the main thrust of what is stated in the article must be correct made me understand why such language had been used. (I would not have chosen to use such language myself, but unlike the authors, I was not directly involved in the events that had “played out”.) The article raised serious questions about the thermite evidence that Jones had presented, and some of the other conclusions he had drawn. It also made

me question how far Steve Jones was prepared to go in studying evidence of what really happened that day. He was, in my view, unduly dismissive of evidence presented in the We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories^{xxviii} article, and there were certain other questions he seemed unduly unwilling to attempt to answer^{xxxi}.

So, as I began to understand the evidence presented, I gradually became less and less supportive of what Steve Jones was saying. I added a link on my "thermite" comparison page^{xxv} to Morgan Reynolds' and Dr. Wood's critique of the Jones' paper because I felt it was important that people be given the opportunity to study all the evidence for themselves. (I notice that the latest version of Steve Jones' paper no longer includes a link to my page^{xxii}.)

Previously, Steve Jones, in his discussion of how he got involved in 9/11 Truth research, mentioned Jim Hoffman several times. Though I had referenced Jim Hoffman's comprehensive website quite a few times prior to my involvement with ST911 - for example, in preparing a leaflet targeted at audiences of the Paul Greengrass fantasy film *United 93*^{xxiii} - I found it surprising when Hoffman seemed to be suggesting that cell phone calls could have been made successfully from Flight 93, in the light of my own knowledge about the "hand-off"^{xxiv} problem, and the study completed by Kee Dewdney (Project Achilles)^{xxv}. Also, I found Hoffman's mention of a "hoax theory"^{xxvi} that Flight 93 landed at Cleveland Airport to be equally puzzling, when there was some news coverage of this at the time. Also, Hoffman's essay about Scholars for 9/11 Truth's website^{xxvii} (st911.org) cannot be ignored and seems to be designed to distract and decoy people looking for authoritative information. In this essay, even though Jones was a co-chair of ST-911, Hoffman says: "Despite the evidence, ScholarsFor911Truth.org has thus far failed to acknowledge that the promotion of nonsensical claims is part of a deliberate strategy to undermine the Truth Movement." He also inaccurately describes Loose Change 2 as promoting "the idea that the Twin Towers were not hit by jetliners" when it does no such thing! Additionally, he seems to imply that Rick Siegel's video *9/11 Eyewitness*^{xxviii} has been produced only to make money (even when it is freely available on Google Video^{xxix}).

As I was learning more about "little things" Jones had said, I became involved in an ongoing e-mail exchange between Morgan Reynolds, Judy Wood, Gerard Holmgren, Nico Haupt, Jim Fetzer, Thomas Mattingly and several others. Quite a few unpleasant and heated remarks were exchanged between some of these people, but I tried to filter out the important information and viewpoints presented. This was all around the

time that the schism in ST911 was developing, and criticisms seemed to be targeted at both Fetzer and Jones.

I became more suspicious when Jones refused Fetzer’s invitations to discuss aspects of the thermite hypothesis in public forums. His actions seemed to be characteristic of someone who had something to hide – and was afraid his evidence and arguments may be deconstructed with close scrutiny. However, I tried to remain “neutral” in case there was information I wasn’t aware of.

We later then learned, from a year 2000 documentary^{xxx} of Steve Jones links to the energy cover up^{xxxi}, which involved him publishing a paper around the time Pons and Fleischman published their pivotal Cold Fusion research. We learned that Steve Jones had connections to Los Alamos National Laboratories (where some of the development for the Atomic Bomb took place) and the Department of Energy. This wasn’t looking good at all – we seemed to be seeing some kind of infiltration of the campaign by a person or people who were adopting a “limited hangout” position regarding what happened on 9/11. They were happy to say 9/11 was an Inside Job, but stopped short of analysing all the evidence available to them, to then try and determine the answers to the “who” and “how” questions.

Alex Floum

Then, another person, Alex Floum, came into the picture – seemingly in defence of Steve Jones. I had previously corresponded with Alex when I was posting more regularly on the ST911 forum. He had written an article summarising the Law Suits which had been started in relation to 9/11 evidence^{xxxii}. I found this to be a good summary and, I had presumed, a useful basis on which to initiate further legal cases. I was later to realise there was a low likelihood of Alex Floum being involved in any such initiations.

A long debate then ensued which was based around the assumption that Jim Fetzer, by supporting the research of Prof. Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds and others, was damaging the reputation of Scholars for 9/11 Truth. It was implied that it was clear to everyone else that Steve Jones’ paper “was the most widely accepted” and any discussions considering the anomalous evidence of what happened to the planes at the WTC was divisive and probably “disinformation”. I had already studied enough of the evidence (mentioned above) to know that this was a sweeping generalisation and it seemed like a tactic being used to discourage or prevent analysis of this evidence.

Fred Burks

Around this time (late December 2006), another character entered the debate of whom I had never heard – Fred Burks. (He was not, at the time I checked, listed as a member of ST911, however, he had joined the society early on and had assisted Jim briefly with the web site. Now, however, he was claiming to be some kind “trustee”). Jim has explained to me that he later removed Fred from the Membership List. Burks had formerly worked as an interpreter for the Bush Administration.^{xxxiii} He sent out a number of messages to the Scholars’ e-mail list expressing the concerns described above. In at least one message he closed with “Deeply committed to what’s best for all of us and to personal & global transformation through love & empowerment.” He instigated a vote among the scholars as to whether the ST911.org web site should be run by its members. The ST911.org domain name had been acquired by Alex Floum at Jim’s direction and on behalf of the society. This meant that, even though Jim had managed the site from its inception, Alex was in the position to control it. When Jim insisted that Alex turn the domain names over to him on behalf of the society, Alex instead gave them to Fred Burks, who now suggested that the way in which the society had been run should be changed or hits redirected to a new site (essentially to “save” Scholars for 9/11 Truth).

The list which Fred Burks used was originally compiled by the ST911 membership secretary on behalf of Steve Jones and Jim Fetzer. While the Society has members, it is not run by its members, and there are no procedures for voting. Jim Fetzer had not given permission for the list to be used and I had seen no messages from Steve Jones to support what Burks was doing or asking Jim’s agreement for such a vote. Burks conveyed the impression that Jim had entered into some kind of agreement with him about voting, which Jim has told me was not the case (I saw many of the e-mails in which this story unfolded). Some of the other Scholars such as Nick Newton seemed to express support for what Burks was doing (which essentially amounted to changing the Website content against the wishes of its rightful owner – or, to put it another way – theft and/or defacement).

Jim Fetzer did not agree with what Fred Burks was doing, but suggested that, if anything like that were to be done, the right person to entrust with the domain names was Kevin Barrett. (Some of the messages which were sent were very critical of Jim Fetzer for even discussing any of this. Jim has advised me that he acted the way he did because he wanted to accommodate as wide a range of views as possible. Not all of the members of ST911 supported the research of Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds – some of them were openly critical of the supposed ad

hominems against Steve Jones (but not those against Wood and Reynolds) and were not apparently willing to dispassionately analyse the other evidence which Wood and Reynolds were highlighting.

Alex Floum also supported Burks and Jones, and complained that Fetzer had threatened to report Floum for abuse of Intellectual Property laws (in seizing control of the www.st911.org). Floum seemed to think this was unfair, but Jim had consulted an attorney and learned that converting a property acquired for another party to personal use violates legal ethics. Some also criticised Floum for stating he “helped to found Scholars for 9/11 Truth” and pointed out that all he did was register the domain name on Jim Fetzer’s behalf. But Jim Fetzer has advised me that he, Carl Weis, and Steve Jones were members of the original "steering committee" advising him in the conduct of the society from early on.

An agreement about what to do with the www.st911.org web page was never reached, in spite of discussion that it might include an agreed statement explaining the schism. Fred Burks, however, had now frozen the site for the second time and, after conducting a second "vote", put up the existing page (archived [here](#)^{xxxiv}) which neatly embodies the (apparently engineered) schism in www.st911.org.

(Jim, who was forced by the freeze to move the scholars' web site to 911scholars.org, has now submitted the issue for a formal resolution and expects that the domain names will be turned over to him as the outcome.)

One sensed “mission accomplished”, as all the e-mail exchanges dropped off and, soon after, <http://stj911.org/> (“Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice” belonging to Steve Jones’ et al.) received an expensive-looking website make over. Further background on these issues can be found in the statements on the www.911scholars.org website [1]^{xxxv} and [2]^{xxxvi}.

Of Molten Metals

One of the key issues of evidence that Steve Jones was being criticised for were statements he made about molten aluminium. He essentially stated that, in the pictures and videos of the South Tower which showed a flowing orange metal, that metal could only be molten iron, because aluminium is silvery when molten. This statement is only partly true. Dr. Wood and her student Michael Zebuhr had set up a demonstration showing that aluminium can glow orange if heated to approximately the same temperature as molten iron^{xxxvii}. This therefore negated one of the basic assertions Steve Jones had made and represented a basic flaw in his thermite hypothesis. Shockingly, at around this time, Michael Zebuhr was murdered^{xxxviii} and another of Dr. Wood’s students had a fire in their

apartment. Since that time, some people have tried to suggest that Dr. Wood and even Jim Fetzer might be somehow linked to these terrible events. However, there is no evidence that I am aware of which gives credence to these views^{xxxix}. It basically seems like a smear campaign against Wood and Fetzer. Sometime after this, Dr. Wood received personal threats around the time she published the highly controversial "Beam Weapon" paper^{xl}. (This paper, however, is founded on basic photographic evidence, seismic data and visual observations of the actual event, as well as an analysis of the profound level destruction observed. The scale of this destruction was not really portrayed well on TV. With the scale of destruction, one would have expected to see some kind of conventional "nuclear" or large volume of visible "hot" explosions. None of these things were seen.)

Ostracism

From an observer's stand point, it seemed to me that people like Rosalee Grable, Nico Haupt, Gerard Holmgren, Morgan and Dr. Wood seemed to have unveiled an "additional layer" of the 9/11 Cover Up. Also, it seemed that tactics of ridicule and "trashing" were being used against this group of people in a disturbingly similar pattern to those used, for example, by people in the "mainstream" who won't accept that 9/11 was an Inside Job. One example of this happened more recently, when Prof. Reynolds was "booted" from SPINE because the rest of the group did not seem to like him discussing the evidence that something other than planes hit the WTC buildings^{xli}.

In message board discussions, whenever the evidence that something other than Big Boeings might have hit the WTC, or that some type of unconventional technology may have also been used in the destruction of the towers, "trolls" invariably appear – usually anonymous and often very promptly. One can imagine that, if this evidence is important and does indeed indicate advanced technologies were used in the perpetration of the "9/11 illusion", elements of the Military Industrial Complex would both have the means and the motive for covering this up. This can be done both by "paid agents" and unwittingly by those people who are unwilling to examine the evidence that people like Steve Jones are not necessarily working to expose all aspects of the cover up. If people have, after the shock of 9/11, "placed their faith" in someone like Steve Jones, there is perhaps an understandable reluctance to "step back again", examine the evidence and see if the same old games are still being played.

“Meet the No Planers”

In September 2006, as discussion of what hit the WTC was raging, a media Hit Piece was published in the UK – in *The New Statesman*^{xlii}. This targeted David Shayler’s brief remarks about the “No Big Boeings” (NBB) evidence as a way of debunking the other “9/11 Inside Job” evidence he discussed with the reporter. This article caused considerable consternation among UK campaigners - some people blamed our lack of progress at exposing 9/11 as an Inside Job squarely on David Shayler’s shoulders for speaking out about the NBB evidence. Some even said this proved he must still be working for MI5, because he was clearly working “against the wider interests of the movement”. This sort of thinking seemed to ignore the very powerful commitment that Shayler had repeatedly shown – travelling all around the UK, giving talks describing how 9/11 was an inside job - for no fee - and staying with friends and other campaigners (myself included).^{xliii}

Jerry Leaphart and NIST/NCST Review Meeting

On Dec 14th 2006, I received a message from Dr. Wood advising me that NIST/NCST were holding a conference call meeting with some people at NIST to review the plan for production of a report detailing how WTC 7 was destroyed. This meeting had allowed public depositions to be made and was going to be Webcast. Dr. Wood asked me to record the Webcast^{xliv}, especially as she had been contacted by an attorney, Jerry Leaphart, who had seen Dr. Wood’s analysis of the WTC destruction and what to make a deposition to the Conference Group. As part of his deposition, Jerry wanted to make comments to the NIST/NCST panel about the destruction of the WTC. Public depositions were limited to 5 minutes duration.

This day was significant for the reason that no representation was made to the NCST/NIST panel by either Steve Jones or anyone directly associated with “his group”. Indeed, Alex Floum would seem to have been a prime candidate for making such a representation, if not Steve Jones himself (as he refers to the NIST studies repeatedly in his own paper). So, the question remains, why did Steve Jones not bother to participate or in the event, or even comment on it? This, to me, seemed like another strong indicator that the parameters under which Steve Jones was working had either been “preset”, or he had decided not to venture beyond a certain point in his quest to uncover how 9/11 was perpetrated. Ironically, Steve’s group is called “9/11 Scholars for Truth and Justice”, and yet there was no mention of this event, or a representation made by

any member of that group (as far as I am aware). Was this just incompetence? (Maybe – but where have we heard this idea before?)

Hustler Article and The Thermite theory

In January 2007, US Hustler magazine published an article “Was 9/11 An Inside Job?”^{xlv}. Apparently Prof. Judy Wood was initially contacted by the author, who later contacted Steve Jones. The article exaggerated the qualifications of Gordon Ross (who has an article posted on the Journal of 9/11 Studies) whilst diminishing those of Prof. Judy Wood. It also quoted that Jim Hoffman was a physicist when he is not. Though I was glad that more exposure was being given to 9/11 being an Inside Job, it was interesting to see the thermite theory being presented in a mainstream publication, and that some basic errors and omissions were evident. I decided to compile a short rebuttal article^{xlvi} with the comments supplied by Profs Wood and Reynolds, Jeff Strahl and Veronica Chapman.

Rick Siegel and the 9/11 Mysteries film

Recently, it has been brought to my attention by Rick Siegel how subtle changes have been made to his footage from 9/11 Eyewitness when it was used in the film 9/11 Mysteries.

For example, Rick has discovered these problems with the film:

33:50 - Shows the first of Rick Siegel’s footage of the North tower

"This video was shot from New Jersey. Smoke rises from the base of the building as an explosion is heard” (Basically this is OK and with original sound from DVD)

34:08 - Second time around the same footage but the sound is replaced! Just after the dark filter effect we see the north tower collapse but the sound has been replaced with something completely different. A siren can be heard to distinguish that this is not the original sound. MAJOR DISINFO #1

Rick makes several other important observations about this film, which should be studied carefully^{xlvii}.

This does not look like “artistic licence” – rather, it looks like a deliberate attempt to distort or change the evidence. This film also includes a presentation of the thermite theory, though it does also cover the level of destruction at the WTC quite well (but not does mention directed energy

weapons as a possible cause, although this concept was embryonic before the recent work of Dr. Wood).

Black Projects and Alex Floum

When I had read Dr. Judy Wood’s Beam Weapon (now often termed Direct Energy Weapon - DEW) paper^{xl}, it seemed clear to me that the evidence she compiled showed clearly that Black Technology had been used in the destruction of the WTC – to me, there was no other possible way the sheer scale of destruction – as indicated by the surprisingly small pile of debris seen following the decimation of the towers – could have been caused. The problem was that she/we couldn’t say exactly what had been used or how. Nevertheless, in essence, this was little different to saying that WTC 7 underwent controlled demolition (and even Steve Jones agrees with this), even if we couldn’t say how the explosives were planted or by whom – or what explosives were used.

Following an e-mail from Alex Floum complaining about the conduct of Jim Fetzer and asking the list/group members whether the ST911 domain should be transferred to a “new society”, I replied that I thought that Steve Jones should proceed with his Journal of 911 Studies domain/site whilst Jim’s site should remain in his control. I also stated my thoughts that Black Technology was used on 9/11 and we were seeing an orchestrated “damage limitation” operation to prevent people from considering or delving deeper into this controversial area.^{xxxv}

I was surprised that no one attempted to ridicule my statements and I was also marginally surprised by Floum’s response. He asked me if I was the same person who started the thread on PhysOrg regarding the freefall times of the towers. This thread had closed months ago, and had attracted many thousands of views and responses^{xxxv}. Why he should have asked me this question in relation to any of the points I made, I do not know. He asked if I could send him links to information about the use of “high tech” on 9/11 – I referred him to Dr. Wood’s paper (as if he wasn’t aware of it already). I received no response to this.

Steve Jones’ Request to Me

In the same message that had prompted a response from Floum, I mentioned Steve Jones apparent inability to address the basic points of evidence that Dr. Wood had raised. Soon after, I received a message from Steve Jones asking me which questions he couldn’t answer, so I pointed him at the list that Dr. Wood had prepared^{xxi}. I expressed my unhappiness at what had happened with ST911 and my dislike of personal attacks.

He suggested that I get together with other researchers and write a paper about Directed Energy Weapons being used on 9/11 and submit it to his Journal of 9/11 Studies for peer review. He mentioned that "personalized attacks would not be allowed". I then replied to him saying that I was not a research scientist (and I had made this clear to him when I joined ST911) so even if I did write a paper, it would not have any real credibility. I also then pointed out that Dr. Wood's paper, though unfinished, would qualify as a Scientific paper and contained no personalised attacks on Steve Jones. I received no response from Steve Jones to these points.

Fetzer Jones Debate - Jan 17 2006

Following repeated requests, Steve Jones finally agreed to talk with Jim Fetzer on Jim's "Dynamic Duo" show on GCN Live^{xlvi}. Feelings were obviously strong and this seemed to have a significant impact on the quality of the discussion. Jim Fetzer talked unnecessarily over Steve Jones and voices were raised on many occasions.

However, on listening to the broadcast (referenced above), I made the following notes, referenced by the elapsed times shown below.

43:38 – Steve Jones shouts there was "significant damage" (twice) to the bathtub (but lower Manhattan still didn't flood). He talks about quantifying data, but in this context what does "significant" mean? He didn't say what volume of water flowed – he merely listed a number of news reports which described some damage to the slurry wall (the bath tub). Such news reports didn't seem to me to constitute a sufficiently quantified rebuttal to what Dr. Wood had written – it seemed to me more like a set of statements intended to debunk the basic evidence.

45:58 - Steve Jones mentions the paper about WTC dust particle sizes by Paul Liroy et al^{xlix}. Though Steve talks about a table of dust particle sizes, his use of this data is rather misleading, in my opinion – he seems to be trying to say that the pulverisation and dustification which Dr. Wood had discussed did not really happen – only large particle sizes resulted. However, a look at the abstract (my emphasis) of the paper above seems to indicate this paper, alone, would not be a good basis on which to judge the level of pulverisation:

.....
Abstract

The explosion and collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) was a catastrophic event that produced an aerosol plume impacting many workers, residents, and commuters during the first few days after 11 September 2001. Three bulk samples of the total settled dust and smoke were collected at weather-protected locations east of the WTC on 16 and 17 September 2001 ; these samples are representative of the generated material that settled immediately after the explosion and fire and the concurrent collapse of the two structures. We analyzed each sample, not differentiated by particle size, for inorganic and organic composition. In the inorganic analyses, we identified metals, radionuclides, ionic species, asbestos, and.....

.....

54:00 – Steve Jones states that the "Spire shakes and falls"¹ but he doesn't explain how - we can't see any additional explosions on the video, so what is the energy causing this shaking and falling?

55:00 - Steve makes strong, repeated emphasis on sulfidation of the steel and makes a vague reference to the use of RDX but does not offer any other specific details of explosives. He then mentions “supercoarse dust” – an odd term because it is clear that some of the dust was very fine – fine enough to be visibly suspended in the air for many minutes or hours.

55:52 - Steve states that he wishes NIST would release more videos of collapse. It seemed odd to me that he did not report that he had asked them to release such videos – seeing as he is considered by many as the foremost researcher from the academic community who has looked at this area.

59:00 - Steve asks if Dr. Wood's paper explains the destruction of WTC 7. This is a curious question – it seems that most researchers agree on conventional Controlled Demolition being used on WTC 7!

So, whilst I was uneasy about Fetzer's conduct of the interview (which was perhaps partly understandable after the “goings on” with the assault on ST911), I was very uneasy about some of the points Steve Jones made and the apparent tactic of debunking the evidence for the amount of pulverisation or related destruction of the WTC complex.

“Ambushed!” (by Greg Jenkins)

Some time ago, Prof. Wood advised us of an impromptu interview¹ which had been sprung on her after she had given a presentation at the

NPCC. She had driven 600 miles and had previously not slept for 48 hours.

People can watch this interview and form their own opinion of it. I will take the liberty of suggesting, however, even though the questions and information exchanged in the interview are revealing in themselves, Prof. Wood would likely have been even more congenial under different circumstances.

[Edit: Dr. Wood did not actually give a presentation herself that day - please see this articleⁱⁱⁱ for more details.]

John Albanese Signs Up for UK 9/11 Forum!

Recently, John Albanese signed up for our UK forum to post information about a new film he has produced about disinformation. He then seemed to make allegations about Profs Wood and Reynoldsⁱⁱⁱⁱ, which I challenged him about. I have yet to see any evidence to support these serious allegations.

9/11 WAS an Inside Job – so what?

It has to be said that despite the many great efforts and significant sacrifices made by many individuals who are trying to campaign for the truth behind 9/11 to be revealed, little has changed in the last 5 years. The “police state agenda” has unfolded before us and enough measures are already in use to see that it is real. It seems that the perpetrators are not really bothered that we know 9/11 was an Inside Job. What can we do about it? They can still unfold their agenda without any significant resistance.

“Ding, Ding – Round Two!”

It would be nice to think that the fight to uncover 9/11 as an Inside Job only had “one round” and that we were well on our way to winning it. However, it seems to me, that we have now come to the end of “round one” and “round two” is now in progress. The perps are well-resourced and well-trained and are now beginning to land many more punches on those who are the closest to uncovering the links between the 9/11 Cover up and the other areas (like black technology and the energy cover up) which would undermine their power base.

Cui Un-Bono?

I have summarised in a table below who seems to have benefited and who seems not to have benefited in the “goings on” described above:

Dr. Judy Wood	Dr. Steven E Jones
...identified against her will in by Steven E Jones	... lauded and applauded for his “Why Indeed...” paper.
... lost her job at Clemson	... retired – and still salaried.
...her student Michael Zebuhr murdered	... described in CBS News Piece as founder of ST911 ^{liv} (see also response from 911Scholars ^{lv})
... receives death threats	... featured in “Improbable Collapse”
... attacked for promoting “wild theories”	...his thermite hypothesis evidence featured in 9/11 Mysteries ^{lvi}

Also

Jim Fetzer’s www.st911.org stolen/defaced	http://stj911.org/ gets a glossy make-over
--	---

Conclusion

Most of us agree that the hijackers that supposedly took control of the supposed planes on 9/11 were not real. However, I would suggest we now seem to have some real hijackers in our midst – some of them already appear to have taken control of parts of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, for example – and others have suggested that other campaigning groups have been similarly “hijacked”^{lvii}. Others seem to be at work trying to limit the parameters of 9/11 research, as that research now takes those who look at the evidence into even more contentious and controversial areas of study.

I felt that enough people would be shocked and reviled by 9/11 Truth to see through the tactics of pernicious debunking, discrediting and ridicule - but we now seem to have formed something like “The Official 9/11 Truth Campaign’s version of 9/11 Truth” - anyone who begins to challenge this “official version” is said to be “damaging the movement”.

It seems that even very loose associations/organisations like ST911, once they begin to gain some traction, are targeted with the same old “divide and conquer” tactics. Some members of these organisations seem more attached to the idea that “unity and truth” are the same thing – when, all

too often, those claiming to speak the truth, as history should teach us, usually have a particular agenda.

Maybe the truth is that we should all be able to follow our own threads of research and paths of evidence, without the pernicious debunking by others and we should be allowed to draw our own conclusions.

Perhaps as the links between the 9/11 scam and the many others that have been played out on the general population over the last few millennia will now become exposed, and this will lead to a new era in human understanding, with access to surprising new technologies which can be used in ways beneficial to many more people than just the ruling elite.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank:

- Prof. Judy Wood for her incredible insights, research, tenacity and dignity in the face of severe adversity.
- Prof. Reynolds and Rick Rajter for their superb analyses of the plane crash evidence and also Prof. Reynolds for graciously publishing, on his Website, the Hustler rebuttal we compiled
- Jeff Strahl for his concise and focused comments and contributions.
- Veronica Chapman for her succinct and acutely observed points.
- Jerry Leaphart for his diligent work from a legal perspective and for being a lone dissenting voice at the NIST/NCST panel conference.
- CB Brooklyn for his collation of evidence re Steve Jones and his willingness to post to the various message boards in order to expose this information.
- Gerard Holmgren, Nico Haupt and Rosalee Grable for being at the forefront of analysis of some of the evidence mentioned here long before many others were "on the case".
- Many others for looking at the evidence and diligently working to expose it in ways they see as appropriate.

5. Dr. Greg Jenkins' "Directed Debunking Energy" and Prof. Judy Wood

Scholarly Questions and Inquiry, or Badgering,
Misrepresentation and Harassment?

March 1st 2007

Limited Hangouts

Recently, I wrote how I thought, based on some personal experiences as well as other recent events, aspects of the 9/11 Truth Movement had been hijacked^{lviii} by groups of people connected with the perpetrators of the 9/11 Crimes. The purpose of this hijacking seems to be to encourage a "limited hangout" position about what really happened on that date, which would keep certain groups or interests "off the radar screen" of criminal prosecution and possibly just single out current members of the "Neocon Clan" and the Bush Administration to bear the brunt of prosecution. For example, some people are unwilling to consider how elements on the Clinton Administration must also have been complicit in setting up aspects of the 9/11 Black Operation. Additionally, people who financially benefited such as "lucky" Larry Silverstein remain at the edges of perception as being one of a group of people who should be prosecuted for criminal activity prior to and following 9/11.

I also wrote about pernicious debunking and personal attacks, which whilst people like Prof. Steve Jones claim to be a victim of, the evidence suggests that people like Prof. Judy Wood have ended up in a rather worse situation, with the mysterious death of one of her students and the loss of her job. As a result of an event in January 2007, it seems that, once again, she has been placed directly in the firing line of 9/11 research – Dr. Greg Jenkins set up an ambush interview, in a side room at the National Press Club, Washington DC^{lix}.

The Interview Setup

There are quite a few facts that need to be taken into account, and some questions that need to be considered, before the video can be fairly reviewed.

Why did Greg Jenkins plan this interview without telling anyone who knows Dr. Wood? Why did he bring at least two professional video cameras, recording equipment, special lighting, and a camera crew to the National Press Club that evening and not attend Jim Fetzer's

presentation? Jim Fetzer was giving a presentation to discuss the data presented by Profs Wood and Reynolds, but Greg Jenkins and crew did not attend Jim Fetzer's talk, nor did they ask any questions following the talk itself.

Jenkins and/or his group tried to talk Dr. Wood out of going to the restroom, saying the "interview" would only take 2-3 minutes. But, Dr. Wood felt she couldn't wait. She saw the cameras for the first time after she came back from the restroom.

Dr. Wood insisted on switching seats with Greg Jenkins because there were other people in the room who were watching the interview and Dr. Wood did not wish to be forced to sit with her back to them, as she thought they may ask questions too, which would then have involved her looking around and behind her. The people helping Jenkins felt they needed to change the lighting and camera positions. As you can see in the video, Jenkins is well lit and Dr. Wood is half in shadow for most (if not all) of the interview.

They set up their "ambush" two rooms away, out of sight of the Fetzer presentation – it is not clear how they got access to these rooms as the doors seem to have been locked before they were there. How did Jenkins know Dr. Wood would be there - who told him? Dr. Wood did not make a presentation on that day – she had attended to support Jim Fetzer. She was a member of the audience on her way to the rest room when they asked her to answer the questions. And why did Jenkins keep his plans of this "surprise interview" a secret? Why did Greg Jenkins present his ambush interview as if Dr. Wood were the invited speaker at the National Press Club?

Dr. Wood had no idea she was going to be interviewed, much less filmed. But, she did agree to sit down for one or two questions, on the condition that no permission would be granted until she had authorized the final product. Jenkins did not obtain a notarized signature and no preview was ever offered by him or anyone connected to him before he posted the video on Google, though he had agreed to do so, sharing an email and phone number. But, both the number and the email address turned out to be fraudulent. (In any case, it was surely up to Jenkins to be polite and contact Dr. Wood, who was the subject of the interview. He did not do this.)

The Video Itself

Much of the discussion in the video centres round a picture which Dr. Wood is shown of debris falling from the tower. Indeed, most of the first 2 minutes of the video is taken up with developing an acute focus on this

issue. Even if one concludes Dr. Wood is incorrect about the exact nature and movement of this debris (which cannot be accurately concluded from the video interview alone), it must be realised that this is not the only point of data that Dr. Wood is concerned with. (She also discusses lack of damage to the Bathtub, subway trains and sub-basement mall stores. She discusses the highly anomalous “toasted cars”, seismic data and small debris piles.)

Jenkins homes in on the “falling debris” issue without really addressing the subtlety of what Dr. Wood is saying. He tries to get her to say “no debris is falling” – in essence, what she is really saying is that the debris that is falling is largely dust, not large steel girders and slabs of concrete. She points out the very fine nature of the dust, Jenkins reacts by adopting a number of blank and confused and sheepish looks, and the discussion essentially goes nowhere. The photos of a “carpet of dust”, with unburned paper mixed in, essentially highlight Dr. Wood’s point, but Jenkins skirts around the issue by continually focusing attention on a single photograph and not allowing or encouraging discussion of the other related evidence. Dr. Wood also questions the use of the word “collapse” and Jenkins does not really explore this proposition thoroughly. A simple building collapse, again, would not cause ankle-deep layers of fine dust and even finer dust which spread into the upper atmosphere. Readers who think Dr. Wood might be wrong about the nature of the debris should consider these pictures [1^{ix}] [2^{kxi}] [3^{kxii}]. Is ALL the debris falling? Is the airborne debris ALL smoke? Does it look to be the right colour for smoke (i.e. is it the same colour as that seen near the flames from the towers)?

The Image Dr. Judy Wood was shown

It must also be noted that Dr. Wood was not shown an identical image to the one that Greg Jenkins inserted into the video he posted. Dr. Wood was shown a low-quality black and white "snowball" photo, while the photo flashed up in the video was in color and possibly of higher resolution. The labelling shown on the color image inserted in the video also does not seem to be present on the black and white printed version – a further difference. This is perhaps why Dr. Wood said, "I can't see that without a magnifying glass" and then commented that she could not see "pennies falling" because the resolution was not up to the job. (Also see comments above.) Additionally, Dr. Wood has described how she thought the black and white picture might have been photoshopped. You'll notice at the end that Jenkins insisted on taking back the sheet with the image on it.

The tactics seem to be, here, to get people to react to “eye-rolling” and theatrics (with Jenkins playing the “interested scientist” who just needs things “explaining to him”). In reality, all that anyone, including Jenkins, has to do – and all that Dr. Judy Wood wants them to do - is look at the data.

The End of the Interview

At the end of the interview, on the one hand Jenkins is apparently polite - thanking Dr. Wood for her time in answering the questions^{lx}. Someone then asks him (off camera) a question along the lines of “what interests are you protecting?” Jenkins answers “I am not protecting any interests, I was just trying to find out what kind of Scientific basis this was in – and um, I think I found out.” So, rather than a detailed review of the data and the anomalous aspects of it, Jenkins resorts to a rather sarcastic remark, inferring that what Dr. Wood said is “silly” or has no validity.

This "ambush interview" was suddenly stopped because security guards came to escort Greg Jenkins and crew out of the building - he probably didn't want that recorded. Jenkins and his helpers were not authorized to be there and were trespassing. They had not rented a room in accord with NPC rules. The security guard's voice can only just be heard in the version Jenkins used.

Tactics and Techniques

There are no links shown in Jenkins’ video to Dr. Wood’s actual paper. However, a statement that Dr. Wood made as a retort, tinged with sarcasm, is posted in a separate caption in the video (someone has clearly taken the time to do this). This is psychology and debunking, not scholarly analysis of facts, evidence and data.

If Prof. Wood had refused the interview, no doubt that fact would have been plastered on various message boards as evidence that she was avoiding questions (but it seems that people are more reluctant to say this sort of thing about other 9/11 researchers than Prof. Wood).

Some people who have watched the video think that Dr. Judy Wood is dodging questions, or not answering them well. I would suggest that this is exactly the impression the video was set up to give. Additionally, techniques have been used to suggest that Prof. Wood’s view should not be taken seriously – an off the cuff remark she made about “pennies falling” is used as the theme for the closing “song”. This isn’t a scientific analysis or discussion – it’s a piece intended to ridicule Prof. Wood and divert attention from the data.

If Jenkins had been so unhappy with Dr. Wood's explanations and he had been genuinely interested in exploring the hypothesis, he could have requested another interview, under more suitable circumstances, rather than posting what he had.

A "Scientific" Method?

If anyone thinks that an ambush video, conducted close to midnight and posted on the internet, without final agreement of the person concerned, is a valid usage of the "Scientific Method", then there may be wider range of data available for usage in Scientific Papers and peer review than has been in general usage up to now. (Also, the interview was conducted by people who trespassed within private property. The time stamp on a still picture of Dr. Wood's group with Dr. Wood's camera shows a date of January 11, so - it probably was after midnight.)

This video is included in a link in Greg Jenkins' paper entitled "The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers^{lxiii}" on Steve Jones' Journal of 9/11 Studies^{lxiv}. The title of this paper is already loaded, and suggests a conclusion to the reader before it has even discussed any of the data. This is not a Scholarly or Scientific approach to the problem. Perhaps a title of "Could Directed Energy Weapons have been used to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers?" would have been less loaded. The video and paper seem to have been posted on the internet within 3 weeks of the Ambush interview. In any case, Prof. Wood has repeatedly stated the Beam Weapon paper is not yet finished.

In Part 1 of his paper, Dr. Jenkins states (about the debris) "This means that, within error, all of the debris in the WTC complex can be accounted for within the sublevel collapses." If this statement is correct, then how did the goods in the Mall Stores survive^{lxv}? How is it that the subway station has only a relatively small amount of debris and the train is not badly crushed and damaged^{lxvi}? If the sub levels were indeed filled with debris as Jenkins suggests, then how can rescue workers have been walking around in the sub-basement levels so easily^{lxvii}? Also, why does the reference for the data Jenkins has used come from The New York Times and not some more directly scholarly or scientific work from FEMA or NIST or the EPA? (Prof. Steve Jones also repeatedly referenced the New York Times when discussing damage to the Bathtub). The New York Times does not seem to be a publication which has an accurate track record in publishing facts about what happened on 9/11.

Additionally (as of Mar 02 2007), though there is a link in this paper to Dr. Wood's homepage^{lxviii} and there is a link to a critique of Steve Jones, there is no direct link to the Beam Weapon pages themselves. Why?

A look at the Letters Section on Journal of 9/11 Studies^{lxix} (as of 02 Mar 07) shows 3 articles specifically about the Beam Weapon hypothesis (in addition to the one above) and then another which describes Dr. Judy Wood's discussion of molten aluminium as "disinformation". If the hard evidence Dr. Wood is presenting is nonsense, why is so much time and energy being spent in attacking it?

Conclusion

It seems that Dr. Wood's only mistake was to agree to answer a few questions. It was a "failure" based on Dr. Wood's honesty and sincerity, trust in a fellow human being to do right by her, as well as from not having any sleep for almost 48 hours. Dr. Wood has no "campaign manager" like Karl Rove. If it wasn't for the media blackout on 9/11 Truth, there is a likelihood she would have been attacked or smeared on the mainstream media – as it is, the alternative media have been used in a similar fashion and willing bloggers seem happy to add their own smearing into the mix.

Perhaps as supporters of Dr. Judy Wood, we should organise a team to operate 2 cameras and lighting, and in secret, ambush interview Dr. Greg Jenkins at a conference where he was a member of the audience. Perhaps we might ask him as to the nature of the source of funding he has received from projects funded by the NSA. Now there's an interview I would like to see posted on google video. Do you think he'd consent to the interview under those terms, and then graciously give permission for it to be posted, without approving the "final cut"?

Further comments about the interview can be found here^{lxx}. From this selection, I found this comment to be one of the most pertinent.

So, the DEW theory has a huge uphill climb in order to be perceived for what it is; namely: A clear, direct, frontal confrontation on whether or not the USA is a free republic or an entity being run by secret forces having the general label of Military-Industrial-Complex? That is the underlying question that DEW theory presents and very few people want to deal with it. Small wonder the reaction to it is so visceral. So, challenges to DEW are primed to be successful based on an "anything but that" predilection among people of all persuasions, even among what might be called plain-vanilla truthers.

I hope 9/11 Truthers – and everyone else - will consider these thoughts, ideas and data in a fair and balanced manner.

6. “Micronukes vs Thermite/Thermate at WTC”

Transcript of discussion which took place at the Vancouver 9/11 Truth

With Prof. Steve Jones and Dr. William Deagle – 24th June 2007

Transcript by Andrew Johnson

Footnotes mainly by Andrew Johnson, with additional comments by Prof. Judy Wood.

See this video^{lxxi} or listen to this audio^{lxxii}.

This is quite an extraordinary discussion in many ways – and in my view, clearly demonstrates that neither Jones or Deagle are being completely honest in their discussion.

You will hear them:

- Claiming to be discussing the evidence, but in reality they don’t discuss much evidence at all.
- Deagle claim Seattle has been pre-wired with mini-nukes.
- Jones suggesting that if there is a nuke-attack, 9-11 truthers should get dust samples and send them to Deagle or Jones.
- Deagle claiming he has evidence of mini-nukes from “contacts” but he hasn’t completed testing his samples – even though he is very concerned to find out what they will use for the next attack.
- Deagle claims he is 100% sure thermate or superthermate was used to destroy the towers.
- Deagle describes the effects on toasted cars as being potentially from an EMP pulse, but he dismisses the evidence for DEW.
- Jones gets Deagle to agree that the evidence of no planes hitting the WTC towers is “ridiculous”.
- Deagle claims micronukes were used in the Oklahoma bombing.
- Deagle doesn’t know whether they are fusion or fission nukes.
- Jones mentions WTC Iron quite a few times.
- Both Jones and Deagle talk about an Isotope of Iodine 110 – but this is extremely obscure (the stable Isotope of Iodine is 127).

Even though Deagle suggests there is going to be a multiple nuke attack in the USA, Homeland Security don't seem to have expressed an interest in this.

Listen to the audio or read the transcript.

0:05 Deagle (D)	Well, welcome. I really appreciate all the work you're doing Dr. Jones. You're a scientist and a gentleman because the pursuit of science is devoid of ego and the real issue we have here both with the Vancouver 9/11 [conference] is the issue - we need to find out not only the plans but also the devices that they're using -- the devices they used in Oklahoma City to bring [down] and demolished that building and the World Trade Centre and the grave danger that they'll use similar types of things on a higher scale in cities across America and Canada otherwise.
Jones: (J)	Let me interject a thought there Bill -- as I have been working on this understanding of what you're talking about...
D:	...for a long time yeah.
J:	...quite a while. The central goal I have now is justice. I think we actually have sufficient data to motivate a trial.
D:	Oh we do. In fact, see, I'm a medical and legal doctor as well and I belong to these -- yeah [inaudible]. I agree. I think we have enough evidence for an international tribunal and treason trials and I think - that's - you're right but ... see if we had even additional evidence... it's not just activating an international trial that I'm concerned about, I am concerned also about activating the public on a larger scale to understand the magnitude of the criminal activity because of the danger of the next events - from my contacts with inside NSA, CIA and other higher contacts -- that the next event -- I was told -- the two next biggies -- and this was proven by the documents I showed today from Philadelphia where they're testing giving 50,000 homes a package with a US Postal Service worker, a city policeman armed, providing a box of "medicines" which may include vaccines that will be given at gunpoint to citizens and they cannot refuse it ¹ and the danger I see is that I was told that they had - at least by mid-90s they had 22 cities pre-wired with nukes -- not little ones that would go off and just cause a building to dissolve, but big ones that could take out, say 16

¹ How will the citizens react to this? Will people simply accept it?

	city blocks of [inaudible] cities like Los Angeles Denver and other ones so they could declare a total state of martial law not just a partial one de facto with the Doctor Krackosian in the middle of the airport - Constantly being kind of - you know - you have to take off your shoes and you're constantly surveilled and next May 11 we're going to have to have a tracker ID -- they're literally going to make a total police state and I think they want to do it by final transforming events I see is a pandemic and nukes going off in multiple cities because I think they'll transcend just using conventional explosives like thermate to using really big ones.[inaudible] I think we agree on that.
Person	Why do you think that?
J:	Well, I mean you're looking to [inaudible].
D:	...the next thing.
J:	...even Brazinsky before a Senate committee in the Congress just this year in February said he could see some action, some event in the United States or elsewhere that would be blamed on Iran and that would then justify a defensive attack on...[inaudible]
D:	Well of course that's what Cheney said too - he said that before, he's ordered STRATCOM to prepare attack orders against 440 targets inside Iran both....
J:	and they're looking at using tactical nukes...
D:	Right...
J:	... I understand it's a possibility, so this is a very serious situation. I think there is some evidence that we agree on ² .
D:	Oh absolutely.
J: 3:33	... I thought that was a good place to start. We agree first of all

² ... so let's not talk about the evidence we don't agree on? Is this cherry-picking evidence, perhaps?

³ Wouldn't it be better to have the evidence displayed on a screen for easier or more focused discussion? There is no powerpoint here – no co-ordinated discussion – just a “friendly chat” – even for supposedly “volunteers” - they are or were both professional scientists – can't they do better?

	that the discussion should be evidence-based. ³
D:	Oh absolutely it can't be based on opinion ⁴ ... because the thing is ultimately if there is not evidence that could ultimately get into a court [inaudible] the court - public opinion then it shouldn't be dismissed but it should be based on scientific evidence.
3:50 J:	It needs to be based on solid evidence, okay. We agree on that - and as we look at the evidence -- I don't think this is the place to go through all the evidence ⁵ --
D:	Yeah - no, no, no.
J:	...but we have both looked at quite a bit of the evidence then. And we agree [inaudible] understand...
D:	It's like the scientific method, you have to have a hypothesis and a theory, and a number of anomalies that could be explained by that theory then you propose a test of the hypothesis - null hypothesis and the test I see beside the evidence we have so far from the US geological about tritium and there is some discussion of whether it could be from something like [exasymes?] which I think is a bit of a stretch but the thing that will help us to close that door to determine if there were indeed some kind of devices in one or more places in the building could be if there's heavy isotopes. Now if they're not present then it means that obviously...
J:	I wanted to establish what we agreed on...
D:	yeah. We're agreed on the thermate of course... it had to be
J:	there is considerable evidence...
D:	Oh... there is no disagreement there at all... yeah...
J:	OK and I think we both looked at the directed energy weapons...
D:	that's... no evidence, in fact I was a doctor taking care of people working with people for 6 years working with directed

⁴ And yet, significant portions of the following discussion are based on opinion only.

⁵ So they *won't* be talking about the evidence in this discussion then...?

⁶ That settles it then – no discussion of lack of debris, dustification effects – Deagle was a Doctor in the SDI programme – he knows - that's all we need to know...

	energy weapons for US Star Wars. ⁶
J:	OK you have a lot more background... ⁷
D:	yeah so I know about Tom Bearden's type of coherence interference weapons systems and scalar weaponry and plasma cannons at Lockheed Martin and Skunk Works and Lucent ⁸ Technologies and the company I was working [at] was General Dynamics.
J:	Let me try one more while we're on a roll here and agreeing. How about the "no planes hit the towers."?
D:	That's ridiculous. ⁹
J:	OK, I agree with you.
D:	In fact, what I was told from my contacts inside the U.S. Air Force, Air Force Academy and so on, is those were probably not United Airlines jets but they were probably E-10s that were flown in there. That's what they told me. That err In fact, I knew this from being a civil aviation examiner ¹⁰ that all jet aircraft, commercial jet aircraft, worldwide, have been capable of being remotely taken over control for over thirty years.
J:	Well, so we agree that jets did hit the towers. ¹¹
D:	Oh yeah, jets hit the towers.
J:	OK now lets get to the...
D:	and of course the other thing is the architectural thing that jets couldn't take them down because I have friends that are architectural ¹² . In fact across the street from where I live in Halifax, this thoracic surgeon's son is an architect in New York and he said he knew immediately -- literally within seconds after both jets hit the towers that there was no evidence

⁷ Is Jones about to say that he has little experience with energy weapons? Six months ago, he said they don't exist.

⁸ From my understanding, Lucent Technologies was formerly part of AT&T - a telecommunications company which had/has little to do with weapons technologies.

⁹ Isn't this an opinion – no evidence, after all is discussed here...

¹⁰ Check Deagle's resume... more later.

¹¹ But what about the physical evidence which shows planes did not hit the towers?

¹² Shouldn't this be "friends that are architects"? Surely he means Structural Engineers?

	whatsoever... because they teach this course... in architecture around the world that these buildings were built to withstand up to a 9.5 earthquake ¹³ and there's absolutely no evidence a jet aircraft could bring down these buildings at all, or even the burning of furniture or anything else so the normal combustible materials couldn't have done to the buildings - it had to have been controlled demolition.
J:	So we agree with that...
D: 6:27	Yeah.
J:	Okay so now lets talk about the possibility of mini nukes. [Jones moves round] So let's see - the evidence that you have then for this hypothesis?
D:	Well, I went over those 13 points -- I don't want to go point by point ¹⁴ but the key thing that I see is evidence such as the Tesla type effects -- Para-magnetic effects on objects at a distance that are not due to a thermal pulse from a regular conventional weapon and I'd like to see those vehicles that's another piece that should be looked at -- like the engine blocks to see if there's Para-magnetic effects on air-conditioners, the engine blocks and the mirrors because the physical evidence supports that hypothesis. The second thing...
J:	Well. Let's talk about the vehicles for a minute. So - you're saying that the damage on the vehicles would be... we agree that it will be great to have a vehicle, but I'm not sure we're going to get one.
D:	Yeah - I think they're still stored down there - I think that the evidence...
7:29 Person	Could I just ask a question? Have you actually seen those vehicles?
J:	We have photos...
D:	We have photos from them ... and apparently

¹³ New York is not in an Earthquake zone.

¹⁴ Are they or aren't they going to discuss the evidence?

Person	[inaudible] and all documented with the location...?
D:	I heard they're still stored down there ¹⁵ actually.
J:	This is a good point though, that the vehicles that were on FDR Avenue there... that was... they were quite a ways away from the World Trade Center [right...]. There's a paper in the journal by James Gourley in the Journal of 9/11 Studies that argues, I think, quite persuasively they were probably ¹⁶ near the towers during the collapses and were towed subsequently to the... to FDR... so that they were not that far away when they were damaged. ¹⁷ You see the difference.
D:	Well, I think one of the things we see is actually that there were per parked vehicles and we can be pretty well sure that they weren't - but that wasn't the situation. The other thing was that part of the vehicle in front - the front of the vehicle was affected in areas even just a matter of... like the back part of the vehicle wasn't affected [inaudible] in the immediate thermal pulse area let's say, of a conventional big explosion let's say the conventional bit explosive let's say a lot of TNT. ¹⁸
8:34 J:	Let me address that. If there was thermate - which we agree on - so you have these hot particles -- Iron principally -- in the dust being blown at the vehicles - that could also give this pattern of damage, near the buildings because of the hot particles blasting and carried with the dust and blown against the vehicles. So what I'm saying...
D:	You're thinking [inaudible] just looking at the pattern, and then again this is only hypothesis I don't think it gets to the theory

¹⁵ Where are they stored? If Deagle knows where, why does Jones say “we’re unlikely to get a car”. Don’t they want to check this out for the science? It could disprove DEW, for example!

¹⁶ But what about the evidence to back up this statement?

¹⁷ It has been established that there were at least 1,400 toasted cars taken to the junk yard. How many cars can fit on Vesey Street? Certainly 1,400 cars can't fit there –therefore they all couldn't have been parked adjacent to the WTC. If they claim they are all from the underground parking garage, how did they get toasted there? If that were the case, that's pretty good evidence the lower levels weren't crushed. But, still, how could thermite splash on them in the basement?

¹⁸ Again, directed energy effects are being discussed here (even if from some EMP or Micronuke weapon to which Deagle alludes) so this contradicts the earlier statement about “no evidence of directed energy” – see footnote 6.

	level but if you look at the effects - if it was indeed - these vehicles were at a distance away there they're at a distance that is so great that the thermal pulse is unlikely and also the kind of damage indicates that it is more Para-magnetic than thermal... in other words the damage would have affected, say, mirrors but yet would not have melted the vehicle. ¹⁹
J:	Let's see - I have looked at those corroded vehicles quite carefully - I have discussed them with a number of people – scientists - and what you see is pock-marks in some cases which affects the metal and it appears to be quite corrosive this would be consistent worth... a ... sulphur - like a sulfidation attack.
D:	Yeah, I mean we could have a combination of both. You could have a combination of pyroclastic jets of super hot iron and sulphur compounds like we're talking about - and a Para-magnetic... because you can have both... or you could have had a combination because one of the things I was told that happened in Oklahoma City is that they had layers. Whenever you do a controlled demolition whether its... and I talked to munitions people since 911 on this who have worked inside of military - the Army Corps of engineers and other people in special Ops and Delta ... say if you're ever gonna do a controlled demolition you have to use things like high explosive cord[ite] – thermate, RDX and other things and of course the thermate in the super thermate are great for cutting... but you have to have charges to blow out the sections... plus you have to have enough kinetic energy to blow - you know, giant sections... so it had to require pretty massive bombs.
10:38 J:	So we agree that there is corrosion and it could be a combination perhaps... or it could be thermate...
D:	It's probably layered. I think ²⁰ it's multiple types of detonation device.
Person	What would satisfy both of you?
J:	That's what I'm going to get at – it's what's called a crucial test.

¹⁹ Is “para-magnetic” energy the same as “directed energy”?

²⁰ ...and the evidence for this thought would be? As his results of isotopic testing are “not in yet” – see footnote 29.

	What we want is a test that doesn't allow for both hypotheses or a combination - but rather one will say this, the other will say that. [yeah] And I think that we agree that radio isotopes due to neutron activation would be would-be a conventional test.
D:	Plus if we got what I would have got what for example I call that Girder Fry which is like – that giant girder which was curved like a big... could that girder - that giant girder be - be fried literally fired by hot gases or whatever from conventional thermate or super thermate or other high explosives other than that and melted this giant girder. And if indeed we did have neutron activation we have iron and [iron] 58 isotopes.
J:	Okay. Here we go now – Iron - you agree that... 59... iron 59?
D:	Well you're going to get iron 59 and 58. 58 is stable... a stable isotope.
J:	So what we want is to look for short-lived isotopes.
D:	... and and longer ones too. You will see some long stable isotopes.
J:	Okay but what we want is the ones that would represent neutron activation - cobalt 60 might be... iodine 110... ²¹
11:59 D:	Yeah exactly yeah. So if you show these heavier isotopes then that's going to help, yeah. Something I'm not sure about half-lives, but cobalt 60 has a half life, I think, of 5 years.
J:	yeah but that's enough... because were only at five-and a half years now.
D:	So we could pick out... if we could find cobalt 60 which is one of our tests – isotopes we're testing. And the other thing I don't know if it was done, or if you did more work on this was - did we test for other chemical residues because super thermate by itself is enough to cut them but you have to have another high explosive to blow the pieces apart once they're cut.
Person	Isn't it true, though that the super thermate if it is a fine dust near the outside of the building exploded?

²¹ The repeated reference to Iodine 110 – before it changes to 131 – is puzzling. The stable Isotope of Iodine is 127 and 110 seems more obscure – so why are they *both* talking about it – this is unclear?

J:	That's correct.
13:10 D:	It'd be explosive but what I think - there's always this degree of redundancy when you are going to explode like the [inaudible] in Las Vegas - so they have redundant systems – so it's almost certain that they have layers of ... of explosive type of things - this is just a hypothesis they probably used backups to make sure that whenever this is going down they couldn't afford like for example – who knows - I think it was WTC 6 - of the 26 floors from the top you saw – in the video... a portion of the building literally turn and then tilt and then, all of a sudden, that building just went poof ²² so whatever turned that building into you know a destructive ye know ash cloud had to be powerful enough to literally take that tilted piece - that could have fallen over and fallen a great distance and literals turn it into fine particles whether they're nano-particles or just the dust.
Person	Could that be just conventional weapons?
D:	Sure it could be. The only way is to first test the hypothesis is to measure things like neutron activation. But I wonder if there's other chemical tests that I said - that measure chemical residues for other [inaudible]... did anybody test those?
13:44 Person	How close are we to finding out this kind of a measurement?
D:	Did anybody test those?
J:	Let's get back to the ... let's get back to the crucial test - neutron activation. So we're looking for radio isotopes that will tell us whether or not there were neutron... nuclear explosives.
D:	Right.
J:	So let's look for example at... and I know you're doing some testing...
D:	Yeah we're going to do some testing... and we expect that as little as 10% of the of the ash material of the buildings for the whatever particle size to be acceptable to actually do the test on

²² This is a term Dr. Wood has used...

	because we expect that and - I’m certain – that you’re right and there was thermate or super thermate ²³ in the building which would have generated a type of ash which would not show neutron activation but there may be additional material in parts of the building where they may have used these devices [inaudible] within 50 or 100 yards... [inaudible]
J:	What size of mini-nukes are you talking...?
D:	The ones I was told they removed unexploded from the Oklahoma City Murrah building and the guy who told me got court marshalled - and I got fired into [inaudible] so I can believe him - were 1/10 of a kiloton Micro nukes U.S. Army Corps of engineers and that they measured tritium which means that they’re...
J:	These are initiated with a fission reaction ?
14:52 D:	He didn't give me the details on that. They were U.S. Army Corps engineers fourth-generation Micro nukes and what I was told from other contacts is that they have Micro nukes now that can be activated by very high-powered magnetic pulses and lasers and that they have those fourth-generation type of Micro nukes available now. [inaudible] – no, this is classified stuff that I was told.
J:	Let me see if we can actually get to 1/10 kiloton fusion bombs we have a solution to our energy problems I don't... you know... without using fission as the initiation... I really doubt that those exist ... are you sure they exist?
D:	That's what he told me.
J:	Who told...? ²⁴
D: 15:33	It was a special op agent that told me this...
J:	... without fission. But... okay. But still you get....
D:	But they might have ²⁵ a fission / fusion bomb.

²³ No evidence has been provided that Super Thermate was or has been used or is in use anywhere.

²⁴ Why does Jones stop in mid-sentence? Isn’t he supposed to ask Deagle who told him this? Surely, Deagle could just say “I can’t tell you” – Jones has no need to worry, does he?

²⁵ So do micronukes exist, or not? The “common or garden” Hydrogen bomb is a fission/fusion bomb – nothing new there...

J:	But either way...
D:	Yeah - you can have a fission/fusion bomb but I was also told by other contacts that they have had – they have fourth-generation nukes that actually use they have are very high-powered or giga-tesla-type pulsed magnetic effects ²⁶ in order to create a fusion reaction and also these super high-powered lasers ²⁷ . So I'm not sure... I mean .. I was told this...
J:	In the data - that I find it quite hard to believe in the fusion...
16:07 D:	One of the things that happened... I found this out from my... you know many years working on different things working on some projects externally and internally ²⁸ is that even up to the university level - that at any of the universities you only receive the top 4% of what is called the doorstep of knowledge and whenever you get into these highly classified programs that it's on a need to know basis and it's extremely - it's extremely narrow in scope and on a need to know basis so that they normally have budgets that are unending and when they tried to recruit me to work on the super soldier program at UCLA by Professor Dr. Wallace [Chartle?] had spent 22 and half million just on personal acquisitions of equipment from his own office. And he told that there's no end to the budget so, but what I'm saying is that the level of this in the public universities is nowhere near what the actual state-of-the-art in facilities which are totally classified in these government...
J:	Well, let's get back to the test for radio isotopes...
17:10 D:	Yeah, we're going to be testing in 1 or more labs and if it's negative because I agree that it will give even more support – but I am also wondering if there were additional things besides thermate and – the reason is we want to check those because here's the key issue to me... if it shows it wasn't and they used thermate, will they go directly to nukes next time? Or will they use a combination of the same kind of things and the next type

²⁶ What exactly is a “giga-tesla-type pulsed magnetic effect”? If it's a magnetic effect, it sounds like it could be a directed energy effect...

²⁷ Why would high powered lasers be used to set off a detonation in a building? Wouldn't ordinary remote detonation be used? It sounds like Deagle is getting confused with the experimental lasers used to initiate a fusion reaction in “hot fusion” programs (called Inertial confinement fusion - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inertial_confinement_fusion)

²⁸ What projects? Externally and internally to/from what or where?

	of explosive to destroy the [inaudible] cities?
J:	The next one is a little beyond the question. It's an important issue... [right because...] but I would like to focus on... so you will look for radio isotopes? It's support looking... doing those types of tests - I think that's the way to do it. The crucial test if you see an abundance and not just, ye know fluctuations statistically...
D:	it's got to be a large enough margin that it goes beyond...
J:	A hundred times or something the iron 58 or 59 or the iodine 110 then you can say "Well this is truly anomalous - we really have something that we can home in... and so on..."
D:	It will help...
J:	On the other hand if you don't see those large excesses...
D:	Then it adds additional support to your thesis which is thermate.
J:	Well perhaps, but on the other hand - in any case we'd say - this hypothesis - we tried it we did the tests, the evidence was not there because evidence is what we require.
D:	Oh, absolutely.
J:	Yeah – so we agree on that - that's good. I'll look forward to your results ²⁹ . And I do have one more thing to say about this... because iodine 110 was tested for a month after... the – just about a month after the event... after September 11th and what was done there...
D:	Was this test by US geological?
J:	It was Leoy et al as I recall. Now...
D:	Where did they test it from? Was it water samples? Or...?
J:	It was sediment in the water.
D:	Right. And what did they find?
19:08	What they found was that they found sediment layers that

²⁹ Deagle is discussing results he hasn't had yet – so he has no evidence? Is this what he is saying? If he is so concerned about the next attacks, why has he taken so long to do the tests? Didn't he think of completing them before making a presentation at this conference?

J:	clearly identified the World Trade Centre dust on top and it's identifiable ³⁰ , as I mentioned you have the silicon rich spheres and the iron rich spheres. I mean there's no...
D:	Yeah, right because it was turned into a vapour right?
J:	No I don't agree with that but...
D:	[inaudible] Your kind of vapour [inaudible] [okay] it melted into these little tiny spheres and then kind of...
J:	... melted. Melted ³¹ it is not necessarily - evaporated but it certainly melted. OK - there we go. Let's get back to the 110. So the sediment – now the see an upper layer which is from the World Trade Centre and then the layer below. The iodine 110 was actually less in the upper layer - the World Trade Centre layer – than the layer below. To me - and this is in my paper which is a letter in the journal of 911 studies.com. This is one of the key areas we were just discussing -- 110 -- iodine...
D:	but you know the half life of 110...
J:	It's short... but..
D:	very short - in fact you can count it in days which is why after Chernobyl...
J:	But there's enough time for it to still be there... and that doesn't...
D:	Just a month later there may not be detectable levels...
J:	I have to... there would be detectable levels after a month... we agree that will 110...
D:	Plus you'd also have to have the areas of building... because I think there were layers of explosives. My thesis was not based on the idea...
J: 20:30	Iodine 131, sorry.
D:	131 yeah. 131 Disappears – we use it for medical tests and it's gone very, very quickly. [inaudible] So if you have any radio trace

³⁰ How can they know it is "clearly" identified as WTC dust? -- especially if it contains little to no iron? And, is it assumed this dust promptly sank to the bottom, right by the shore? What about the stuff that floated downstream?

³¹ Melted – but what about the dust? Was “melted stuff” in the river?

J:	The point is the sediment below was even higher than the sediment above. So obviously it lasts long enough for you to have a measurement.
D:	It could just be background...
J:	...it was made by these scientists that - there is then ...and they had other
D:	Where is the dust that they gathered – was it on a roof somewhere?
J:	It was in the Hudson river, as I recall – the sediment – and the report is... it’s in the sediment [yeah]... it’s in my letter... it’s quoted [it’s some distance] I just had some notes from it
D:	Well, I have several scientific questions. The first is that if it’s a month after...it would be back down in the range of background.
J:	No...It’s already lower than the sediment...
D:	It doesn’t matter...
J:	Why does the sediment below not...?
D:	No, no what happens is that – let’s say the materials in the building had to be turned into particles, OK - and let’s say that dust was blown out by thermate – right – that the wallboard and furniture and the people and everything ended up in the bottom of the Hudson river – that sediment debris if it did have activated iodine 131 would have degraded to whatever the background for that material is...
J:	... what’s the half life?
D:	The half life is something like 72 hours – it’s very very short. ³²
J:	I don’t know...
D:	It’s very very short – I am pretty sure of that – we give iodine tablets and we tell people that within 72 hours they’re back to background.
J:	If anybody has internet we can look it up. But the point is these

³² Iodine 131 has a half-life of about 8 days - 192 hours - <http://www.brainyencyclopedia.com/encyclopedia/i/io/iodine-131.html>

³³ “serious scientists analysed...” – as opposed to? “Comedy Scientists”?

	serious scientists ³³ analysed...
D:	They never went.... and looked for the other ones
J:	And the reason... no, they did look for others - and it's in my paper – have you read actually my letter that addresses the many new hypotheses?
D:	I have looked at some of those things.
J:	Did you read my paper in the Journal?
D:	I think I remember having a look at that yeah...
J:	Because this was one of the main points –
D:	Did they test for beryllium 9?
J:	They tested for Iodine 131 specifically...
D:	And they did they do that by induction and coupled [plasma microscopy?]
J:	I didn't go back to ...
D:	It's actually a calculation based on ionization, so you have to...
J:	They measured the sediment layer...
D:	But what technologies did they use?
J:	It's in their paper I'm sure...but I don't have that recollection – I quoted the result.
D:	What they do is they use a thing called induction coupled iron spectroscopy – they back-calculated the difference between the base isotopes and the other ones.
J:	In addition they looked for ... the paper also cited in my paper where the scientists looked for alpha beta and gamma emissions. They said the alpha emissions were...
D:	This is the sediment in the Hudson...
J:	No, this is now in the dust as I recall
D:	The dust at the bottom of the Hudson – yeah...
J:	No not from the bottom of the Hudson... the dust from the world trade centre – [oh yeah] dry dust. So they looked for a new [degree] alpha beta gamma [inaudible] emissions.
D:	Yeah – it was closer – if there was neutron activation produce those things – it would disappear pretty quickly though...

J:	It varies a lot. I mean cobalt 60 – lasts a long time...
D:	Oh yes – Cobalt 60 – but....
J:	Iron 58 I think lasts quite a while too.
D:	Yeah – but then indeed but depending on the basis - cobalt 59
J:	Of course, but I mean Iron – you’ve got tons of iron ³⁴
24:14 D:	Yeah Iron, Iron – you’ve got some steel – one of the things... one of the things that was very suspicious was the fact that they hauled away the steel so quickly... but has anyone ever done any analysis for the heavy neutron activated isotopes and iron
J:	OK. I have a piece of the iron from the World Trade Centre – this was a leftover from a monument that was put together [good] ... and I have that and it’s [banded?] – it’s quite heavily bent
D:	Was it bent from a physical wrenching or was it bent from a thermal pulse?
J:	I showed it to a machinist – it’s hard to tell – it’s clearly an angle iron - it’s clearly opened [?]
D:	What you want to do is have a piece of metal that looks like it was literally cooked like that Girder Fry like you see in the pictures...
J:	It does have some residue [yeah] on it ...
D:	In other words it looks as if it was cooked by a high pressure – very hot temperature thermate, you know like you talked about or the idea of a thermal pulse – from a mini-nuke or a conventional weapon you want to see if the neutron activation – I only think a percentage of the actual debris of the building would be acceptable to the task which is why my guess is less than 10% of the material that you would see would probably be samples where that might have occurred.
J:	...interesting. In any case this is [worth testing] and I did look at just... I’m not saying this is the most sophisticated test, certainly, but I looked with a Geiger Counter and this is about gosh ... last year...

³⁴ Was there a lot of Iron in the WTC? Or was it steel? There is only a comparable tonnage of iron to that of whatever thermate (if any) that there was,

D:	Yeah - most of the isotopes though will be stable not radioactive...
J:	I guess you know the answer... it's in my paper. There was no radioactivity [yeah] in this iron ³⁵ – this steel from the World Trade Centre [yeah] that had been heavily damaged and indeed there was a flow of material on it so...there's nothing above background and that the results are the... numerical results are given in my paper. I encourage you to read it...
D:	Yeah, yeah - one of the things about Iron and neutron activation is only a very tiny amount of the isotopes have a relatively short half-life are going to be the radioactively stable ones like Iron 58 are not radioactive long... ³⁶
J:	So the point is, I summarized in my paper [yeah] various studies that had already looked for radio isotopes including Iodine 131, alpha gamma and beta emitters and of course for myself I looked at the steel and the dust [right] [inaudible] McKinlay so it will be interesting if you see something that I missed...
D:	What we're going to be doing is that we're using a technology [inaudible] because we also have to use the right technology because we're going to be looking for stable isotopes above background by a marginally wide enough to see if it shows the isotope ratios that would indeed indicate there was enough mixing in the pyroclastic clouds that would be spreading and mixing and also....
J:	Why are you looking at the stable isotopes?
D:	No - we're looking for these – these ones like the higher and heavier isotopes like you know ones like – like Beryllium 9 and ten ³⁷ you know Niobium 94 ³⁸ and Cobalt 59 and 60.
J:	Well Cobalt 60...

³⁵ Repeated references to IRON – was it iron or steel they tested?

³⁶ Iron 58 is a STABLE isotope – not radioactive.
<http://www.americanelements.com/fe58.html>

³⁷ Beryllium 10 has a half life of 1.51×10^6 years - <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beryllium> why is Deagle looking for this?

³⁸ Niobium 94 has a half-life of 20,300 years <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niobium> why is Deagle looking for this?

D:	The [principle was there?] if we find the heavier isotopes of Beryllium – that's going to be a real [cruncher] because Beryllium is rare to see in places like – in and around a nuclear device.
27:30 J:	OK - So we need to analyse [?] that you're working – that's good – that's the results are not yet in - OK
D:	Oh no - we'll see and again we're planning on running probably these 3 samples ³⁹ and if we get repeated samples negative there – if we get positive we're trying doing it in a different lab – we're also asking people like yourself – you're a physicist ⁴⁰ – and samples of what you have and use similar types of technology if we get positive – we have to have somebody independent like yourself go and test not only test the samples you have but other ones to see if – even say one sample in 20 is positive for some of the isotopes by a wide enough margin...
J:	That's important. You need the plus or minus too...
D:	Right plus or minus ⁴¹ – and a range of coincidence – you need enough samples positive – and it should be done not just by a range of individuals – so you can't say he has an agenda so he's trying to prove his theory so you can end up with independent corroboration...
J:	You need some independent [inaudible] as we've done with the iron-rich spheres.
D:	Yeah – you've proven this thermate dust...?
J:	I think we're in fairly good agreement on what needs to be done and I hope you will look at some of those other studies which I did...
29:10 D:	Oh yeah – I'll look at those and again I'm a scientist - I want to find the facts – I'm not just looking to the idea of finding the mechanism which brought down the towers – which I think you've shown is thermate and superthermate are there.

³⁹ Where did Deagle get his samples? Is he testing Jones' sample from which some of the Thermite evidence was supposedly determined? The McKinley dust? Where did the 2 other samples come from?

⁴⁰ Good that he remembered this...

⁴¹ Plus or minus what? 10% - 20%? Units? Quantities? What margins of error are acceptable? How about a nice graph with error bars, perhaps?

	<p>I'm very concerned with what I have been told from my contacts inside the Special Ops Delta and other agencies the next major 2 events that we are worried [inaudible] pandemics like I mentioned this about talk about the Sunday test in Philadelphia - but also the danger of nukes going off and they will not just use conventional thermate, superthermate – the next event they're gonna do in US cities will be nukes going off in US cities – just like the Virginia[?] harbour the test at the end of April 27 when they finished the test was a 100 kiloton nuke going off in Virginia[?] harbour and they did similar tests last year in Charleston, South Carolina. Their idea was to do a wargame simulation with not only North American, Canadian and US but also British Security Services but also bring in Foreign troops to control the population...</p>
29:40 J:	<p>Yeah – let me mention one thing to finish because I think we're pretty well in agreement of goals and concerns. On the idea of some operations⁴² – some event - in the United States blamed on Iran...</p>
D:	<p>They want to attack Iran between now and the fall is a particular danger period because I think they want to attack before Ramadan next year.</p>
30:05 J:	<p>OK. One other exercise is that we have learned that with evidence we can learn a great deal so if there is an event and - we won't even name a city⁴³ lets just say an American city - blamed on Iran, certainly there will be 9/11 truthers nearby and I hope they realize the importance of collecting a sample [right] whether that's dust ... [also radiation] right - having a radiation detector handy if you've got one – whether it's Geiger - if you send me a sample I'd be glad to look at it and I'm sure you would too, Bill⁴⁴. So, if there is such an event the point – the</p>

⁴² Who will be carrying out these “operations”? Al Qaida, “Son of Al Qaida” – isn't this important too?

⁴³ Why won't Jones name a city? Deagle names a City – see footnote 47.

⁴⁴ This whole section is quite extraordinary – and a whole separate commentary could perhaps be written on this. Some main points though – a) If there was such a terrible disaster, wouldn't the authorities deal with it? They should do the tests, take samples – not “volunteers”. (b) So, a city is nuked – then 9/11 truthers casually go out with their “Wal-Mart” Geiger counters – altruistically not being worried about getting themselves irradiated. They collect the samples and send them to “the man with the scientific method”? and Deagle agrees!! Crazy stuff...

	reason I’m emphasizing this is because it’s a bit of a warning if there are perpetrators thinking about – such another 9/11 they’d better think twice because 9/11 truthers are out there – we’re watching. We will get samples – we know what to do – evidence-based studies – we can do very quickly and we can put an end to lies - on the next 9/11 if it [inaudible] ... which I hope we’ll avoid... is what I’m trying to say...
D:	Well we’ve already probably stopped them – a lot of the work that you’ve done – many other 9/11 truthers...
J:	And Alex Jones...
D:	And Alex Jones and all the great leaders. I think what we’ve done we probably don’t know how many 9/11 type events we’ve already stopped.
J:	It could well be – good point.
Person	How shall people retain continuity of evidence and get that to you?
D:	Chain of custody...
J:	Chain of custody it’s very important...right
31:50 D:	I could tell because I’m a medical legal expert on this. What you want to do is you want to bring it to an attorney or another [public?] and you actually have to sign an affidavit you collected the specimen on a specific date legal [inaudible] it needs to have a chain of custody ⁴⁵ signed and sealed and a seal that can’t be broken – if that seal is broken it means the chain is broken but the bag has to go in a steel container to a laboratory by signed courier with a chain of custody number on it but a riser[?] has to give an internal chain of custody number intake so that there’s no breaking of the chain [inaudible]
J:	I think it’s an important point – we’re talking about amateur people – helpers – and so if you get multiple people – 3 or more, for example – filming someone, filming someone collecting and then seal that in a bag and the dust as we have learned has a great deal of information carried with it [right] and that can then be taken to [inaudible] that’s fine and it seems to me that if it’s video-taped the procedure – I mean,

⁴⁵ Apparently Jones’ McKinley dust sample does not have a chain of custody like the one Deagle describes, so how can an International trial be initiated with any evidentiary foundation? Does Deagle have a chain of Custody for the 3 samples he is “testing”?

	these people that are collecting are not going to know to gather iodine 131 and plus an equal amount of cobalt 60, no, they're just gonna collect the dust and send it... I think we'll get a very credible case in a very short time if – if we can have co-operation of – truthers - if there is another 9/11-like event we can now do something to stop this - so that's a great goal.
D:	Yeah – I think that ... I really believe that meetings like this are - have stopped the death of millions. What I was told back in 94 by a special agent - she was in a cold-sweat telling me this - that at that time they already had 22 cities pre-wired with nukes and they told me the names of the cities that are targets ⁴⁶ .
J:	I heard of some of these names – one's not far from here actually [yes – Seattle] ⁴⁷
Person	I would just like to make a comparison Dr. D: - on a scale of 1 to 100 what percentage do you say that you agree with Dr. Jones' thesis that thermate was used in...
D:	Oh I am... 100% that thermate was used – 100% [He was just saying]
Person	The difference between your 2 theories - if I'm getting it right - is Dr. Jones is not pursuing a thermonuclear bring-down of the World Trade Centres – and you're continuing to do research...
D:	We're just researching it to make sure – we need to know what demolished it and if it was superthermate then it means it's powerful enough to bring down these 2 towers ⁴⁸ and create debris piles and all the anomalies that we saw. If it wasn't, I think – it's my own opinion now – if we do find evidence of nukes in the World Trade Centre and we're gonna also get the concrete cap off the Murrah building because there was – and I was told this by the special agent – that told me this – there was 2 unexploded micronukes a C4 pineapple, RDX and there was

⁴⁶ So why has Deagle kept this information to himself? If he knows acts of terrorism are going to be committed, is he not committing a crime by not taking this information to the Dept of Homeland Security or whoever?

⁴⁷ So, presumably, this information has been passed to the authorities in Seattle so that they can find out where the nukes are – they've been there for a few years – so, isn't it now time to find them and disable them?

⁴⁸ Can't Superthermate be tested in controlled conditions to establish its destructive potency? Wouldn't this be a better way to make such a determination?

	thermate in the building that was not exploded in the Oklahoma city Murrah building, OK? ⁴⁹ I was told that face to face by this agent – Special Ops agent – so I know there was thermate in the building. What I am concerned about is if I think if there is any evidence at all that there was the use in some portions of the building of micronukes – it greatly increases the danger I think of nukes going off in US cities in the next few months.
Person	[inaudible] You said thermate is used to help bring the building down – but also...
J: 35:13	Oh absolutely – C4 or RDX
D:	Yeah – there could have been others ones– they had a whole bunch of layers ⁵⁰ – like this guy literally told 5 or 6 things and he spent hours with me explaining because of my background as a chemist before I went into medicine I was a biochemist ⁵¹ – and so I understood and I said – you gotta explain this to me because he’s a frantic munitions guy and he’s told me there were layers in these buildings – like a work of art. My thesis as I mentioned before is that I think that they literally blew out the building, with the thermate in the floors ⁵² and so on but that they took out the core of the building with these micro-nuclear devices. Now that could be wrong if they used thermate there too – but if they did use it to bring out the core of building using – thermate - and there may have been with micronukes they may have started from upper floors and done it so many floors apart – that changes the thesis of what they might do when they do their next operation ⁵³ – because it’s a kind of controlled demolition if they take out 16 or 20 blocks of say Los Angeles – and like the top 3 cities – LA is one of the top 3

⁴⁹ Readers might also compare the damage in the Murrah building with that in WTC 6 (<http://www.drjudywood.co.uk/#History>)

⁵⁰ What evidence is there that they use “layers” of explosives to destroy buildings? How was this done in Okalahoma – can Deagle supply more details?

⁵¹ Deagle has a very impressive cv – Medical and Legal Doctor – chemist and Biochemist. Good for him!

⁵² In how many floors? All of them – half? ¾ etc?

⁵³ Again, who is doing the operation? Can’t they be traced and stopped or is the attack inevitable?

	cities that's likely to be hit, OK? And so...
Person	[inaudible] radiation... if you're using nuclear bombs...
D:	It depends if it's a fourth generation or they have...
Person	... would have a lot of contamination that would spread evenly.
D:	Well, remember - they're not dirty bombs – remember these bombs now, the new fourth generation nukes and I was told this by people in the NSA – the bombs that they have now - since the 1950's they - have types of nuclear bombs that generate mostly gamma rays – mostly neutrons like a neutron bomb from battlefield weapons mostly electromagnetic pulse – so they can have weapons that give very little blast but give a massive electromagnetic pulse so they can be very selective in the energy distribution patterns of the type of weapons they have now - and I was told and this again is stuff that's not conventional - and that they can detonate these without having to use a nuclear fission/fusion type ye know triggering thing ⁵⁴ – but use these ultra-powerful magnetic pulses that have lasers in order to actually generate nuclear explosions.
J:	If they really have that, we have an energy solution so... these guys are...
D:	Well they're sitting on...they don't want to have...
J:	They're sitting on it...?
D:	Course they are...
J:	I don't think [inaudible] had a chance to ask your question did you? ⁵⁵
37:17 Person:	Well I guess my biggest point here – questions to both of you – looks like you're looking for a motive for something that brought the building down other than what you both agree isn't fire...
D:	The reason I am looking for the extra additional things is because of what I know independently about the danger of the next event – because I know that we're gonna operate now with the thermate to start the international court of justice ⁵⁶ –

⁵⁴ Will the trigger be fusion or fission? How is fission achieved without critical mass?

⁵⁵ Why does Jones suddenly change the subject here, when it was getting so interesting...

⁵⁶ Chain of custody of evidence being...?

	<p>that needs to happen now – but if we get additional evidence that there were nukes. Thermate can be acquired ye know, through e-bay and through you know munitions – forensic[?] companies that can actually detonate buildings. You can’t acquire 4th generation micronukes except from the US military. Because the ones that they took from the World Trade Centre – from the Oklahoma city Murrah Building – which were, I was told, this was very specific - US Corps of Engineers – 1 tenth of a kiloton detonation excavating⁵⁷ micronukes – OK? So with those specific requirements we’re talking about only one source where they could acquire that type of detonation equipment. So if - that even makes it more damning in terms of who did the detonation. We know it was a controlled demolition and we know there was thermate in it – but if we find the evidence that there were nuclear devices even for parts – even for a part of the building, like the top or somewhere in the core then it makes it much, much more devastating for the side trying to protect against the idea that the US government and elements within the FBI and the ATF were involved because we know the first attack on the World Trade Centre in 93 and this is in the Wall Street Journal – December 24 was actually done by the FBI hiring the Egyptian munitions forensics so the grave danger here is if – if my test is negative then it actually buttresses Dr. Jones’ theory more, but if it’s positive it puts us in much more danger of them⁵⁸ actually blowing up nukes in multiple cities and it also changes the level of...</p>
J:	[inaudible] a little more [inaudible]
39:07 Person	I guess the question then is the evidence leading you to this or are you following an idea to the evidence that...
D:	We’re trying to let the science lead – when you’re a scientist you don’t try to get operating ideas – you try to look at the anomalies, develop a hypothesis that could explain it and there’s some difference in terms of our interpretation of what we have so far – but you set up a test that can determine

⁵⁷ Are they for excavation – or for controlled demolition – like in the towers? For CD, the directional control of the explosion is surely far more important than for excavation, to ensure orderly collapse of the building? Why isn’t Jones picking Deagle up on points like this?

⁵⁸ Again, who?

	whether the hypothesis is supported or not and if it is positive – if the test is negative from the heavy isotopes that we’re testing it gives absolute support ⁵⁹ to the thermate theory of Doctor Jones – if it’s negative. If it’s positive it means in addition to thermate which is already proven - that they used layers of other explosives – including nukes – they could only be sourced from the US Government or the military... ⁶⁰
Person	Just to clarify you did have a paper and several studies that said that they already tested for these?
J:	That’s right. My paper ⁶¹ – my letter in the Journal of 9/11 Studies cites other studies that have already been done looking for iodine 131 and then alpha, beta, gamma emitters and finding things in the World Trade Centre...
40:10 D:	Most of those alpha beta gamma emitters are just due to the neutron activation are – in things like calcium and phosphate – in other words those disappear pretty quickly – so what I’m looking for...
J	But some are long lives...
D	...harder to find out – again - what we’re going to find out here shortly is if the tests show positive and again is there less than say 10% of the material could even be acceptable and may even carry it because if there isn’t sufficient mixing with the areas where these “hypothetical” micronukes might have gone off ⁶² . But here’s the good thing about it - if the test is done from the neutron activation isotopes and let’s say all 3 samples are negative it means absolute support that the thermate – which I agree is there – is even more supported and then it buttresses what Dr. Jones has said even more - OK? And it means that super thermate was sufficient to do ALL of the damage ⁶³ rather than some of it and we don’t have to hypothesize... so

⁵⁹ Absolute? Or there may be another hypothesis that a negative result supports – such as the large-scale use of DEW?

⁶⁰ So that’s who – perhaps the military needs to be questioned, then?

⁶¹ Is it a paper or a letter? Being a letter, it is less likely to have been peer-reviewed. Why write a letter to his own journal?

⁶² So, still no evidence, in this evidence-based discussion, of micronukes?

⁶³ But Jones suggests use of C4 or RDX and Deagle says (see 35 “a whole bunch of layers”) which therefore contradicts the notion of Superthermate doing ALL the damage.

	it's not – it's actually – because it's science – science moves forwards rather than ye know, sideways it means that it adds additional support rather than taking away from it. ⁶⁴
Person	One less theory to consider....
D	Well it's also very serious - it means that super thermate had to be put in there and it actually supports what Dr. Jones said.
J	Can I mention one thing just for the record here... [sure thing] which I - There is a form of thermate TH3 that's used by the military in grenades – that's correct. But what I wanted to mention – this I didn't say publicly but I would at least like to get it on the record – in case something happens- but in the dust we recently – this student ⁶⁵ and I – looking at the dust – optically we see these red specks – lots of them in the dust. That's curious – these are not spheres – they're chunks, and pieces – they look like shells – like an egg shell – kind of. Thicker than that – but that's what they look like a broken up egg shell.
D	You mean under a scanning electron microscope?
J	No – this is optically and looking at the material under a microscope – oh about 100x (power) yes -
D	So they're pretty big chunks?
J	They're a fairly good size ⁶⁶ – that's right, now we go to the scanning electron microscope and do the EVS testing and we see Iron, Aluminum and Sulfur in these chunks – and what [inaudible] it could be the thermate before it's exploded and then it just broke into pieces so that's something we're pursuing...I'm not saying that's...
D	You mean the thermate – before the thermate might have been exploded or broken?
J	That's right – before the reaction – this material in this shell

⁶⁴ It very much sounds like Deagle wants to support the thermite hypothesis – which he already regards as proven – and this really says nothing – “science moves forwards?” “sideways”? This says nothing!

⁶⁵ So is Dr. Jones working with Students in his retirement? On what foundation? Who is now funding his research in retirement?

⁶⁶ Why have these only been discussed now? Where are they from anyway, the Mckinlay dust? Has Jones only just noticed them after a year?

	form – so we’re pursuing that. That would be a great discovery to find it after and before.
D	So in other words there may have been some thermate areas that weren’t exploded...
J	...that did not explode – that were blown up and you have these little pieces now...
D	Oh really?
J	Yes – and so we’re very excited...
43:05 D	So by [inaudible] testing that if for example the test is positive for the radio isotopes and you look at this and it does show fragments of unexploded thermate – then it could further support not only the thermate theory – but the thermate + micronukes.
J	Sure. So we’re pursuing... you know the data leads you along and I think that was one of the curdisis [?] points and it’s quite exciting [yeah] as a scientist – it’s a bit of an adventure – wow well - that there’s some red stuff – I am not sure why it’s red ⁶⁷ – but it has aluminum sulfur and Iron and then that just matches what you expect from Thermite, but of course as a citizen you say well this is really getting very obvious.
D	Yeah well, I gotta thank you. I really think that the end-statement...
J	Thank you – good talking
D	I really think that if this is positive it just adds another layer it does not disprove the thermate/thermite 100% agree that and there’s no directed energy weapons or any other exotic type of thing that could’ve done it ⁶⁸ .
J	Alright. Good. We’re in quite good agreement – yes thank you.
D	Yeah – you’re welcome – take care
J	You too.

⁶⁷ Can’t it be analysed with a mass-spectrometer?

⁶⁸ One thing they can really agree on is that directed energy weapons were not involved!

7. A Touch of "The Hidden Hand"?

July 28th 2007

I write this piece having some feelings of guilt, which may seem silly or strange, but that is how I feel.

I was, on July 26th, scheduled to chat with a man called Ambrose Lane on a show called "We Ourselves", which goes out on a channel called "XM Channel 169 - The Power"^{lxviii}. Ambrose has other unrelated shows on WPFW a Pacifica station covering the Washington D. C. metro area as far north as Baltimore and as far south as Richmond VA. Ambrose's shows are archived at <http://www.weourselves.org/show/index.html>.

However, the call for me to go on the show on July 26th, at 8pm (BST), never came - and I wondered why. The following day, I found out. The Network "XM Channel 169" which hosted the "We Ourselves" show had cancelled it and fired the host (Ambrose Lane). This came as a shock to everyone and, as far as I know at the time of writing, XM have given Ambrose Lane no credible reason for their sudden decision.

In this article, I have tried to put together the main points that I was hoping to have discussed in the interview.

On the show, I was due to be speaking with Dr. Judy Wood as well - about the latest evidence she has found which shows that an advanced but unknown type of Directed Energy Weapon was used to destroy most of the WTC complex^{xl}. Over the last few months and weeks I have been in regular communication with Dr. Judy Wood regarding her ongoing study and presentation of this evidence. There are a number of reasons for counting this as the strongest hypothesis - it explains the most evidence, such as:

- Lack of large debris (most of the material the towers were made of was almost instantly "dustified", with only a few steel girders left – the "steel was shipped to china" statements seem to have been a cover story - as we have seen no evidence this "shipping" actually happened).
- Lack of molten metal (this is commonly spoken of and is mentioned in some 9/11 truth videos and testimonies, but there is no photographic evidence of its existence. Indeed, the photographs that Dr. Wood has shown us contradict the idea of its existence. For example, there is no "steam explosion" when rain fell on the area where molten metal was supposed to have

been in the immediate period following the destruction of the WTC).

- The Bath tub was not sufficiently damaged by the enormous amount of debris which should've fallen into it – we know that Lower Manhattan was never flooded.
- “Toasted Cars” – over ½ a mile from the WTC.

You can see all the evidence laid out at <http://www.drjudywood.com>.

Following a number of stories that have recently appeared in the Press and on the Web, and following discussions with a mutual friend of Dr. Wood and myself, Frank Ferguson, we had developed a concern that this weapon (because we accept it exists) could be used again in the next False Flag operation - perhaps to "fake" the "threatened" Al Qaida Nuclear attack - on US soil in, shall we say, a very significant place – such as Washington DC.

Our concerns were amplified in recent days, as we have heard more and more “terror talk” from the likes of Michael Chertoff saying^{lxxiv}:

"I believe we are entering a period this summer of increased risk...Summertime seems to be appealing to them," he said of al-Qaida. "We do worry that they are rebuilding their activities."

Also, Air Force Gen. Victor "Gene" Renuart has said ^{lxxv}:

...that while the terrorism threat within the nation's boundaries has increased in the past year. He added, "Am I concerned that this will happen this summer, I have to be concerned that it could happen any day."

Additionally, on 19th July Paul Craig Roberts -- a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Reagan was quoted as saying^{lxxvi}:

"The administration figures themselves and prominent Republican propagandists ... are preparing us for another 9/11 event or series of events," he said. "You have to count on the fact that if al Qaida is not going to do it, it is going to be orchestrated."

Added to these ominous statements, one of the main items we wished to discuss was an article that appeared in the Washington Post on 10 May 2007, entitled “Bush Changes Continuity Plan” ^{lxxvii}

In this article it mentions:

"The prospect of a nuclear bomb being detonated in Washington without warning, whether smuggled in by terrorists or a foreign government, has been

cited by many security analysts as a rising concern since the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks."

towards the end of the article it says:

"White House's Homeland Security Council staff. [Frances Fargos] Townsend is to produce an implementation plan within 90 days. Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff will continue to coordinate operations and activities, the directive said."

An item of particular interest to me which has received no mainstream and little if any alternative media coverage (such as on Infowars.com), is contained in portions of a discussion that took place at the Vancouver 9/11 Truth Conference on June 24, 2007. This bizarre discussion was between Brigham Young University (BYU) Physics Professor, Steven E Jones and Dr. William Deagle. In it, Dr. Deagle stated that "22 US cities have been pre-wired with nukes." They were also discussing the possibility of "another 9/11 type attack" and, Prof. Jones was heard to say (about 30 minutes into the discussion – see Chapter 6):

"One other exercise is that we have learned that with evidence we can learn a great deal so if there is an event and - we won't even name a city - lets just say an American city - blamed on Iran, certainly there will be 9/11 truthers nearby and I hope they realize the importance of collecting a sample [right] whether that's dust ... [also radiation] right - having a radiation detector handy if you've got one - whether it's Geiger - if you send me a sample I'd be glad to look at it and I'm sure you would too, Bill . So, if there is such an event the point - the reason I'm emphasizing this is because it's a bit of a warning if there are perpetrators thinking about - such another 9/11 they'd better think twice because 9/11 truthers are out there - we're watching. We will get samples - we know what to do - evidence-based studies - we can do very quickly and we can put an end to lies - on the next 9/11 if it [inaudible] ... which I hope we'll avoid..."

These really are extraordinary statements to come from two supposedly well-qualified scientists.

There seems to have been a concerted and probably co-ordinated effort on the Internet to either attack Dr. Wood herself, or divert attention from the data she presents. For example, the new association called Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth (<http://www.ae911truth.org/>) has not discussed or mentioned in any detail Prof. Wood's extensive study – even though Prof. Wood herself has degrees in engineering subjects.

Ancillary to the study of the WTC photographic evidence that Dr. Wood has studied, it has been found that a number of companies that NIST contracted to contribute to the NCSTAR 1 report have links to Directed

Energy research or products. One example is ARA (Applied Research Associates – www.ara.com) who produced the plane crash animations. They also are a defence contractor and Silver Level Founding Sponsors of the Directed Energy Professional Society (DEPS)^{lxxviii}

As a note to this area of study, former transport secretary, Norman Mineta, is frequently quoted as someone who tried to highlight anomalies in the story of VP Cheney's account of what happened with the supposed plane which hit the Pentagon. (Mineta stated to Lee Hamilton, of the 9/11 Commission, that Mineta was in a bunker when Cheney apparently declined to give a shoot down order for a plane that was about to crash into the Pentagon^{lxxix}. Note that if the events went as Mineta described, the fellow coming and going from the room wouldn't have had time to leave the room and return. If the "plane" were actually travelling at 550 mph, 10 miles is covered in about 1 minute. Part of that time would be spent in the dialog, "do the orders still stand?" So, it would seem unlikely that this fellow would have time to even leave the room and return for the next dialog. It turns out that Mineta himself was former Vice President of Lockheed Martin^{lxxx} – one of the world's biggest defence contractors and also one the primary contractors in the Airborne Laser Project which is described as "America's first directed energy weapon system"^{lxxxi}

Conclusion

We therefore seem to have a range of evidence that a directed energy weapon was used as the primary method of destruction a number of the WTC buildings. We have also seen the links between certain people who would seem to support "9/11 truth" and directed energy contracts or projects.

We have seen a number of statements suggesting that a large-scale or nuclear attack on the USA by Al Qaida is imminent. Within certain quarters of the 9/11 truth movement, we have seen the suggestion that "mini-nukes" were used in the destruction on the WTC and that US cities already have them "pre-wired".

If we posit that the mini-nuke idea is another "cover story" for what happened on 9/11, and we consider that the Directed Energy Weapon might be orbital, it would potentially allow the 9/11 perpetrators to fake a nuke attack on a target of their choice. The main point here is that any real nukes being moved by land, air or sea would probably be, at some point, detected if any of the current security systems actually function in any useful way. However, the Directed Energy Weapon cannot be detected by any of the usual land-based systems (and who would be looking for it anyway).

If the 9/11 perps have a plan similar to what I have suggested above, then it makes sense that they would try to shut down any discussion of ideas which may uncover it, and they would try to attack or discredit those involved in such discussion. I am therefore given to wonder, was this the motive behind Ambrose Lane's show being cancelled on the very day on which these issues were due to be discussed?

There is, of course, the possibility that part or parts of this conjecture could be entirely wrong – I hope all of it is wrong actually. Weighed against the possibility that a false flag attack on US soil equalling or exceeding the scale of 9/11 will happen soon, am I, as the author of this article, prepared to be criticised for being unrealistically rash, extremist or plain silly in my conclusions? You bet your top, middle and bottom dollar I am.

8. Going In Search of Planes: Re-visiting NYC 9-11 First-Responders' Accounts

Based on a report which contains contributions by

Morgan Reynolds ♦ Russ Gerst ♦ Jeff Strahl

CB Brooklyn ♦ Cathy Palmer

October 2007

Listening to Those Who Were There

As we continue to delve into what happened on Sept 11 2001, we seem to be uncovering more evidence that some very strange things were happening near and at the World Trade Center in New York City when the towers were destroyed.

A re-examination of videos of the plane crashes and both the actual destruction of the towers and the aftermath seems to strongly suggest or even prove that (a) unconventional weaponry destroyed the towers and (b) the stories of large planes hitting the towers are bogus. For (a) one can simply ask “Where did the building go?” (and no, it wasn’t “into the basements”). For (b) one can simply ask “How can a hollow tube made of light materials cut through multiple steel girders, with little or no deceleration?”

A repeated pondering of the answers to questions (a) and (b) can lead on to a re-examination of other data about 9/11. Such a re-examination of existing data was proposed by Attorney Jerry Leaphart, in September 2007. Jerry brought to our attention the accounts / “oral histories” as given by over 500 Emergency Service “First Responders” to the 9/11 Tragedy, as posted on the New York Times Website^{lxxxii}.

These accounts were published on 12th August 2005. Mr. Leaphart originally tasked us with analysing the accounts of the responders to see what was contained in their accounts of 9/11 about seeing the plane crashes – particularly the 2nd one. We therefore shared our findings and they are discussed in the report referenced at the end of this article.

Tribute

However, I must pause for a moment and say that, whatever the conclusions of this study and however it is interpreted, we must have a large tribute and debt of thanks to those people who responded on the day of 9/11 and think of the lives they undoubtedly saved and the injuries

they helped to prevent. Many of them have suffered severely due to the adverse long term health effects of the dust they worked in while working to save people. I hope for their sake, too, that we can learn the truth about 9/11.

Delving Deeper

I decided to go “one step further” and, once I had downloaded all 500 accounts, I used text searching software to scan all the accounts and determine, primarily where each person was when the 2nd plane is supposed to have hit the tower. I also tried to determine where witnesses were when the 1st crash occurred. I then entered all this information into a database, which allowed me to more easily count who saw or heard the 2nd plane. (All the details of how this was done are contained in the report.)

In going through the accounts, I also decided to look for any use of the words “Missile” or “Rocket”, “Plane Parts”, “Luggage/Suitcases”, “Landing Gear” and witnesses hearing the F-15/F-16 planes. The witness accounts of the latter are particularly interesting to compare to their accounts of the sound of the 2nd Boeing, before impact.

A number of reports of FBI Agents talking about a possible “3rd Plane” heading for New York were also discovered, along with a number of other accounts of witnesses describing anomalous occurrences.

“I Saw The Plane... I Heard The Plane...”

The words “plane jet airplane aircraft” were found in 426 accounts, 1770 times. The final account Sample Size was used for the “Witnesses to a plane” study was 291. A few of those who simply described seeing the impacts on TV were left out, but some were included – the main focus of the study was on those who were close to where the 2nd impact happened.

16 witnesses reported seeing the 1st plane before impact and 16 witnesses reported hearing the 1st plane before impact but only 1 Witness reported clearly seeing and hearing plane 1 before impact.

I managed to establish that at least 96 witnesses were near the WTC (with ½ a mile) at the time of 2nd impact and a further 21 witnesses were inside one of the WTC buildings at the time of the 2nd impact. This gave a total of 117 witnesses who were near or the Inside WTC buildings at the time of 2nd impact.

- Only 19 of the witnesses near the WTC reported actually seeing plane 2 before impact and, as a percentage of total number near the WTC, this was 20%.
- Only 20 of the witnesses near the WTC reported actually hearing plane 2 before impact and as a percentage of total number near the WTC, this was 21%.
- Only 8 of the witnesses near the WTC reported actually seeing and hearing plane 2 before impact and as a percentage of total number near the WTC, this was 8.3%.
- Of those witnesses inside one of the WTC buildings at the time of the 2nd impact, only 2 reported hearing the plane (none saw it). As a percentage of the total of those inside WTC, this was 9.5%.
- There were 117 witnesses inside or near the WTC and 291 witnesses in the total sample I used. The percentages given below, then, are therefore based on the number 291 – 117 giving a total of 174.
- There were 33 witnesses who were further than ½ mile from the WTC Complex and reported seeing plane 2 before impact. As a percentage of the total of those who were further than ½ mile from WTC Complex, this was 19%.
- There were 2 witnesses who were further than ½ mile from the WTC Complex and reported hearing plane 2 before impact. As a percentage of the total of those who were further than ½ mile from WTC Complex, this was 1.1%.

“I Wasn’t Initially Sure it Was A Plane”

Quite a few witnesses were not at all sure that large planes had been responsible for the damage at the WTC. Accounts where they said “I didn’t realize it was a plane at the time” or “I only realized later it was a plane” were studied. Due to the different ways witnesses described being unsure about the true nature of the crash, it was difficult to pick out keywords to find these accounts. (Most of these accounts were discovered in reading them for other parts of this study.) Time limitations may have prevented finding them all.

A number of witnesses reported that they didn’t realize that the second impact was that of a plane – many of them “found out later”. This is in direct contradiction to those who reported to seeing plane parts, engine

parts and landing gear. For example, from the account of Patricia Ondrovic (File No: 9110048):

I saw a police captain that I knew, and he came out to me. He looked absolutely terrified, he was shaking, he was pale, he was sweating. I looked at him, I said what's wrong? He said there's another plane headed our way, and they just blew up the Pentagon. I said, another plane? What are you talking about? I hadn't realized that planes had hit this, I thought they just set bombs off. I didn't realize when I got there that planes hit it. I said, what do you mean another plane? He said two planes hit the World Trade Center. So I'm thinking a little Cessna. How can a little Cessna do all that damage? He said no, 757s. I said big things? See I was there for about 25 minutes before I knew that planes had crashed into this.

Similarly, the account of EMT David Timothy (File No. 9110156) expressed some doubt that he saw a plane.

The next thing I heard was a loud like an engine roar. I looked up, and the next thing I knew I just saw -- I don't know if it was the tail end of the plane or what, but I saw something. When I looked up, I heard 'boom'. I'm sorry, the north tower was the first one. The south tower then got hit when we were right there.

Perhaps even more significant was where 2 witnesses who were standing next to each other, initially, did not agree upon the idea of a plane crash. From the account of Scott Holowach (File No: 9110114)

At that time Chief Ganci was behind me and he thought there was another explosion in the north tower and that's when I turned around and said Chief, listen, there is a second plane that hit the other tower. He was like no no no no, we have another explosion. I said no, Chief, I witnessed it. I watched the plane hit the other tower. He is like are you sure. I said Chief, I'm 100 hundred percent positive I watched the second plane hit the other tower.

There was some additional confusion and rumours circulating about the nature of any planes involved. From the account of Anthony Bartolomey (File No: 9110013)

Q. When you arrived there, did any civilians report anything to you?

A. Yes. Numerous civilians were telling me that a plane had hit the building. There were discrepancies as to the type of plane. Some were saying it was a Cessna or Lear jet type, a small jet plane. Some said it was a large passenger plane. One person actually said that it was like a military style plane that actually shot missiles into the building.

There are other instances of this type of confusion. The account of Peter Fallucca (File No: 9110388) mentions a “fireball or something” and a missile attack as witnessed by a police officer:

It was a big fireball or something from the plane I guess, came from across the street in front of our rig, and as we get out of the rig, there's a cop, city police officer, in the street. He's telling us, "I'm getting out of here. I just saw a rocket." He said he saw it come off the Woolworth Building and hit the tower.

Firefighter David Sandvik (File No. 9110375) did not hear the motor of the plane, when he was *underneath the “impact” fireball...*

We start heading down the block and we get down to I guess about Church Street and the second plane hit, and I remember just being underneath. I never heard the motor of the plane, the sound of the engines. We just heard the explosion, you felt the explosion, and looking straight up and seeing that fireball that you see on the news, but we're underneath looking up now at it.

Landing Gear and Tires

There were over 10 different reports of Landing Gear being found. Some of these put the Landing Gear on Vesey Street, West Street, in a Parking Lot (which may be on West or Vesey Street), in a Jacuzzi, on top of a woman or in Rector Street. From the account of Dean Coutsouros (File No: 9110049)

...we got in front of 90 West Street, we held up there for a few minutes underneath the scaffolding to reassess the situation, how we were going to get into the building. There was all kinds of human debris. The landing gear of the aircraft was in that parking lot there. There was all kinds of stuff all over the floor.

From the account of John Breen (File No: 9110321)

We did see part of -- I didn't see it, but Jeff Johnson told me later on he did see part of the landing gear actually fell right through the roof and it was in one of the Jacuzzis in another room.

With 4 apparently separate reports of aircraft landing gear or tires being found in different locations, it is difficult to believe that these tires genuinely could have survived the crash. For example, from the account of Steve Grabher (File No: 9110241):

We came right down West Street, down here. We couldn't get too close, because by the time we got near 2 World Trade Center people were jumping off the roof like crazy. Landing near the hotel and the street was littered with body parts. I don't know if it was from the plane or what. But there was just body parts

all over the place. Chunks of meat. I saw an airplane tire. I walked past an airplane tire. What looked like an airplane tire. Again we were looking up the whole time.

Reading accounts like this, and seeing the picture of the tire under the scaffolding^{lxxxiii}, one is immediately reminded of the story of the survival of Mohammad Atta's passport.

Similarly, the sightings of luggage and suitcases do not seem to be explainable other than by the idea that this evidence was planted – how could such items survive the enormous impact and fireball, which is said to have been sufficient to destroy the WTC's structural integrity?

Federal Bureau of ... Information...?

It seems like there were a good number of FBI agents on the scene – at least one of them seemed to be promulgating reports of a 3rd plane being en route to NYC. How were they so sure, considering the confusion in the “fog of war”? Terence Rivera's account (File No: 9110343) has some interesting details.

There was a -- he wasn't a regular security guard. He had a weapon on him. I don't know if he was FBI or Secret Service and he was trying to put the pants out on one individual that was conscious. His pants were still smoldering. I took the can, fire extinguisher off the truck and then sprayed down the pants on the person that was still conscious. At that time, I had asked him where did this individual [had] come from. He told me when the plane had hit, a fire ball had shot down the elevator shaft and had blown people out of the lobby

Sometime while we were doing that, that same individual that was -- when we first got there, that was trying to put the pants out, he came over and he is saying to us that it's a terrorist attack. You guys are too close. It's a terrorist attack.

Then I went -- that same individual, the security or -- he told me to go over to the command post and let them know it's a terrorist attack. There are more planes in the air.

With repeated accounts of the FBI agents mentioning a 3rd plane attack was imminent, one is given the impression that they were unwittingly or deliberately promoting the plane stories at a time when the picture of what was happening was very likely still not at all clear.

Hearing the F15's/F16's

There seemed to be more consistency in the witnesses who reported hearing the F15's/F16's than the sounds of a Boeing (other witnesses may

have reported these as different planes). From the account of Robert Larocco (File No: 9110081):

At that point we hear a plane -- it turned out to be two planes, and they were closing in on us and the motors were getting louder and louder. All eyes went up to the sky and were looking. I kind of thought to myself as I looked at guys running for their lives and for cover that now we're going to get kamikazed. The rescue workers, they are trying to take us out. I stood there and looked at the sky all around in all directions and couldn't really tell where the sound was coming from. It was getting louder and louder. Then I spotted them, they were coming out of the west, like out of Jersey City, that way. They were two F15 fighters.

Strange Events

On page 13 of his account, Paramedic Robert Ruiz (File No. 9110333) describes an apparently spontaneous car fire:

Like things weren't bad enough already, the car that's parked right on that corner catches on fire. I don't mean a little fire, the entire thing. Don't ask me how. The entire car caught on fire. You would think maybe just a motor part or just the engine part. But this entire car just goes up in fire.

In his account (File no: 9110179), Frank Cruthers, Fire Chief mentions WTC 7 was expected to collapse:

Early on, there was concern that 7 World Trade Center might have been both impacted by the collapsing tower and had several fires in it and there was a concern that it might collapse. So we instructed that a collapse area –

Q. A collapse zone?

A. Yeah -- be set up and maintained so that when the expected collapse of 7 happened, we wouldn't have people working in it. There was considerable discussion with Con Ed regarding the substation in that building and the feeders and the oil coolants and so on. And their concern was of the type of fire we might have when it collapsed. They shut down the power, and when it did collapse, the things that they were concerned with would have been. That's about it.

Controlled Demolition of the WTC?

For quite some time, I was convinced that the mechanism of the destruction of WTC 1 & 2 had to be similar to controlled demolition – it was the only thing that could account for the near free-fall time of “collapse”. However, I have since been enlightened through the results of

Dr. Wood's study – the overall evidence does not support the idea that controlled demolition was the primary method of destruction of the towers. In examining the witness accounts, I found quite a few where the collapse was described as possibly like the sound of an approaching plane or rocket. For example, from the account of Faisal Abed (File No: 9110071):

You just heard this thrushing, thrushing noise like a rocket. I thought the building was under attack again. You just start seeing this smoke coming down. We just took off. We went north. We actually -- sorry, we went west. We went towards the river. All right. Then we just went towards the river and went up north a little bit behind the building. That was after the first one went down.

He describes a continuous noise rather than lots of explosions going off. Let us not confuse this part of the account with those accounts of earlier explosions before the towers came down, rather than as they were coming down. The repeated sequence of timed explosions heard during a controlled demolition is very distinctive and none of the witness accounts I studied described hearing this sort of sound as the towers collapsed.

What Aren't We Allowed to Know?

Patricia Ondrovic's testimony, mentioned earlier, contains redacted portions and there were a number of other portions discovered in this research, and there are almost certainly others. Having used the file searching software, it would suggest there are redactions in at least 46 accounts. One can understand why certain parts of certain accounts may be obscured – perhaps so as not to cause upset to relatives of victims or where they might reveal certain small points of sensitive information. However, suspicions should be raised in the cases where significant portions of accounts were redacted, such as those of Rene Davila (over 10 pages in File No: 9110075) and Ronald Coyne (over 4 pages in File No: 9110395).

Conclusions

On studying the accounts of the plane impacts, a confused picture appears. For the first plane, only one witness - William Walsh (File no: 9110442) specifically describes an American Airlines Plane. Other witnesses describe a whole variety of planes – some seen “out of the corner of their eye”. Some describe a military plane, some initially thought it was a small Cessna type plane. Of those witnesses who describe specifically seeing or hearing the planes, there are a number of instances where a curious turn of phrase is used at one or more points in the

account. For example, the account of Thomas Fitzpatrick (File No: 9110001).

The noise from the plane was enough to make you not want to look up. I thought the plane was actually going to land in the street to be honest with you. The noise was outrageous. When it hit the building it was even worse.

Overall, I conclude the descriptions of planes given by the witnesses do not give one any more confidence than the video material, such as that presented in the September Clues^{lxxxiv} series, that large planes hit the towers. With something as unique as 9/11, it was easy to “sell” people the plane stories in the midst of such a terrible tragedy.

There is a need for some witnesses to be questioned again about their experiences to determine the true nature of the crashes - and other anomalous events at the time of the WTC towers' destruction. I hope that someday this is possible and that the true 9/11 perpetrators are brought to account for their heinous actions.

The data and full report on which this summary article is based on can be accessed at www.checktheevidence.com

9. A “Lengthy” Discussion of The Steel in the Debris of the WTC

Inspired by the Research of Dr. Judy Wood

November 2007

Introduction


The research published by Dr. Judy Wood on her website www.drjudywood.com graphically documents the paucity of debris following the 10-seconds-per-tower destruction of two quarter-mile buildings on 9/11/01. As an attempt to numerically illustrate the level of destruction, an overall figure of the total length of steel, which should have been present in the debris pile, is here calculated.

Basic Data about the World Trade Center Towers 1 and 2

A figure of 415 metres was used for the height of the towers. These values

Parameter	Value (m)
building width	63.14
building depth	63.14
core width	41.8
core depth	26.52

Table 9-1 WTC Dimensions



The figures above^{lxxxv} were used in the calculations below.

But this pointless! The Steel Was Quickly Shipped Away!

It seems that various unsubstantiated statements have been made over time to explain the extreme level of absence of debris. One such statement is “The steel was all sold to China and shipped away promptly,

before it could be examined.” However, we have no evidence that such a large-scale operation was undertaken or completed in the immediate aftermath of 9/11. Did anyone report many fleets of trucks, filled with steel girders, driving down the streets of Manhattan to the Docks, and their loads being transferred onto large container vessels? There are no pictures or video of this supposed operation that are readily available, nor have the details of such a major clean-up exercise ever been discussed.

Can We “Count” The Debris?

In Part 1 of “The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers”^{lxiii}, published online in the Journal of 9/11 Studies^{lxiv}, Dr. Jenkins states:

Some proponents of the ‘missing debris’ hypothesis prefer to “count” the debris from photographs. This is an inherently reckless approach to the problem. Photographs offer no way to directly view all the individual steel beams in debris piles or debris occupying sublevel collapses. For instance, any attempt to “count” the beams or “wall sections” in the debris pile of WTC 7 will fall short of accounting for the total mass of the building for the simple reason that the debris is located in a pile and all photographs only show the surface. That does not mean that the rubble pile does not contain the mass of the building. Even if the debris were spread out somewhat, the same problem applies when attempting to “count” the debris.

In this article, I hope to show that, because of the sheer scale of the WTC buildings, there is considerable value in attempting to calculate other figures which illustrate the very large volume of material which should have been visible in the immediate aftermath of the WTC Towers destruction.

Calculating Approximate Total Length of Steel

Vertical Columns

The towers were 415 metres above ground, though some steel pieces would have been below ground level. There were 236 exterior (perimeter) columns and 47 interior (core) steel columns in each building.

$\begin{aligned}\text{Total Length of Vertical Steel} &= 566 \times 415 \\ &= 234890\text{m}\end{aligned}$
--

Spandrels and "Wheatchex"

The spandrel steel belts on the exterior walls were approximately 1.32m wide, and when joined, they spanned the width of one side of the building. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Approximate total length of Spandrel Steel per floor} &= 63.14 \times 4 = 252.56 \\ \text{Total Length of Spandrel Steel} &= 252.56 \times 2 \times 110 \\ &= 55563.2\text{m} \end{aligned}$$




Figure 9-1 Spandrels – "Wheatchex" - Page 27 of NCSTAR1-3B

Looking at this another way, there would have been:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Number of Exterior Columns} \times \text{No of Buildings} \times \text{Height} / \text{Group of 3 9.1 metre lengths} \\ &= 236 \times 2 \times 415 / (3 \times 9.1) \\ &= 7175 \text{ "Wheatchex" (approx)} \end{aligned}$$

How many of these can we see in the debris piles?

Trusses

The trusses spanned the interior of each floor of the building, as shown below




Figure 9-2 Diagram Illustrating Total Lengths of Truss Steel (Page 16 of NCSTAR1-3B)

Looking at the diagram,

- We have 20 pieces of Length A, top and bottom = 40 pieces of Length A
- We have 14 pieces of Length B, left and right = 28 pieces of length B
- We have 10 pieces of Length C running Top to Bottom
- We have 18 pieces of Length C running Left to Right

The actual pieces may have been arranged in a more complicated grid than that assumed using lengths A, B and C – but these would have been good approximations to the total length

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Length A is given by } & (63.14 - 26.52)/2 \\ & = 18.31 \\ \text{Length B is given by } & (63.14 - 41.8)/2 \\ & = 10.67 \\ \text{Length C is } & 63.14 \text{ metres} \\ \text{Total Length of "A" pieces would be: } & 18.31 \times 20 \\ & = 366.2 \\ \text{Total Length of "B" pieces would be: } & 10.67 \times 28 \\ & = 298.76 \\ \text{Total Length of "C" pieces would be: } & 63.14 \times 18 \\ & = 1136.52 \\ \text{Total Length of Steel Pieces in 1 floor} & \\ & = 1801.48 \\ \text{Total Length of Steel Pieces in the 2 towers} & \\ & = 1801.48 \times 2 \times 110 \\ & \\ & = 396326\text{m} \end{aligned}$$

Floorpans

Outside of the core, steel floor pans were used and these were filled with concrete. The floor area in sq metres would be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Floor area} &= 63.14 \times 63.14 - (26.52 \times 41.8) \\ &= 2878.12 \text{ sq m} \end{aligned}$$

It is understood that the floor pans were approximately 3 x 20 metres, but I have not been able to find an exact figure for this. This would mean there would likely be 48 of them per floor (if they were all the same size, which is just an approximation)

So, if we were to consider these as lengths of steel, we would have 48 lengths of 20 metres of steel per floor

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Length of Steel in Floor Pans} &= 48 \times 20 \\ &= 960\text{m} \\ \text{Total Length of Steel in Floor Pans} &= 960 \times 2 \times 110 \\ &= 211200\text{m} \end{aligned}$$

Totals

Exclusions

The total given in the next section is probably rather conservative, as there are at least 2 elements omitted from the calculation – the cross-bracing in the core and, for example, the panelling around the elevator shafts – some of which should have survived.

Totalling

Totalling the figures calculated above:

Table 9-2 Length Totals

	Metres	Kilometres	Miles
Vertical Columns	234890	235	147
Spandrels	55563	56	35
Trusses	396326	396	248
Floorpans	211200	211	132
Total	897979	898	561

So, as a rough approximation:

There should have been a total length, laid end to end of over **550 miles** of steel pieces.

Allowing a 10% margin of error in these calculations would bring the figure down to over 500 miles length of steel in the debris. Needless to say, the considerations made in this article do not consider lengths of concrete, or for example, the hundreds of miles of cabling and ducting which the towers would also have contained – little, if any, of which were seen in the debris piles.

Where Did 500 miles length of Steel Go?

The photos in this section are from www.drjudywood.com .

Did the WTC Steel End up in the basements?

There have been attempts to reduce the significance of the findings of Dr. Wood. One such attempt, authored by Dr. Greg Jenkins is called “The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers”,^{lxiii} and published online in the Journal of 9/11 Studies^{lxiv}

Part 1 of this paper is entitled “What Missing Debris?” and Dr. Jenkins writes:

If all the building debris were compacted into the damaged sublevels, then this would yield a volumetric compression ratio of 10.2%. This is within the error of the compression ratio for WTC 7, $11.5 \pm 1.6\%$. This means that, within error, all of the debris in the WTC complex can be accounted for within the sublevel collapses.

It can be suggested that there are at least 2 problems with this supposition. As the WTC towers came down, we see that there is little or no compaction going on – rather, the towers are turning to dust, so there is no physical process which would compress the debris to fit in the basements. We can categorically state that, whilst there was some debris in the basements, that debris was not especially compacted, nor did it fill the basements.

The Debris Was Not in The Basements

Photographs (and other evidence) that Dr. Wood has presented illustrate that only a small or even tiny proportion of the total debris was in the WTC Basement Levels.



Figure 9-3 - GZ workers descend into the subbasements below WTC2. While there is extensive damage, there is little building debris at the bottom of the hole. There is no

sign of molten metal. A worker in the distance walks along a massive core column.
(photo filed 9/18/01) Source^{lxxxvi}



Figure 9-4 This photo was taken inside the mall. The store sign "innovation" is visible on the left. (photo filed 9/19/01) Source^{lxxxvii}

Was the Debris Laid out Above the Basements?

This picture would seem indicate there were very few long lengths of steel in the vicinity of WTC during the afternoon of 9/11.



Figure 9-5 - On the afternoon of 9/11/01 the "rubble pile" left from WTC1 is essentially non-existent. WTC7 can be seen in the distance, revealing the photo was taken before 5:20 PM that day.

There only seem to be a few "Wheatchex" or long lengths of steel in all of the picture below. A conservative guess would perhaps be 100 "Wheatchex", in total, in all the pictures below:



Figure 9-6 here again we see the "rubble pile" from WTC1 is essentially non-existent. The ambulance is parked at ground level in front of WTC1. WTC6, which had been an eight-story building, towers over the remains of WTC1.



Figure 9-7 - The north wing of WTC4, as viewed from Church Street, looking west, appears surgically removed from the main body of WTC4, which has essentially disappeared. If WTC2 fell on it and squashed the main building, where is the part of WTC2 that did this?

10. Press Release - Scientists See WTC - Hutchison Effect Parallel

14th and 18th January 2008, Washington DC, USA - In two appearances on a Washington DC Pacifica Radio Station, WPFW, on a show hosted by Author and Political Commentator Ambrose I. Lane, Sr., Dr. Judy Wood, a former Professor of Mechanical Engineering, and John Hutchison, experimental scientist, discussed how photographic and video evidence suggest that the World Trade Centre (WTC) towers were destroyed using Directed Energy Weapons (DEW). Many of the observed effects resemble those seen in John Hutchison's experiments.

In early January 2008, Wood posted a new study on her website (<http://drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>), which relates effects seen in photographs taken before, during and after the destruction of the WTC complex, to effects seen in Hutchison's ongoing experiments. Wood and Hutchison co-authored the study.

John Hutchison is a Canadian inventor and experimental scientist who has been working with "field effects" for almost 30 years. The Hutchison Effect is a collection of phenomena discovered accidentally by John Hutchison in 1979 during attempts to reproduce the work of Nikola Tesla. Hutchison uses radio frequency and electrostatic sources. The Hutchison Effect occurs in a volume of space where the beams intersect and interfere. The results are levitation of heavy objects, fusion of dissimilar materials such as metal and wood, anomalous melting (without heating) of metals without burning adjacent material, spontaneous fracturing of metals (which separate by sliding in a sideways fashion), and both temporary and permanent changes in the crystalline structure and physical properties of metal samples.

Hutchison has reproduced his experiments many times and the results are recorded on video and have been included in a number of TV documentaries that focus on unusual scientific experiments. Hutchison's metal samples have been repeatedly tested by scientists, including a group at the Max Planck Institute in Germany, confirming Hutchison Effects.

The article by Wood and Hutchison (<http://drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>) documents effects and events seen in the vicinity of the World Trade Centre and compares these with observed characteristics of the Hutchison Effect.

The observed effects include:

“Weird Fires” - The fires seen near the badly damaged cars do not seem to ignite nearby office paper. Some photos show firefighters walking very close to or even through the fires. A video by John Hutchison shows similar looking “fires” on a model metal boat.

Bent Beams and “Jellification” - Samples that Hutchison produced show very unusual effects on metal. Sometimes the metal “jellifies,” turning soft and losing form, leading to severe bending or fracturing of the sample. Sometimes samples erupt from the centre and sometimes they turn to dust, similar to what happened to the WTC on 9/11.

Ongoing reactions - Hutchison’s samples often show an ongoing reaction, even after the energy field is removed. This “non-self-quenching” reaction seems to occur at the nuclear level. This also appears to be happening at Ground Zero (GZ). Dr. Wood’s study suggests that the WTC site is still being “decontaminated,” with trucks moving dirt into and out of the site, while “hosing down operations” continue, which Dr. Wood and Andrew Johnson photographed and recorded on video in January 2008.

Transmutation - Sometimes materials subjected to the Hutchison Effect seem to change at a molecular or even atomic level. This could be the explanation for the apparent rapid rusting at GZ, where steel rusts like iron. Also, some photographs show unusual effects on the aluminium cladding used on the twin towers that look similar to effects produced on Hutchison’s aluminum samples.

Wood, Hutchison, and Johnson appeared on two Ambrose Lane shows, “We Ourselves,” and discussed the similarities between the WTC event and the experimental evidence produced by the Hutchison Effect. “I have been collecting data over the last year and a half or so and I have found these distinct and unusual characteristics, which I have given names such as ‘fuming’ and ‘toasted’ cars – I have even noticed flipped cars in some pictures,” said Wood. “In some cases, the flipped cars are sitting next to trees that are fully covered with leaves.”

“If the flipping of the cars was caused by big explosions or ‘wind’ from the towers coming down,” asked Johnson, “how did the leaves stay on the trees?” Material scientist George Hathaway observes that the Hutchison Effect causes either lift or disruption of the material itself. Lift explains the flipped cars.

In some of his experiments, Hutchison observed “spontaneous combustion” where “fires appeared out of nowhere.” He also confirmed that Col. John Alexander and others from the U.S. military visited him in 1983 and filmed his experiments with a team from Los Alamos National Laboratories (LANL) ^{lxxxviii}. Canadian MP Chuck Cook and Dr. Lorn A

Kuehne of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) contacted him in 1986 and told him his work was “a matter of National Security.”^{lxxxix} Hutchison says he’s been told that defense contractor, S.A.I.C., has his technology and has been developing it.^{xc}

Asked about ongoing dirt removal and hosing down at the WTC complex, Hutchison commented, “I think there is an ongoing reaction or ‘infection.’” Wood noted that the damage done to the Bankers Trust (Deutsche Bank) building was repaired, but then they decided to take the building down. This evidence indicates there is a continuing reaction there. Rusting beams in the Bankers Trust building and in the temporary PATH train station also suggest ongoing reactions too.









At the end of the first show, a caller said, “This is a revelation beyond revelations...this trumps everything...If this story ever gets out, it will change the course of the United States’ and the whole world’s history.”









Another caller said during the second show, “I am thinking that these revelations we are hearing this morning should have the people so excited and so outraged that they should be flooding the lines to their congressmen and news people to get this message out as the number one story of the year.”

For more information please see:

<http://www.hutchisoneffect.com/> <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/>

WPFW Related: <http://www.weourselves.org/>
<http://www.wpfw.org/>

Phenomenon	"The Hutchison Effect"	Anomalies at the WTC
<p>Weird Fires The fires seen near the toasted cars don't seem to ignite the paper. Some photos show firemen walking very or even through them. Are they "cold" fires?</p>		
<p>Bent Beams Samples that John Hutchison has produced show very unusual effects on the metal – sometimes severe bending occurs</p>		
<p>Jellification Sometimes the metal "jellifies" - other effects are also seen.</p>		
<p>Cars/Lift and Disintegration Some WTC pictures show cars that are upside down. (How?) One of the key effects John Hutchison has reproduced many times is a "levitation" or "anti-gravity" effect.</p>		

<p>Toasted Metal & Effects</p> <p>A number metal effects have been observed in samples from the WTC and these show similar features to some of the samples made by John Hutchison</p>		
<p>Transmutation</p> <p>Sometimes, materials subjected to the Hutchison Effect seem to change at an elemental level – could this be the explanation for the rapid rusting – steel is turned into Iron?</p>		
<p>Holes</p> <p>Samples seem to end up with “voids” in them, following their experiments. Could this effect have created holes in WTC6 and other buildings?</p>		
<p>Fuming</p> <p>Could this be related to the fuming at ground zero? Could it also be the result of ongoing reactions?</p>		

11. The Hutchison Effect and 9/11 – “An Ace in the Hole?”

1st March 2008

In 2006, Dr. Wood had posted her first study of the destruction of the WTC complex and in an appendix linked some information regarding what has become known as the “Hutchison Effect” - as a possible energy phenomenon that might have some relevance to what happened on 9/11.

In approximately mid November 2007, Dr. Wood had cause to revisit the idea of the Hutchison effect and she sent John some of the WTC photo evidence she had been studying, for him to comment on. It was a pleasant surprise to find that John was willing to discuss areas of correspondence between WTC photo evidence and the effects seen in his own experiments. Most other people with a science background that we had contacted had not expressed any interest in, for example, discussing the links between the Cold Fusion cover up and 9/11. (See CB Brooklyn’s article about Prof. Steve Jones and 9/11^{xcii}).

John was very helpful to us and sent us ideas, pictures, information and photos of documents he has kept. He has a number of “Blogs” that he has created^{xciii}, where he has posted hundreds of images related to his work and interests. Some of the things he has posted are very candid and open. John sent us scans or photos of various documents and photos showing how his work has been investigated by Scientists, the Military and in various TV documentaries, almost since the time he started his experiments, back in 1979.

On 25th December 2007, having discussed a number of points of evidence with me and with John Hutchison and got agreement that he could be listed as a co-author, Dr. Wood began posting a new series of web pages entitled Anomalies at the WTC and the Hutchison Effect^{xciii}. A few days later around 12th Jan 2008, Dr. Wood added a kind of “overview list” to the front page, to show a summary of the main evidence, which we found to be quite compelling, and the preliminary feedback that we got generally indicated the same feeling.

Also on 12th Jan 2008, I travelled to Washington DC having been invited to go onto Ambrose Lane’s show “We Ourselves”^{xciv} on Mon 14th Jan and Fri 18th Jan. At that point, I was not sure whether I would be appearing with Dr. Wood on the same programmes, but thankfully, she was able to make the trip. As anticipated, Dr. Wood and I appeared on Ambrose Lane’s “We Ourselves” programme on 14th and 18th of January and we were honoured to be joined on the 18th of January by John

Hutchison himself, who confirmed details of his work and some of the witnesses to it, and he also expressed an interest in some of the effects seen at the World Trade Centre. He also agreed that the ongoing effects at the Deutsche Bank (Banker’s Trust) building were indicative of some type of infection. (Links to audios of these interviews are here [1^{xcv}] [2^{xcvi}]— please download and share. Links to videos of these interviews are on this website^{xcvii} and Dr. Wood’s website^{lxxxix}.)

About six hours after the radio show, also on Fri 18th Jan, Alexander (“Ace”) Baker sent an e-mail regarding the Hutchison effect to Dr. Wood, myself and several others. Baker is a fellow 9/11 researcher, whom I admired for his notable “Chopper 5 Study”^{xcviii}. This study was a detailed video analysis showing that the live WNYW (Fox 5) helicopter video of UA Flight 175 striking the World Trade Centre is a fake. I had also been impressed with way that Ace had dealt with rebuttals to his analysis from Eric Salter, another researcher, who had been quite rude to Ace. Ace had also appeared^{xcix} several^c times^{ci} on Jim Fetzer’s “Dynamic Duo” radio programme, and Prof. Fetzer often introduced him as an “expert in digital processing”.

In Ace Baker’s e-mail, he said he was about to attempt to produce or reproduce the Hutchison Effect experiment. He said

“As it turns out I have experience with Tesla Coils. As a young teenager, I helped build a Tesla coil device. It was a Boy Scout project.”

His e-mail included further details about how he had made the Tesla Coil^{cii} – a device for generating a high voltage discharge, and that he was going to attempt to make two smaller coil assemblies that same weekend. This timing seemed quite interesting, though I have to confess that, at the time, I was a little puzzled at why, he had chosen to do this, but I did not think too much more about it.

About two hours later on 18th Jan, Ace sent another e-mail, saying he had actually managed to obtain Tesla Coils on e-bay and that they would be delivered on Sunday by Special Delivery. (Which mail delivery services work on Sunday? Why did Ace want them so quickly?)

Subsequently, on Monday 21st Jan, Ace sent another e-mail saying “Success! I have reproduced the Hutchison Effect!” In that message (which was also sent to John Hutchison) was a link to a YouTube video which Ace had made of his experiment. (The original video that Ace posted^{ciii} was moved to a different place on YouTube^{civ})

I responded to Ace, asking if he could post a YouTube video (not realising he had already done so, due to only rapidly scanning the subject line of his message and not reading the body). The video showed a doll’s

house with a toy table moving jerkily around and then “flying up” into the air. A reflection of the toy table was shown in a small mirror. The video seemed to be of good quality.

On watching the video, I was rather uneasy – my feeling was that what he had made was a fake video, though I didn’t have enough information to be certain, so I made no further comments at the time. I could see he had gone to some trouble to make the video – which, to me, meant one of two things. (a) The video was genuine and Ace really had managed to reproduce the effect. (b) Ace had made a fake video for some other unknown reason. I could not really convince myself that (a) was the correct reason, because I was certain that John Hutchison had spent quite some time in getting his experiments to work successfully (in the early days, he was unable to produce effects reliably, but latterly he is able to produce effects very reliably). I was therefore suspicious that Ace’s presentation was not .

John responded to Ace’s posting of the video saying that he thought it was “cute”.

However, I left this all “on one side” as I was about to return to the UK. On returning to the UK, I wrote a press release, which was reviewed and edited by Dr. Wood and Dr. Reynolds. The press release discussed the main points of correspondence between the WTC photo evidence and the various aspects of the Hutchison Effect. It also mentioned the discussion of 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect on Ambrose Lane’s show. When we did the shows, we were pleased with the audience reaction – especially the initial reaction we got from one caller who said:

“This is a revelation beyond revelations...this trumps everything...If this story ever gets out, it will change the course of the United States’ and the whole world’s history.”

On 30th Jan 2008, the press release was posted on several Websites, including PR Log^{cv} and OpEdNews^{cv}. The reaction was generally quite small, but mostly positive.

On 7th Feb 2008, Dr. Judy Wood appeared on the Dynamic Duo^{cvi}, with guest host Dr. Morgan Reynolds, to discuss the Hutchison Effect and 9/11. It was intended that John Hutchison would also appear, but John had to take an important call, so he was unable to join the discussion.

As had been posted elsewhere, Dr. Wood had filed a Qui Tam^{cvi} case against a number of contractors who contributed to the fraudulent NIST NCSTAR reports. (Dr. Wood’s filing of a “Request for Correction”^{cix} earlier in the year laid the foundations for the Qui Tam). As things turned out, more documents towards this case had to be filed by Friday 29th

February 2008. A lot of work had to be done to meet this deadline, as Dr. Wood wanted to incorporate newer information into the submission.

On Weds 27th February, Ace Baker sent another e-mail to a group of people (including John Hutchison). In this message he said that he would be appearing, again, on Jim Fetzer’s Dynamic Duo radio show to discuss further aspects of 9/11 video fakery and also ... his work on the Hutchison Effect. Though Ace had advised us on the 26th Feb that he would be appearing on the 27th, in his latest message, Ace included links to 3 new video clips he had made which seemed to reproduce some of the effects that John Hutchison had seen in his experiments.

It felt odd that Ace would be discussing the Hutchison Effect with Jim Fetzer before Dr. Wood – but it seemed to be clear where Ace was heading with his discussion.

The 3 new video clips were of good quality, and in one of them, Ace appeared on the left, juggling balls, whilst the Hutchison effect demonstration occurred over in a framed area to the right. In another clip, the background showed a small Tesla coil, discharging, whilst the effect took place in a framed area in the foreground.

Before the Show with Ace

When Ace had said that he was going to be discussing the Hutchison Effect on the Dynamic Duo with Prof. Jim Fetzer, Dr. Wood expressed surprise that Ace would be going on before her, discussing things that related to an area in which he had no special expertise.

Fetzer initially responded saying he did not know what Dr. Wood meant, because he hadn’t asked Ace to talk about the Hutchison Effect, only video fakery. Dr. Wood pointed out that Ace Baker had said he would be talking about the Hutchison Effect in the same e-mail that Fetzer then responded to! Fetzer then said he’d missed this in Ace’s e-mail, but had not imposed any restrictions on Ace as to what he should talk about, but he did offer to switch the appearances over. Dr. Wood was not able to appear on the Wednesday night, so Ace Baker was still scheduled to appear.

Ace Baker on Dynamic Duo

Ace Baker appeared with Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo, as planned, on 27th Feb⁶. In the first hour, Ace discussed other video fakery research he had been doing, but in the 2nd hour, he discussed the Hutchison Effect. His opening statement more or less set the tone of what was to follow:

“There are a lot of disciplines that are relevant to 9/11 [research] and, while nuclear physics and quantum mechanics are not my areas of expertise, video fakery is.”

Ace had posted some videos on his relatively new Blog (started in Feb 2008)^{ex}. Ace Baker does have his own website^{exi}, where he has some 9/11 research posted, but the Hutchison-related information, as well as a critique of other 9/11 video fakery research, has been posted on his Blog (perhaps for the purpose of obtaining more comments etc).

He started by describing a video he had edited together showing some of the aspects of the Hutchison effect. The 1 minute 10 second compilation of clips showed only the levitation effects and even though he showed a clip with the cannonball, he did not show the cannonball levitating. (Neither did his clip show any metal effects such as snapping bending or “jellification”, which can be seen in the videos I edited of Ambrose Lane interviews.)

Ace Baker then went on to discuss the video clips he had made and how he had faked the levitation effects by using a magnet to make objects stick to the wooden surface, whilst they were filmed upside down. Then he would move the magnet around for a few moments, before finally removing the magnet so that the object fell down (thus appearing to levitate). Ace went on to explain that he had seen videos of John Hutchison’s demonstrations about 10 years ago (on a low quality tape) and assumed that he was seeing things being filmed upside down. I had also seen similar videos 10 years ago and, at that time, without much additional information or exploration probably would have then agreed that it was trickery of some kind. Later, I did gather more information and realised there was a lot more to this – such as the interest of people like Boyd Bushman at Lockheed Martin.

Clearly Ace had spent some time setting up these demonstrations – putting magnetic or metal pins or pieces in the toys/samples in the correct place so that they would work well in the demonstrations. He also later explained how he had split the screen and done a video overlay, which allowed him to appear and a cat to appear at the same time as the “effects” were happening.

Hutchison and Tesla

Ace mentioned that John Hutchison was trying to mimic the experiments of Tesla and then Ace went on to describe Tesla’s brilliance – for example for inventing a system of alternating current for use in electrical power transmission over cables, but Ace incorrectly attributed the invention of the Vacuum Tube to Tesla. (This is credited to John Ambrose Fleming,

who invented the first practical electron tube called the 'Fleming Valve'. In 1904^{cxii}). Ace then went on to acknowledge the possibility that something very powerful and mysterious that had been kept secret, but he said he thought the John Hutchison videos were fake. (Indeed, his 28th Feb 2008 blog entry unambiguously declares “John Hutchison is a Fraud”^{cxiii}. Curiously, the filename that this entry was saved under is entitled “Dr. Wood-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html”). In the programme, he said

“It’s tough for me. There is no bigger supporter of Judy Wood’s work than I, but [I feel have to] offer whatever input I can in my strongest area of expertise which is – while I don’t really know that much about quantum mechanics – I do know a thing or two about video.”

Does Ace believe that using deception is a way of showing support?

Ace and the Red Bull

Ace had also set up a demonstration of a red bull can bobbing around and then crushing, comparing it to one of John’s own experiments with a Red Bull can. He explained he had to put steel screws in it because the can was aluminium, and therefore not magnetic. He explained how he had reached in and crushed the can every so often, as he filmed it, then he edited out the portions of video where his hand appeared. He explained how he carefully arranged the lighting, and then did a video composite – showing the clocks on the right hand side, so that the viewer would think there were no edits in the video. It would therefore appear Ace had clearly gone to quite a bit of trouble to make this video^{cxiv}.

The motion of the can in John Hutchison’s video is not the same as in Ace Baker’s video – it is more fluid. Also, the can flexes and bends in the middle slightly as well as at the end. Also, at the end, it appears to go out of view, then come back into view a couple of times.

Ace and Jim Fetzer then discussed briefly how the Wikipedia article on John Hutchison is “skeptical” of his experiments, claiming he cannot reproduce them. This is untrue. Wikipedia seemed to be an unusual source for Jim and Ace to quote, considering the pedigree of Wikipedia when it comes to the discussion of 9/11 research. They did not quote any of the other significant articles about the Hutchison Effect, such as those listed on a site called RexResearch^{cxv}, though they did note Wikipedia Page had been edited around the time the show went on air.

Ace then went on to discuss John Hutchison’s “toy UFO” video, which used a wire attached the toy UFO. Ace describes how the UFO is levitating, but there is a “problem” because of the string. The truth behind

this experiment is that it was not a levitation experiment in the same way as the others were. This was for a high voltage experiment – with the voltage being delivered through a wire (not a string).

Ace and the Boat Experiment

Jim Fetzer and Ace then discuss the Boat Experiment video, where John has placed a boat in a shallow tank of water. The water “shimmers” and the boat wobbles slightly. Additionally, fires periodically light and extinguish around the sides of the boat^{cxiv}.

Ace suggests that, because we can’t see the right hand end of the boat, someone is likely to be holding it and moving the boat. Ace then discusses the strange fires which skip around the boat and then says they disappear within one frame and the water goes calm. This description is inaccurate, as the water is moving and flames are seen approximately 10 seconds into the video. Later in the video, however, flames are seen when the water is calm – this is repeated at 1 minute 10 seconds. At 1 minute 25 seconds, flames are seen when the water is calm again. Ace suggests the fire is real and that John may have “‘flash powder’ or something like that, but this does not seem plausible as the same points on the boat ignite more than once in the sequence (and I can see no evidence of editing). Also, is it possible to get such fire effects without smoke? Is it possible to get such fire effects of that colour, lasting for several seconds, rather than just a single flash? I really don’t think this is flash powder. The fire/flashes in the YouTube^{cxvi} videos^{cxvii} don’t resemble those shown in the boat video - there is much more smoke, the flashes are short-lived and they are more explosive.

Ace suggests the tub is vibrated by a sander. Why would the tank need to be vibrated? How does it help the supposed fakery? Surely the vibration is not really very interesting in itself – but the fire is – so why bother faking the vibration?

Ace then offers to make a reproduction of the boat video (which again, would take quite some trouble and perhaps at least \$100 for the materials?). Why do this?

At the end of the show, Fetzer thanked Ace for coming on and said he would “have to have [him] back”.

Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison on Dynamic Duo (Commentary)

On 28th February, Dr. Wood and John Hutchison appeared on the show with Jim Fetzer^{cxviii}. Fetzer had had stomach flu for some time and

seemed fairly quiet. Nevertheless, he did ask John Hutchison about his educational and career background, and his source of income for more than the last 30 years – this is far more than he has done with his other guests. John replied candidly, with no trace of reticence or concern.

Later, John described how Scientists such as Rene Louis Vallee and Andrei Sakharov had studied the Hutchison Effect and had suggested many of the effects were caused by an interaction between the electrostatic and RF fields, but that this interaction was not immediate – the effects only happened some time after the fields had interacted.

As Dr. Wood and John discussed some of the effects on the steel and the glass at the World Trade Centre, Jim Fetzer seemed noticeably quiet and there were a number of longer silences as Dr. Wood waited for Fetzer’s reaction.

After an interesting discussion about the residual effects at Ground Zero, Fetzer switched to asking where John Hutchison was on 9/11 and then he asked John thought about Ace Baker’s attempts at copying Hutchison’s effects. John said he thought Ace was “having fun” with his video project, and Fetzer then said that because John’s effects were “so peculiar and so odd” that the possibility of video fakery should not be ruled out. Before John had a chance to answer this point, Fetzer started talking to Dr. Wood again, and moved on to the next section of the webpage. Dr. Wood then said “what happened on 9/11 was pretty unbelievable – does that mean it didn’t happen?”

In the remaining minutes of the programme, there were a number of rather long silences as Dr. Wood pointed out the unusual aspects of the data. Dr. Wood asked if the perpetrators of 9/11 would want people to look at the data. Jim Fetzer, without responding, then asked John if his phenomena had anything to do with 9/11. John responded saying he thought there was a “high probability” when considering how much research had been going on into other directed energy weapons and how powerful they were.

Fetzer then thanked Dr. Wood and John for coming on, but asked no further questions and made no further comments. He did not seem to express the same enthusiasm for his guests as he usually does, although perhaps this was due to his illness.

Ace Baker Sends More e-mails around Weds 27th

A sequence of e-mails were sent by Ace Baker, around the time of the Weds 27th Dynamic Duo. In the first of these, Ace stated:

Hutchison is a video faker, pure and simple. There is no Hutchison Effect. I'm sorry. Hutchison makes silly upside-down videos.

He then went onto explain how he thought some of the videos had been made and he said:

He's been caught red-handed using strings on the toy UFO thing.

Ace repeated some of the points he had made in the program, but he seemed far more certain of what he was saying and also he seemed quite angry:

As long as he was just pushing UFO's, I didn't care. But when he stepped into 9/11, and video fakery, he stepped onto MY TURF. Under NO circumstances will I allow John Hutchison to pollute 9/11 research with his trickery.

This seemed to be a very odd statement. The only context in which UFO's had been mentioned was in relation to the video of the high voltage experiment, which Ace took to be something else (levitation using a string). Why did Ace react so vigorously to John? In any case, all that John had done was comment on some of the evidence that Dr. Wood had collected regarding the World Trade Centre. It was Dr. Wood who contacted John and John had sent information and comments – John was not “polluting 9/11 research”. Ace had stated that he is Dr. Wood's greatest supporter, but it was apparent that Ace was not supporting Dr. Wood's research expertise.

Ace had accused John of trickery because he could make videos which mimicked some aspects of John's experiments. Ace had not reproduced:

- a) the levitation of the cannonball
- b) the metal effects
- c) the fire effects
- d) the bending and flexing motions in the can

In fact, Ace had not properly reproduced any of John's videos. For Ace to call John a fraud seemed a very bold and reckless, because we had substantial evidence that John's experiments had been validated many times. We had documents from Scientists, we had TV documentaries and letters from Canadian and Government groups showing how they had been actively researching the phenomena John had discovered. In addition, it was Ace himself who admitted he had been dishonest and deceptive about the videos he presented. Is this a good way to find the truth about something?

Ace claimed to have explained some of the other effects that John had generated:


The bent rod is . . . a bent rod. He heated it up, bent it, and let it cool. Notice how it's charred in the middle, like where the bend is?

This, again, seemed like a rush-to-judgement. I had observed a number of metal samples from John, such as these:



Ace had not bothered to check the diameter of the rods which John had bent – up to 3 inches in diameter. I had seen no evidence of “burn marks”. Was John a blacksmith as well as a video faker? (That is, he would need a hot kiln and metal shaping tools to do this.)

Though not video fakery per se, the metal sample with the knife in it is equally silly. The knife is stainless steel. The metal looks like a very soft aluminum. He poured some liquid aluminum around a knife. When it cooled off, he took a grinder to it. Voila! Fused knife! Please.



How did John get liquid aluminium to work this way? We can see on the right hand side the knife is quite well embedded into the metal block, though over to the left it does not seem fully fused. The marks of the surface of the block go in different directions, and certainly do not look like the results from using a grinder. In the picture on the right, why would molten aluminium have left the wood unburned?

A Lack of Scientific Curiosity?

On 29th February, a deadline for filing documents in Dr. Wood’s Qui Tam case, Ace Baker sent another e-mail, noting how he had advised Dr. Wood, Morgan Reynolds and myself of his claim to have bought Tesla coils on e-bay in mid-January. He then said:

Dr. Wood said nothing. Dr. Reynolds said nothing. ... Mr. Leaphart said nothing. I had produced evidence of anti-gravity levitation, one of the most important and amazing aspects of the Hutchison Effect, and the silence was deafening.

This, to me, seemed to make Ace’s motive clear. He seemed to be saying “I made a fake video. You didn’t detect it was fake, therefore how can your judgement be trusted?” Unlike Ace, I did not want to accuse him outright of fakery, because I did not feel I had enough evidence to be certain that he had made a fake video. I did not want to get into a debate about this peculiar behaviour. He asked why we had not asked him questions about his experiment and how peculiar he found it.

John had sent Ace (and others) a follow-up email, noting that Ace's video was a joke. John pointed out that Ace would need a lot more equipment to produce the Hutchison Effect. (Note, John does not use Tesla coils for levitation.)

My response at this time was to send Ace an e-mail message with some of the most interesting questions regarding the Hutchison Effect.

- 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?
- 2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?
- 3) How would you explain the ongoing effects on the Banker's trust building?

Regarding John Hutchison, I asked Ace these questions:

- 1) How do you explain the samples of metal that he has shown us?
- 2) How do you explain the multiple witnesses to his experiments?
- 3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security?

- 4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him?
- 5) What do you think of Col John Alexander's statements that John Hutchison is seeing the effects of "PK" (Psychokinesis)?
- 6) Why would LANL express an interest in basic video fakery and spend 4 months working with John?

Ace responded a short time later saying:

> 1) *How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?*

Good question. Certainly very powerful weapons of some type were used to disintegrate the towers.

> 2) *How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?*

Good question. Ordinarily bending steel like that requires foundry conditions.

So Ace did not have an alternative explanation for what happened at the WTC, but he still thought it was a powerful weapon. Ace rejected the idea that a letter from the Canadian Government to John said that his work was a matter of National Security:

> 3) *Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security?*

I read the letter. It does not classify "his experiments as a matter of National Security". It is rejecting Hutchison's request for information on the grounds of National Security. Please.

Ace's response was, to me, a very unusual response – the letter clearly linked John's experiments with National Security issues, even if the exact meaning is somewhat ambiguous. Ace's next response was also very surprising to me:

> 4) *Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him?*

Have Mr. Puthoff and/or Col. Alexander contact me, and I'll explain to them how Hutchison's videos are made.

This demonstrated an unusual lack of humility. Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander are well known in “alternative knowledge” circles. Alexander is best known for his involvement in the Non Lethal Weapons programme^{cxix}. Puthoff is an experimental Physicist^{cxix} and he has published many papers and a textbook on “Quantum Electronics”. He has ties to the NSA, so like Alexander, seems to be connected to the Military Industrial Complex.

So, Ace was suggesting that he'd be able to convince two well known figures, both who have ties to the Military Industrial Complex and have expressed interest, over several years, in John Hutchison's work, that John was a fraud? This claim of Ace's was quite extraordinary to me.

Ace went on to suggest that the researchers from Los Alamos never actually visited John – he seemed to be suggesting John had made the whole thing up.

Ace further stated:

.....
I'm 100% certain that Hutchison's videos were made exactly as I describe.
.....

So Ace was saying the Hutchison videos were fake, but still didn't explicitly disagree the Hutchison Effect evidence was similar to effects seen at the WTC. Ace didn't really fully address the fact that many videos of John's experiments were taken by other production companies, such as www.gryphonproductions.com and www.bluebookfilms.com.

I wanted to confirm some of the answers Ace had given so I sent him another message, asking him to confirm that his views on these points:

- 1) Everything JH says regarding his experiments is fake.
- 2) Los Alamos have helped him promote fakery of one kind or another.
- 3) All the metal samples he has are fake or not what he says they are.
- 4) You have no idea what caused the documented effects at the World Trade Centre.

Ace responded, saying he thought all of John's videos were fake (but I asked about the actual experiments, not just the videos). Regarding the Los Alamos National Labs (LANL) connection, Ace said:

.....
Or, it could be that the government is seizing an opportunity to promote false beliefs. They do that ALL THE TIME. If there is any documentation about LANL and Hutchison, I'll review it.
.....

Currently, I don't have copies of substantial documentation, but I have seen at least 2 documents showing the connection, and Col John Alexander certainly doesn't deny his connection to John Hutchison.

Ace also confirmed he does not know how the WTC was destroyed.

Questions

The key questions in all of this seem to be:

- 1) Why has Ace Baker taken it upon himself to try to disprove the Hutchison Effect? Why is this so important?
- 2) Why has he gone to such trouble to make several different videos? (A new one appeared whilst this article was being written.)
- 3) Was the timing of his attack on the Hutchison Effect coincidental?
- 4) Why did he accuse Drs. Wood, Reynolds and Jerry Leaphart of a lack of Scientific Curiosity?
- 5) Why does he regard 9/11 Research as “his turf”?
- 6) Why does he seem reluctant to talk about the links between the Hutchison Effect evidence and WTC Evidence?
- 7) Why is his reaction so vehemently against the Hutchison Effect (e.g. “John Hutchison is a fraud”) with no leeway for his own error. I.e. why doesn’t he say “I am pretty sure it isn’t related to the Hutchison Effect, but there could be something here.”
- 8) Why is his research into the Hutchison Effect so different in character to his other research such as the Chopper 5 video?

Conclusion

I would suggest the reason is that Ace Baker knows that the Hutchison Effect is very relevant to what happened on 9/11 and he wants to discourage people from thinking this. I would suggest he did what he did to try to break up a small group of researchers, and to try to set them against one another. (I suggested this idea to Ace in a follow up e-mail and he did not respond to this point).

I would suggest Ace Baker knows more than he is letting on. Who else knows?

12. 9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - The Chips Have Fallen

11 March 2008



John Hutchison's Levitation
Experiment



Car Near WTC in the
Aftermath of 9/11

It was approximately 1 year ago that I felt there was a need to document the circumstances surrounding the break up of the original Scholars for 9/11 Truth group, which became *9/11 Scholars* and *Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice* (see Chapter 4). After the split, the 9/11 Scholars group was headed up by Prof. Jim Fetzer and Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice was headed up by Prof. Steve Jones, who had already been connected to the Cold Fusion cover up and Los Alamos National Laboratories and who had been caught using faked or massaged data in his presentations^{cxxi}.

At the time of the split, I was still puzzled by certain aspects of what happened, and others in the group that were corresponding with one another at that time still had misgivings about being involved in either camp. However, I felt that the evidence was clear about Prof. Steve Jones - and that Jim Fetzer had been able to see problems with the way Steve Jones was acting and the way he was presenting data^{cxiii}, therefore I had only minor reservations about being associated with Fetzer's 9/11 Scholars group.

Jim Fetzer Commends Andrew Johnson

On Mar 24 2007, following the split in the Scholars Group, Jim Fetzer sent an e-mail to several people, including me, inviting them to join the Scholars Group's "steering committee". In this e-mail he said:

I have been impressed with your integrity and dedication and efforts to promote truth and exposed falsehoods about the events of 9/11. I need people like you to advise me in relation to the future of Scholars and to offer comments, criticism, and critique as appropriate.

This seemed like a good development, and when someone makes a statement such as this, one is more likely to consider the request seriously. I agreed to be on this committee. However, there was very little activity and the only question Jim Fetzer asked us during the time that I “served” on this committee was whether he should take action against Alex Floum over intellectual property issues. At that time, I suggested Jim not do this, because it was not really specifically related to the study, research or exposure of 9/11 issues and so did not seem worth expending any effort on.

The next discussion of any significance that I had with Jim Fetzer came in late September 2007, I had compiled a study of NYC “First Responder” witness accounts in an effort to find out how they described the impact of the second “plane” on WTC 2. Jim Fetzer invited me onto his radio show “The Dynamic Duo” to discuss this. On 02 Oct 2007, he sent me an e-mail saying:

Your summary is excellent. We can go thorough it--you can lay it out--and we can go from there. Examples of witness reports are very effective.

On 3rd October 2007, I spoke with Jim on his radio show^{cxviii}. We had a good discussion about this study and some interesting questions were discussed and analysed. At the end of the broadcast, Jim Fetzer said:

Andrew Johnson, I can't thank you enough for your excellent work – I'm really proud to have you as a member of Scholars, and I'm very grateful for all you're doing. Keep up the good work.

So, from these messages and statements, it would seem that Jim Fetzer valued my opinion, my methods, study and conclusions.

The Hutchison Effect on Jim Fetzer

In late December and early January Dr. Judy Wood posted her study comparing the damage at the scene of the destruction of the WTC Complex with the effects observed in Hutchison’s experiments. Dr. Wood and I had also appeared Ambrose Lane’s show “We Ourselves”^{xciv} on Mon 14th Jan and Fri 18th Jan. (See ^{xcv}, ^{xcvi} and ^{xcvii} also Dr. Wood’s website^{lxxxix}.)

Dr. Judy Wood explained to me that Jim Fetzer was advised directly about this new study on approximately 20 Jan 2008. On 30 Jan 2008, I posted a press release about this study on PR Log^{cv} and OpEdNews^{cv}.

During this time, I received no communication at all from Jim Fetzer. Surprisingly, the first comment I heard from him came via Dr. Wood, in an e-mail, where he offered to “smooth” the Press Release I had written. Why did Fetzer not contact me directly, as author of the Press Release? Why had it taken him almost 2 weeks to contact Dr. Wood regarding the Hutchison Effect study? This situation was strange to me. Fetzer had previously complimented me and I was on the “steering committee”. Why had Fetzer not contacted me first? One might have thought that if he was unhappy that I had written the press release (as a matter of urgency, as I saw things), he might have even “chastised” me for not involving him in the process. However, I did not attach the press release to the “Scholars” group – but it obviously mentioned Dr. Wood.

Jim Fetzer and Ace Baker and Video Fakery

On 27th Feb 2008, Ace Baker appeared with Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo^{ci}. They discussed how Ace was sure that John Hutchison had faked his videos and how Ace was therefore greatly concerned that Dr. Judy Wood had associated herself with “a fraud”. The problem with Ace’s analysis then became the subject of an article I wrote, describing why his conclusions were ill-founded as they were based only on a limited set of evidence^{cxxiv}.

Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison on Dynamic Duo

On 28th February, Dr. Wood and John Hutchison appeared on the show with Jim Fetzer^{cxxviii}. Fetzer introduced John as follows:

JF: *John I want to welcome you to the Dynamic Duo.*

JH: *Hello-o...*

JF: *John – could you tell us a little bit about yourself – ye know - your background and your education – especially your training in science and technical subjects?*

Rather than, say, asking John how he started to perform his experiments, or perhaps what he thought of the intriguing data that Fetzer and Wood had just been discussing, Fetzer chooses to ask a question about John’s training and/or education. Why did Fetzer seem more interested in this than in the bizarre data and effects that had also been touched on, both on Fetzer’s previous show with Ace Baker and with Dr. Judy Wood only moments earlier? Regardless, John replied candidly, and cheerfully. Fetzer

then asked about him going to High School and pointed out that John did not “matriculate to a university” or have a university degree. John agreed, without any reservation or hesitation. Fetzter, still not asking about the anomalous data or effects, then said “How have you made your living, John?” What was unclear to me was how this was relevant to the study of the WTC evidence - which was the subject of discussion at the time John came on. How exactly was Jim Fetzter’s line of questioning relevant to the Hutchison Effect evidence itself?

As I mentioned in the previous article^{cxiv}, during the broadcast, Jim Fetzter seemed noticeably quiet and there were a number of longer silences as Dr. Wood waited for Jim Fetzter’s reaction. He made no points of science and did not specifically query or re-interpret any of the points of evidence in relation to the WTC that Dr. Wood presented.

When Jim Fetzter asked John Hutchison for an explanation of the Hutchison Effect, John Hutchison gave a summary describing how it may be caused by a poorly understood interaction between Radio Frequency (RF) fields and Electrostatic Fields.

Did Fetzter not consider it significant that the Hutchison Effect was actually named after John? If Prof. Stephen Hawking had been on the program, because someone in the 9/11 Truth Movement had referenced Hawking Radiation^{cxv} for example, would Fetzter have asked about Hawking’s background in the same detail as he did of John Hutchison?

Dr. Wood first learned of Hutchison's work in October 2006 and she has said that she felt she could not endorse it or deny it without additional information and/or studying. It took well over a year for her to feel confident enough about the science of John Hutchison's work, and to fully appreciate the striking parallels with what happened on 9/11. She reached that point, very carefully and methodically, by conducting research in that area of science.

Jim Fetzter, though has written a number of books and has studied and taught courses in the Philosophy of Science, is not an engineer, and not a scientist per se, and hasn't studied the science. However, he seems to have few reservations about the methods employed by Ace Baker to mimic and by inference discredit John Hutchison’s work. Is this a credible position for Jim Fetzter to adopt?

After the Dynamic Duo Show

It seemed to be that Jim Fetzter had drawn the same conclusion as Ace Baker – that John Hutchison was a fraud, and he seemed to think that Ace had essentially demonstrated this beyond reasonable doubt. To make sure I had read the situation correctly, I sent an e-mail to Jim Fetzter

asking him 6 specific questions about what had been discussed in the broadcast with Ace Baker. His initial response did not answer my questions. In it, Fetzer said:

You have taken for granted that Hutchison's research is well-founded or at least sincere.

This was incorrect. I had known of John Hutchison's work since around 1998 or 1999, having come across it in a book by UK author Albert Budden and also having heard it discussed by Lockheed Martin Scientist Boyd Bushman and UK Defence Journalist Nick Cook on a programme called *Billion Dollar Secret*. I had audio recordings of John Hutchison on my own Website – from 2004 and 2005. So I had certainly not taken Hutchison's research for granted! Fetzer stated this, even though I had previously advised him that I had researched into areas related to black projects, as well as free energy technology. If Jim Fetzer had looked at my Website in a little more detail, he would have found the research and presentations I had already posted there. I had included a segment about John Hutchison's experiments and experience in a presentation I had originally put together in March 2004^{cxvii}.

Fetzer's message was overall, rather negative, leaving only a little leeway for his own error. For example he said:

I don't know enough to resolve it, but I'm very troubled. Hutchison's work does not look right to me. It appears to me to be fake, phony, and staged, something we might expect from some high school student who is contemptuous of authority--especially academic!--and is out to make fools of them.

Fetzer didn't discuss any specific points of evidence, he merely offered feelings and opinions and seemed to suggest that because John had no academic background, his experiments and work were bogus. Fetzer completely ignored the evidence that the Hutchison Effect was real. This evidence included documents^{cxviii}, metal samples and witness testimony. Neither Ace Baker or Jim Fetzer directly addressed any of this evidence. Why? Fetzer's focus was primarily on the idea that videos of the Hutchison Effect could be faked easily (but even that point is debateable, as Ace had clearly gone to some trouble).

I sent an e-mail back to Jim Fetzer pointing out that he had not answered any of my 6 questions and I said:

For you to support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis now forces me to resign from the 911scholars group, regardless of what anyone else on this list chooses to do.

So I decided that because his emphasis was on the idea that it was likely a fake, because the fake video produced by Ace Baker looked too similar to the videos made of John's experiments (which, in most cases, were not filmed by John anyway), I could no longer see how Fetzer was interested in looking at the evidence that this view was inadequate and incomplete.

Fetzer responded with a message saying:

I hope you understand that, in rejecting Hutchison (in the tentative and provisional fashion characteristic of science, where new evidence and new hypotheses might revive an old theory or impugn a new one), I am not rejecting Dr. Wood.

This was not what I had stated to him. I had stated to him that I could not support his conclusion, as he had not criticised Ace for putting out a fake story about buying coils on e-bay and then making a fake video to explain away the Hutchison Effect. Fetzer had ignored evidence.

Fetzer continued:

If there is something to Hutchison's "effects", it would mean that he has discovered laws of nature (anti-gravity, unusual forces, etc.) the existence of which has heretofore been unrecognized (unsuspected, unconfirmed).

This is correct – but the conclusion that Hutchison has, indeed, discovered anti-gravity can only be drawn once the evidence is evaluated. Fetzer ignored this evidence – as already mentioned above. Fetzer continued:

I most certainly do not "support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis" and I cannot imagine what has given you that impression.

I was given the impression in Fetzer's earlier e-mail, in which he said:

I think Ace's point was that it is easy to simulate "Hutchison-like effects" and claim they are valid when they are not. That seems to me to be perfectly appropriate and I do not fault him for that.

Ace had produced a fake video and sent round a fake story about it. Fetzer "did not fault him" – if Fetzer didn't support Ace's approach to 9/11 research, then why did he say the opposite of this?

This same e-mail also contained a message Fetzer had sent to another person in our small group who had questioned Fetzer in a similar manner. To this other person, Fetzer wrote:

Andrew Johnson posed questions to me, which implied that, unless I disavowed Ace, he might have to consider withdrawing from Scholars.

Technically, this interpretation was not accurate. I had not suggested Fetzter “disavow Ace” for me to continue my association with the Scholars group – rather, I had said I could not support the group’s founder if he supported the methods that Ace had used. This was a subtle, but important difference – I said that I could not continue to be a member of the 911 Scholars group if its founder wasn’t significantly more critical of Ace’s approach – based as it was on a lack of evidence.

Jim Fetzter Answers Key Questions!

I further clarified my feelings and position that I wished to resign from the Scholars group in follow-up e-mails to Fetzter. Fetzter’s support of Ace’s approach was confirmed in the next e-mail I received from him, in which he had chosen to answer the questions I posed, thus:

1) Do you think it is a good way to assess the validity of a study by making a fake video, after initially giving out a false story about that video? i.e. Ace Baker said he had obtained Tesla Coils from e-bay to attempt experiments related to the Hutchison Effect, then he posted a video saying he'd reproduced it. In reality, he put out a false story and sent a later e-mail suggesting we should have detected this and commented. What are your views on this, coming as it did from a respected researcher?

Come on! He's pointing out how easy it is to fake this stuff. There was nothing wrong in his doing what he did. You should be more open-minded.

Fetzter says there was nothing wrong with what Ace had done – he had made a fake video, but initially lied saying he had used Tesla coils to produce the effect. Fetzter saw nothing wrong with this.

2) Ace, on his blog, has declared John as a fraud and that his videos are 100% fake. How much do you agree with his conclusions? What do you think of the considerable amounts of other documentary evidence that John has been visited by Los Alamos National Labs (which Steve Jones has been connected with)?

For reasons I have explained already, I also think Hutchison is a fraud. But I stand behind Dr. Wood's research, which I extoll as extremely important.

Again, Fetzter was agreeing with Ace – and ignoring the documentary^{cxxviii} and physical evidence that Hutchison was not a fraud. Fetzter seemed to be saying “everything else apart from this Hutchison stuff that Dr. Wood had posted was good.” So Fetzter was disregarding my view – someone he invited onto the committee. More importantly, he was disregarding the significantly more qualified view of Dr. Wood. Instead, he decided that Ace was “on the money” – simply because Ace was an “expert in Digital

Processing” (but with unknown qualifications) and Ace had produced a video which mimicked some (not all) of the characteristics of Hutchison’s experiments. Why was Fetzer saying this?

3) *I have been checking Ace's blog and one of the file names he used was "Dr. Wood-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html"^{cxviii} Do you have any thoughts on the fact that he has used this particular filename? Why do you think he has done this?*

You are making a mountain out of a molehill. He thinks Dr. Wood has made a blunder. You think she and Hutchison are "right on". I agree with Ace.

Fetzer doesn’t specifically answer my question here – but he still agrees with Ace – who says Dr. Wood has made “a blunder”. In any case, I thought this debate was primarily about the Hutchison Effect, not Judy Wood – why didn’t Fetzer make this distinction himself?

4) *One would think that Ace might have made a single video to point out the possibility of video fakery, but I think he has now made 4 or 5 different ones, and seemingly he's gone to quite a bit of trouble to do this. Do you have any thoughts on the reasons behind this?*

This stuff is very easy to fake. Why don't you at least admit as much. What in the world justifies you in thinking Hutchison is on the up and up?

This answer from Fetzer is very surprising and again he completely ignores the other documentary^{cxvii} and physical evidence, as well as witness testimony and many videos shot by different film companies. I had already pointed this all out to Fetzer. Dr. Wood and I had already discussed this 6 weeks previously on Ambrose Lane’s radio program^{lxxxix}. Why did Fetzer ignore all of this, and what I’d previously said?

Also, making a fake video proves nothing in of itself – this is precisely why other evidence must be evaluated before drawing conclusions!

5) *Do you think that Ace has managed to reproduce any or all of the effects that John Hutchison has? (I noted on your show that Ace discussed the Red Bull Can experiment and described the can flexing and bending throughout the length of it, yet his faked video did not duplicate this phenomenon - therefore Ace had noted these anomalies, but had not reproduced them.)*

They are close enough to raise serious doubts in most minds--indeed, in every serious scientific mind, in my opinion. I know we disagree. OK?

Again, Fetzer just thinks “close enough” is “good enough”. He suggests “every serious scientific mind would have serious doubts, in his opinion”. I myself have been described as having a “scientific mind”, but because I

have evaluated the evidence I have little or no doubt that the Hutchison Effect is *real*.

6) Ace says he is sure the Hutchison Effect is not real, but he can't explain the evidence that Dr. Wood has collected. Why would he attack Dr. Wood for giving an explanation that involves a well-documented, almost 30-year old phenomenon?

Appealing to the Hutchison effect to explain Dr. Wood's work is to appeal to a mystery to explain an enigma. There is no explanatory benefit here.

This statement by Fetzer is almost meaningless and is based on no evidence – only his own opinion. The comparison of the WTC evidence and Hutchison Effect evidence is obvious to those who see the photographs side by side. Fetzer, at this point, ignores this evidence too.

Jim, some chips seem to have fallen here and I, as a fellow member of 911 Scholars am keen to get your views on "where they now lay". I need to work out if I can continue to be aligned with the 911 Scholars group, or whether it's founder would support the idea that guests on his show can, without criticism, use "debunking tactics" to attempt to discredit perhaps the most diligent research that the group might be associated with. The answer to this question is especially important to me now that that researcher has definitely used deception as part of his approach.

There was nothing wrong with what Ace has done. I applaud him for showing how easy it is to fake this stuff. You haven't shown it is genuine, but, for reasons I do not understand, are swallowing it hook, line, and sinker!

Again, Fetzer re-asserts his support for Ace promulgating a bogus story and making fake videos. He says he “does not understand why” I am “swallowing” the Hutchison Effect “hook line and sinker”. Again, Fetzer completely overlooks or disregards all the evidence presented here. Is Fetzer trying to make me feel stupid? This seemed to be the approach he would now adopt, but in the next e-mail, Fetzer expressed concern that I would “offer a very unflattering portrait” of him, as I had mentioned I was going to compose this article. The reader must decide whether Fetzer’s view on this is fair or accurate – all I can do is present all of the evidence for review. My intent is simple: to analyse the evidence, draw conclusions and find the truth. I am not at all comfortable with how this matter has unfolded.

A “War of Credentials” and The Logic Quiz

Following this exchange, Fetzer then decided he would start to debate my methods of reasoning, based on his own “35 years teaching students how to think responsibly”. He also stated that this appeared “to be a lesson that you [Andrew] need to learn”. I had sent several messages to Fetzer where I stated I claimed no credibility for myself, only that I collected evidence, analysed it and posted conclusions. Fetzer suggested I “seem to believe that all opinions are equally good!” I never said this. Those reading this article and my website will quickly gain an impression of how credible the information and analysis is, so you might like to consider this as you read on below – and you might also like to consider carefully Fetzer’s earlier messages to me, documented near the beginning of this article. Here, he seemed to be comfortable that my analyses were credible.

In Fetzer’s next e-mail, he decided to test me on aspects of methods of reasoning and logic, based on his knowledge of the Philosophy of Science. I decided I would accept his challenge even though I questioned (for myself) his motives - for 2 reasons. Firstly, why didn’t he set me such a “quiz” in order to gain entry to the Scholars group? Surely it would’ve been better to ensure that members thought “logically” and “responsibly” before disputes over evidence arose? Secondly, what did these questions – such as “What is the difference between deductive and inductive reasoning?” have to do with WTC or Hutchison Effect evidence specifically?

I have to confess, that at this point, I no longer took the debate seriously. In such instances, I defer to my sense of humour to carry the matter forward – as I have found this method is far more useful and it can occasionally precipitate useful information, which is harder to obtain using the anger/accusation/ridicule approach. Fetzer, however, had started to use the “ridicule” approach. In the message referenced above, he wrote:

Creating a fabricated video to demonstrate that a video can be fabricated is not deceitful but appropriate. It is actually a form of replication. Ace did that to show how easily it can be done. You are holding that against him? Really, Andrew, you can't be that dumb!

Again, Fetzer ignores the aspect of Ace putting out a fake story and then he suggests I am “dumb” for not agreeing with him. Is this evidence, or an attempt at debunking and ridicule? Other elements of this message contained a similar comment.

In my response to Fetzer, I pointed out his earlier praise for my NYC Witness Study^{cxix}. Why was he now suggesting I was “dumb” for disagreeing with him?

“Total Evidence” and “Special Pleading”

I found some of the questions in the “Logic Quiz” that Fetzer had set for me were quite tricky – I had never studied the theory of logic. In researching answers to the questions Fetzer had set for me, I came up with some interesting terms, and I sent him my “answers” in another e-mail. For fun, I set Fetzer some questions related to software and programming (but he declined to answer them). Fetzer asked:

.....
What is the requirement of total evidence?
.....

It seems that this consideration applies to this very case of the Hutchison Effect (HE), Ace Baker’s “evidence” and the WTC Evidence. In researching the definition of “total evidence”, I found this: “One crucial respect in which inductive arguments differ from deductive arguments is in their vulnerability to new evidence”. I would suggest this applies precisely in this case. I also found this link^{cxix}, where it is suggested that “the confirmation function must use all the available evidence and not an arbitrary subset” So, I responded to Fetzer’s question about “total evidence” thus:

.....
*It is that ALL the evidence is evaluated! Perfect! Yes! HE and WTC do have a total evidence requirement and Dr. Wood in her study is MUCH closer to it than Ace Baker, so even by your own knowledge and teachings, you are not adhering to the standards of logic you teach. What Ace Baker has done (and you have supported him) is use an *arbitrary subset of evidence*! A perfect expression! Thanks!*
.....

Another question Fetzer posed was:

.....
What is special pleading?
.....

I found a definition at this link^{cxix}: “The informal fallacy of special pleading is committed whenever an argument includes some double standard. For example, if someone criticizes science for not producing all of the answers to life but excuses their religion for not having all of the answers about life, they are engaged in form of special pleading.” I therefore responded to Fetzer thus:

.....
Ab - this is also a good one. It's when an argument includes double standards. This applies very well here. Ace Baker produced a fake video, in his search for the truth. He is engaging in "special pleading" - by claiming he has mimicked a
.....

real process, therefore the real process must be fake - he has ignored "total evidence" and adopted a double standard.

In the same e-mail, I made several other points which, based on the research I did to try and answer the questions he posed, were significant in debating the way Fetzer and Baker had treated this whole business.

Fetzer Responds

In trying to answer the Logic Quiz, I felt I had least got some things right, even though it was, for me, a 2-hour “crash course” in Philosophy and Logic Theory (subjects I have never formally studied at any level). I eagerly awaited his response...

I am sorry, Andrew, but your standards of credibility and mine simply do not coincide. I suppose that having a Ph.D. in the history and the philosophy of science and having devoted my professional life to logic, critical thinking, and scientific reasoning have given me a different perspective than your own.

Again Fetzer does not debate specific points of evidence and he also ignores my answers to the “quiz”, which, I contend, expose how weakly he has applied his own standards of thinking to this case. Fetzer then went on to make another bold statement:

I find it fascinating that you infer that, because Ace Baker and John P. Costella and I disagree with you, we must be suppressing, distorting, or otherwise fabricating evidence!

Whilst I had suggested Fetzer was trying to cover up the Hutchison Effect’s relation to the destruction of the WTC, I never accused him of fabricating evidence. Neither had I accused Ace Baker of fabricating evidence. Ace himself admitted faking a video – so I wasn’t accusing him of anything other than what he had already admitted doing! Fetzer also said:

Make sure that you observe in this article or yours that I stand behind Dr. Wood's research but not Hutchison's. And be sure to explain our reasons for thinking as we do. That called playing fair by laying our cards on the table as well as your own.

So, here is all the evidence – all the cards, and all the chips for the reader to consider.

Fetzer sent a short follow up e-mail, where he responded to my note that I thought the quiz he’d set had been “fun, fun, fun”.

Since I mentioned there were three differences between inductive and deductive reasoning and you (wrongly) mention a common misconception, I presume you

already know you are wrong on that one. I'd love to offer you a tutorial, but you are not a very promising student. In any case, thanks for your good work of the past. All my best!

So again, Fetzer makes disparaging remarks, rather than replying to the specific points I'd made about the evidence and the way he had analysed and criticised it – or rather, the way that he and Ace Baker seemed to have agreed that ignoring evidence completely was the best policy in this case.

By this point, of course, I knew what Fetzer was doing – and so again, I deferred to my sense of humour and responded thus (in reference to my earlier “fun, fun, fun” comment):

Can't you at least "mark" my attempts at "special pleadings" and "total evidence" [answers] - go on, please!?!

Or "has the Daddy Taken the T-bird away, then?"

Fetzer didn't seem to see the humorous side here, and responded thus:

I had no idea I was dealing with a child! Thanks for clarifying that!

I had perhaps “taunted” Fetzer somewhat, during the exchange of e-mails, but I had not insulted his intelligence nor had I made disparaging remarks – I tried hard to stick to points of evidence, both regarding the Hutchison Effect and the WTC and his own analysis of these things. He responded without addressing the evidence and he suggested I was either “dumb” or “childish”. Is this an effective way to debate the truth of an issue?

Summary and Conclusions

Here are some observations. Prof. Jim Fetzer, is an author or editor of multiple books, and he repeats this fact at regular intervals.

- Fetzer said he was impressed with my “sticking to the truth” but completely ignored my analysis of the Hutchison Effect evidence and he never sent any comments up until Ace Baker had been on his show.
- Fetzer claims he is more credible, due to his PhD and experience, yet he gives more credibility to Ace Baker's analysis regarding the Hutchison effect rather than that of Dr. Wood. He never disclosed Ace's qualifications – yet he takes Ace's view as more credible than Dr. Wood's and my own – even though he asked Dr. Wood and myself, but not Ace Baker, to be on the Steering Committee.

- Fetzter does not take exception to the fact that Ace Baker put out a false story about his video.
- Fetzter takes no account of the other evidence regarding John Hutchison – and has not commented on the other documents^{cxvii}, metal samples etc.
- Fetzter takes no account of the fact that John Hutchison has submitted a sworn affidavit for the court^{cxviii}, which in effect means that if he is lying, he could potentially go to prison.
- In the broadcast with Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison, there were a number of long silences where Fetzter had an opportunity to question points of evidence, analysis or science. At no time did he do this in any meaningful way.
- Fetzter does not consider it significant that the Hutchison Effect was actually named after John.

Some people will, even though all this evidence has been presented, think Fetzter either just has a “big ego” or that he is just being stubborn or stupid. The key question is, why has he been so consistent in this behaviour with regard to the Hutchison Effect and the WTC destruction? I think that the answer is because he knows that the Hutchison Effect is extremely important in this area of research and he has been “given the job” of distracting people from the evidence and turning attention away from it. He cannot, however, simply do this by “trashing Dr. Judy Wood” overtly, as this would be too obvious. He can, however, attempt to “trash” others who are involved in this affair when they are unimportant in the overall scheme.

I think this all goes to show, again, that we now stand at a juncture in human history and it seems to be revolving around revealing secrets and exposing falsehoods. Some people, however, are helping to keep the truth covered up – and by continually challenging them, questioning them and reviewing the evidence, we can work out who those people are.

I hope that this work has served to document the truth about Jim Fetzter and the Hutchison Effect and that the reader will draw their own conclusions as to what has really been happening here.

13. 9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - Handling the Truth

6th Apr 2008

Some people have now observed that the 9/11 Truth Movement is being directed and controlled, in order that only a certain amount of information is revealed – at a certain time, and in a certain way. I first began to understand how this seemed to be happening during the break up of the original Scholars for 9/11 Truth Group in about Feb 2007 (see chapter 4). More recently, I feel I have, with the help of others, been able to document another significant instance of the attempted control of 9-11 related information. In completing this documentation, I have been somewhat concerned that I may be accused of some type of “ad hominem attack” against those whose statements and actions I am documenting. I feel somewhat similar about writing this article, for the same reasons. Weighed against this, I feel that certain truths need to be told in order that people have a chance to understand how the mechanics of the control of information related to 9/11 - and the energy cover up – are operating. In short, I have now come to the conclusion that, when trying to get to the truth, we have to scrutinize the history, behaviour and psychology of those presenting or discussing evidence has to be carefully considered.

In this article, I will present evidence concerning the latest attempts to cover up one of the “central secrets” of the 9/11 Black Operation. That secret, I strongly contend, is this: free energy technology, related to Hutchison Effect technology was used to destroy the majority of the WTC complex. “Free Energy” technology is a “catch all” term to describe a kind of technology that can be used to “get out more energy than you put in” (i.e. you apparently get the energy for free). Mainstream science rejects this idea on its face, because it is said it breaks the laws of thermodynamics. (When looked at from a different perspective, however^{cxxxiii}, this seems to be incorrect – it is known the energy is real, but assumed it is too difficult to construct technology to use or extract it to do “useful work”.) Cold fusion is one example where many, many experiments show a small input energy can result, in certain circumstances, in a large energy output. (See www.lenr-canr.org)

Some of the effects observed in John Hutchison’s experiments are apparently the result of an output of very high energy levels, and yet his input energy is small – only a few kilowatts at maximum. (This is the energy required to operate a kettle to boil water).

In December 2007, Dr. Judy Wood posted her study of the very striking similarity of experimental characteristics of the “Hutchison Effect” to a number of pieces of evidence at the WTC. Dr. Wood and I were given an opportunity to discuss this issue on Ambrose Lane’s “We Ourselves” show in January 2008^{cxxxiv} and on our second appearance, John Hutchison joined the discussion. Following this radio show appearance, two of the people associated with the 911 Scholars group – Prof. Jim Fetzer^{cxxxv} (the founder) and Ace Baker^{cxxxvi} (not a listed member of the Scholars group, but a regular guest on Fetzer’s radio show) - when challenged, began to behave differently towards Dr. Wood and I – at least in relation to the “Hutchison Effect” study. I attempted to document this “change in behaviour” in the articles referenced above. Following the actions of Baker and Fetzer, I asked that my name be deleted from the 911 Scholars list.

In the articles referenced above, I documented the very strong reaction of Fetzer and Baker – they both (essentially) agreed that John Hutchison was a fraud – and in saying this, ignored and considerable amount of evidence which suggested, beyond reasonable doubt, that John Hutchison’s work was valid.

It is interesting to note that there was an apparent “change in strategy” by Fetzer - sometime in February 2008 – from apparent support of Dr. Wood’s study to his support of Baker’s pernicious debunking tactics.

“Good Cop?”

On Feb 5th 2008, Jim Fetzer sent Dr. Wood an e-mail which had come from one of his contacts which included these paragraphs. This contact was enthusing about Dr. Wood’s research:

I've been meaning to write to you on a number of issues, not least your collaboration with my dear friend, Dr. _____, which I was instrumental in bringing about and for which he is very grateful. In particular for "having opened their minds to the work of Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds as well as your own".

...and

Hi _____, You've been right about Judy Wood, I have been studying the website and I had to update mine, this is of such importance that I have c.e.r.n. people and international physicists on the edge of their seats and today I will have a meeting with one of them. We we might just nail the evidence soon. Thanks!!!

(It should be noted that Jim Fetzer has not posted any of his own original 9/11 research in the way Dr. Wood has, though he has other research

posted on the possible involvement of directed energy weapons in the death of Senator Paul Wellstone^{cxxxvii}).

From reading these forwarded messages, it seemed that people at CERN were interested in Dr. Wood's research. This seemed, on its face, like a very positive development – much of the research at CERN concerns Energy Phenomena of one type or another.

However, these messages were never followed up with anything more substantive and were therefore quickly forgotten about – especially once the Ace Baker “campaign” was underway.

The next few e-mail exchanges centred around Ace Baker's fake video debunking attempt, but on 26th Feb 2008, Ace Baker announced he would be appearing on Jim Fetzer's show. Dr. Wood thought this was rather an odd way to do things – that Fetzer was going to get someone else to talk about Dr. Wood's research with Fetzer before Dr. Wood did. Dr. Wood therefore e-mailed Fetzer and several others in a small group to say this much. It was an especially odd way of doing things because Ace Baker, as it was known by this time, had already circulated a false story that he had bought equipment on e-bay to reproduce the effect, but he then he made and posted a fake video to apparently reproduce a very limited number of the effects seen in John Hutchison's own work. Additionally, unlike Dr. Wood, Baker had no real relevant qualifications. Fetzer soon replied.

“This Doesn't Look Right to Me...”

On Feb 27th 2008, Jim Fetzer sent Dr. Wood an e-mail expressing concern that she had notified several others of the group that she was being critical that Ace Baker would be going on Jim Fetzer's show to discuss the Hutchison Effect:

Just between us, why didn't you send me a personal note when you noticed what you perceived to be a problem? What's going on there? I find that a bit odd. And you and John already appeared with Morgan to discuss the H-effect, so what's the deal if Ace is doing something with it? I admit I have been sicker than a dog with stomach flu and simply tried to solve what you took to be a problem, but if you couldn't come on Wednesday anyway and have already discussed it with Morgan, why is it such a big deal? No one holds your work in greater esteem than do I. Give me a break, OK?

One point here is that John Hutchison had not yet appeared with Dr. Morgan Reynolds on the Dynamic Duo show – though he had planned to, it never happened. Why did Fetzer ask Dr. Wood to “give him a break”? Once the Ace Baker broadcast and associated blog entries were

complete, it seemed quite clear that a full-scale debunking exercise was underway, and this therefore seemed to justify Dr. Wood's earlier concern.

“Bad Cop”

On Mar 3rd 2008, shortly after Judy Wood and John Hutchison's broadcast on the Dynamic Duo, Jim Fetzer sent another e-mail to Dr. Wood. The tone of this message was rather different to previous messages he had sent.

Just between us, if Dr. Wood were to back off her relations with Hutchinson, whom I consider to be a fraud, I think her standing can be salvaged. Whether she is willing to do that, I have no idea. But this is certainly an option that is available to her. We all make mistakes and have misplaced enthusiasms. But my opinion is that--absence physical explanations of the kind I asked of him at the time on the air--he is most unlikely to contribute to our/ her success.

Here, Fetzer suggests Dr. Wood should not continue her association with John Hutchison. The reason given here is not based on any evidence - it is that Fetzer “considers John to be a fraud”. Fetzer specifies no particular evidence, merely that John could “not explain” his phenomenon. However, this statement by Fetzer is not 100% accurate – John did provide a basic explanation of his phenomenon during the broadcast, and it was thus:

OK. I don't normally go into theories too much – I have my own personal theory that it's affected on a subatomic level, but Rene Louis Vallee and Andrei Sakharov brought up some interesting reports, along with many others, on what happens here and we found that the RF fields are not the cause – or the electrostatics – it's something that happens after that. They seem to join or [be] combined in space and time to cause a[n] other effect – which happens to be like a shielding of the gravity pull – basically the reverse of gravity – and you see things lift off. Things go in a translational motion as well as ... if not, metals seem to start bending and twisting and pulling into different patterns and shapes. We also found it affects the background radiation, to quite an extent – where you get a couple of counts per minute.

John then names several scientists who have evaluated the phenomenon – and several of them have posted reports^{cxxxviii}. If John Hutchison was a fraud, why did he agree to come on Fetzer's radio show (no fee is paid), where he could, in theory, be exposed as a fraud?

Recently, part of the interview with Fetzer and Hutchison was transcribed for us by someone. One section makes particularly interesting reading:

Hutchison: Well, my education is -- I flunked my coloring book and blocks. I'm self-taught, and I've been involved in many applications in engineering and research and one of them happened to be in to Nicola Tesla, which I was able to replicate a lot of his experiments. And pushing it beyond the envelope there, we managed to cause levitation of objects and also the destruction of objects, as it's called. And it gained interest in to the U.S. military back in 1983, which they did a lot of experiments and tests with it.

Fetzer: So you grew up in Canada?

Why does Fetzer ask about John's upbringing rather than the interest of the US military in his experiments? At this point, Fetzer knew that US Defence Contractors such as SAIC and ARA were defendants in the Qui Tam Cases of Drs. Wood and Reynolds, so why doesn't Fetzer have an interest in what John has to say about the Military's work with John? (Fetzer does not discuss this at all in the rest of the programme.)

Fetzer Ignores Evidence

Again, as documented previously, Fetzer wilfully ignores the strong correspondence between the WTC evidence and fully documented effects seen in John Hutchison's experiments – bent “horseshoe” beams, spontaneous cold fires, levitation, transmutation of materials and ongoing effects.

How can Fetzer threaten Dr. Judy Wood's reputation? What gives him the right to do so? What gives him grounds for using this sort of language when Dr. Wood's association with Fetzer is completely informal – she is not an employee, nor does Fetzer have any agreed method of working with her. Therefore, what on earth compels him to talk about “salvaging her reputation”? Can this e-mail therefore be perceived as some kind of thinly-veiled threat?

Another peculiar aspect of the message is that, rather than starting a new message, or replying to one from Dr. Wood, Fetzer had forwarded an article from the Washington Post entitled The New Art of War. He also changed the subject line of the message. Why did he include this article in the message to Dr. Wood – which was also copied to Jerry Leaphart and Dr. Morgan Reynolds? Why did it include a very long list of recipients, to which the original forwarded message was sent (this list included Steven E Jones and others)?

The New Art of War article begins as follows:

If there were any doubts that the United States is preparing for war in space and cyberspace, testimony before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee last week would have wiped them away.

According to Gen. Kevin P. Chilton, head of U.S. Strategic Command, "our adversaries understand our dependence upon space-based capabilities, and we must be ready to detect, track, characterize, attribute, predict and respond to any threat to our space infrastructure."

Although space threats have received much attention in the past, it was the possibility of cyberspace warfare that was given new emphasis at the hearing.

Was Fetzer giving some "coded indication" that Dr. Wood exposing the truth about what destroyed the WTC is a "threat" to the US's space infrastructure? Was he somehow indicating Dr. Wood's exposure of this evidence could be treated as an act of "Cyber Terrorism"? Is it a possibility that Fetzer is actually "going along" with the unfolding agenda - for tighter global control of ordinary people, whilst at the same time pretending he is working to prevent its implementation?

Also, if Fetzer truly thinks Dr. Wood had something wrong in her "Hutchison Effect" study, why didn't he address this on his radio show, as he went through the "JJ" pages? (Fetzer raised no points of criticism during the broadcast). Before sending this message, Fetzer had no specific argument with anything John Hutchison or Judy Wood had said – he merely thought "there was a possibility of fraud". This is true with almost every controversial issue – and the only way to resolve it is by considering the widest possible range of pertinent evidence.

Questions and Speculations

I find the above developments of some concern, both for what they are, and the additional questions they raise.

It was puzzling to receive initial communications from CERN via Fetzer – apparently supportive of Dr. Wood's new research – research that had been publicly discussed several weeks earlier. How does Fetzer know people at CERN? Why didn't any of these people contact Dr. Wood directly? Why was the communication routed through Fetzer?

What then caused the switch to a tone which was more sinister, mentioning the idea that "Dr. Wood's reputation can be salvaged" – even though no evidence had been presented to show that her study was somehow invalid?

Is it possible that "psychological tactics" were in use by Fetzer? Perhaps he hoped that Dr. Wood would be very enthusiastic about CERN's apparent interest – and pursue this angle in preference to some other one (such as work on the Qui Tam cases).

One possibility is that CERN would not want any information relating to free energy technology to become widely known. They are large benefactors from energy related research^{cxxxix}:

CERN, with an annual budget of more than EURO 600 million and more than 6000 regular users working in 500 institutes in 50 different countries....

The Hutchison Effect and Cold Fusion hold the potential to produce limitless, cheap, free energy – with relatively simple equipment, compared to what is used at places like CERN. At CERN, however, things like “hot fusion” are (unsurprisingly) promoted within the organisation^{exl}.

So they, too, like the Military Industrial Complex have a very strong vested interest in keeping all this information out of public view or “in the realm of the incredible”.

As Dr. Wood did not express any specific interest in the CERN contact, did Fetzer then change his strategy from “Good Cop” to “Bad Cop” hoping that she would react to a more threatening posture?

Please consider the evidence and draw your own conclusions.

14. 9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - An Ace in the Hole – Part II

Aug 19, 2008

Some time ago, I posted a series of 3 articles^{cxli} which attempted to document the peculiar machinations of Alexander “Ace” Baker and Prof. Jim Fetzer in relation to a study posted by Dr. Judy Wood regarding 9/11 evidence and Hutchison Effect Evidence^{lxxxix}. Dr. Wood also posted an article^{cxlii} highlighting the unusual attitude that Jim Fetzer took to John Hutchison when John appeared as a guest on his “Dynamic Duo” show on 28 February 2008.

In the articles I wrote, I contended that the evidence collected by Dr. Wood - and the reaction to this same evidence - strongly implied that the basic thrust of the argument is correct – that some type of technology related to that used to create the Hutchison Effect was indeed employed in 9/11.

Since Dr. Wood posted her original “Hutchison Effect” study in early 2008, she has posted an additional series, which includes a good deal of data regarding Hurricane Erin, which was closest to NYC during the events of 9/11^{cxliii}. As part of this study, Dr. Wood has obtained magnetometer data, logged by instruments in Alaska during the events of 9/11^{cxliv}. These data show very interesting variations in the earth’s magnetic field during the events of 9/11. Reaction to this study seems to have been more muted, though the data is now getting some exposure.

Dr. Wood and I were invited by Jim Fetzer to make two appearances in his “Dynamic Duo” show slot on GCN Live. These two appearances took place on 30th July 2008^{cxlv} and 31st July 2008^{cxlvi}, and will be the subject of a separate article.

Decoy and Distract?

On 18th August 2008, Dr. Wood and I received an e-mail from Ace Baker with the subject:

Ace Baker - \$100,000 Hutchison Effect Challenge

Ace Baker was apparently offering “\$100,000 if John and/or Dr. Wood can reproduce the H-Effect.” The message contained a link to an entry on his blog, in which he set out the general terms of his challenge. Strangely, however, Ace neglected to include John in the “CC” or “To” fields. When Dr. Wood noticed this, she forwarded her copy of Ace's email to John.

John Hutchison is, at times, quite a prolific “blogger” himself^{xcii} and he contacted Dr. Wood to state that he had posted a response to Ace Baker’s challenge on Ace Baker’s own blog, but it seems as though it was not approved or posted there. John advised us of the general contents of his post, from memory, soon after he had tried to post it.

Some time previously, Ace had offered a sum of \$5000 if he could film “Hutchison Effects” in John’s lab, but Ace never followed through, so this seemed to represent a substantially larger offer. However, I was very curious about this new offer, because Ace had previously stated “John Hutchison is a 100% fraud”. If Ace believed this, then what was the point of offering a large sum of money? I was therefore given to ask Ace Baker the following questions:

- 1) Who would he be approaching to validate the effects, and how will their qualifications compare to those of George Hathaway, Col John Alexander, Hal Puthoff and others? (They have already been involved with evaluating and documenting John Hutchison’s experiments.)
- 2) Why was Ace willing to put up this amount of money for this demonstration, as opposed to, say, putting it into a Legal Case to sue the media regarding TV fakery? (I asked Ace Baker this question because he has stated he is an expert in video fakery and has published a detailed study on the 9/11 “Chopper 5” video^{xcvii}, in which he concludes that the video has been heavily doctored, using video compositing, to present fake images as real.)
- 3) If Hutchison-Effect-like technology was NOT employed on 9/11, then would Ace be willing to pay for research to answer questions regarding (a) Inverted cars (b) horseshoe beams (c) explosion of Scott packs (d) witness accounts of levitation effects etc.

In other words, I was trying to ask if Ace wanted to see the truth of 9/11 uncovered. (He did not dispute the validity of the points of evidence (a) - (d) above.) Finally, I asked him:

- 4) What were his thoughts on (a) The Hurricane’s path (b) The Alaskan Magnetometer Data?

In the same message, I said I was very interested in alternative explanations, based on good evidence, for the effects seen on 9/11, as I thought that this is what the search for 9/11 truth was for. I stated that I was open to a different, consistent interpretation of the evidence, if it answered all the questions regarding that same evidence.

In Ace’s response, he answered question 1 thus:

1. Hutchison/Wood are free to discuss any details/clarifications should they decide to accept the challenge.

This was not relevant to the question I asked – I asked who would help him to validate that the effects were real. Was Ace trying to divert his answers away from dealing with the evidence?

2. I am willing to offer \$100,000 to FOX5 to license broadcast-quality Chopper 5 footage. That challenge coming soon.

This also did not really answer the question I asked. I actually queried him about possibly making a legal challenge, based on his TV fakery research. Instead, he seemed to answer this by describing a proposed “bet” with FOX5. Again, it seemed as if Ace was diverting away from the evidence I was asking him about – he didn’t respond at all regarding the issue of legal action being taken.

In answering the third question, Ace said:

3. There is no Hutchison Effect to have been employed on 9/11. No, I am not willing to offer \$100,000 to "some people". The purpose of this challenge is to demonstrate to the public that Hutchison and Wood are liars.

Here, he did not seem to interpret the spirit of my question as I had intended. I intended it to mean would he be prepared to fund research, rather than fund debunking. Would he be prepared, in principle, to fund research to advance an alternative explanation? In his answer, he seemed to be stating that he was wanting to prove that John Hutchison was a liar (and Dr. Wood was a liar, independent of the facts put before him, both in this e-mail exchange and in earlier ones. Also, it is not called "The Hutchison and Wood Effect."). This, to me, shows a disturbing lack of desire to discover what actually happened on 9/11. If Dr. Wood’s study is incomplete or inaccurate or even inappropriate, then why can’t Ace come up with a better method to find the correct explanation? How will proving John Hutchison a fraud (even though Ace was already convinced of this) help determine what did happen on 9/11? I was given to ask myself, therefore, what is Ace’s true intent and focus? Who was he doing this “stunt” for - himself?

In his answer to question 4, again he seems to blatantly ignore data:

4. The challenge has nothing whatsoever to do with hurricane Erin or the Alaskan Magnetometer data. It has to do with the scientific claims made by John Hutchison. Hutchison's claims pre-date 9/11, and continue to this day.

Could it be that there is a strategy to distract people away from looking at the basic data - which starts to clearly show that field effects (for example,

effects on the earth's magnetic field) did indeed play a significant role on 9/11? Is all this an exercise to create more and more forum verbiage to drown out any serious discussion of evidence? Is he trying to set up a fake exercise to test the existence of something which has already generated over 500 lbs of anomalous metal samples?

I must admit to being somewhat surprised at Ace Baker's answers to these four questions – especially his apparent “blanking” of the Hurricane Erin data, so to clarify this, I sent one further e-mail with some follow-up questions. I asked him if his "Hutchison Effect challenge" really had nothing to do with 9/11 research. He replied:

.....
1. Wrong. The Hutchison Effect Challenge is related to 9/11 research, in that it will require honest researchers to eliminate "Hutchison Effect" from consideration.
.....

I then asked him if he thought Hurricane Erin was not relevant to what happened on 9/11. He responded:

.....
2. Right. Hurricane Erin is unrelated to 9/11.
.....

Finally, I asked him if he really had no interest in finding out how the towers were dustified on 9/11. He said:

.....
3. Wrong. I am very interested to learn how the towers were blown up. But I'm also interested in documenting the strategy of the govern-media psy-op team.
.....

So what strategy has Ace documented? On his blog, he has repeated several times that “John Hutchison is a fraud” and has simply just made some fake videos. Ace has made his own fake videos, simulating 2 or 3 of the effects (incompletely). Ace has also completed a study of TV fakery. In both cases, he has not “moved” his evidence into a legal framework, as Dr. Wood has done. He has not submitted an affidavit in a court case, as John Hutchison has done. (I also submitted an affidavit for Dr. Wood's Qui Tam case^{exlviii}.)

Ace Baker's Double-Standard?


It is worth mentioning that Dr. Wood is not the only person to have suggested how the WTC complex was destroyed. People such as Dr. Steven E Jones have suggested thermite or thermate (or some variant thereof) was used to destroy the WTC. Ed Ward and others have previously stated that “micro-nukes” must have been used. Ace Baker has not, however, offered \$100,000 to Prof. Steve E Jones for a demonstration of thermite, nor has he offered Ed Ward, or anyone else to my knowledge, any sum of money for a demonstration of micro-nuke technology. If Ace was being even handed in his assessment of 9/11

research, surely he would have made such an offer when these theories were first “put on the table”. Can we conclude there is some special reason why linking 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect is so “dangerous”?

Observations/Conclusions

- Ace said he was convinced that John Hutchison was a 100% fraud but Ace was still willing to offer \$100,000 and travel to Vancouver at his own expense as part of this challenge. Why?
- Ace seemed less interested in using his own TV fakery research in some kind of legal action than he did in attempting to debunk John Hutchison (and essentially Dr. Judy Wood too).
- At appearances in Seattle and Portland, John Hutchison brought some of his samples as an exhibit. He allowed the audience to examine and photograph these samples^{cxlix}. (If John were a fraud, why would he do such a thing?) So, it is clear to those people who handled the samples that the things they were holding in their hands were not the result of “video fakery”. Also, many samples have been given to other people around the world – so we have lots of physical evidence which shows the Hutchison Effect is real.
- Ace Baker had previously offered to come and meet Dr. Wood in, Seattle in 2006, at a presentation she was giving then. The presentations that Dr. Wood and John Hutchison gave in Seattle and Portland in May/June 2008 were advertised weeks or even months in advance. Ace could have attended one or both of these presentations if he wanted to. He could have seen the samples for himself. So why wasn't Ace there to ask questions and to examine the samples?
- Below are a few of many photos the Dr. Wood herself took on one of her trips to see John Hutchison.





- Ace was not interested in the relevance of the Hurricane Erin study – despite the clear evidence of field effects in relation to the Hurricane itself, 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect. Why?
- Ace seemed to say he did not want to fund research into an alternative explanation for the destruction of the towers, yet he said he was interested in how they were destroyed – does this make sense? If he is genuinely interested in finding out what happened on 9/11, then why didn't he offer or consider finding some “better” alternatives?

I leave the reader to draw their own conclusions about the overall meaning of this “episode”. Does it illustrate how the cover up of 9/11 truth is working?

Addendum – Ace Baker on Dynamic Duo - 26 Aug 2008

On 26th August 2008, Ace Baker appeared on the Dynamic Duo^{cl}. Part of a segment in the first hour discussed Ace Baker’s “Challenge” and mentioned the posting of this article (before this addendum was posted). At time code 2:36 in this clip^{cl}, he stated, in regard to this “challenge”:

I've been getting the hate correspondence from – from Andrew Johnson and so forth....

This was a curious statement, as all the e-mails I have recently exchanged with Baker are included in this article in their entirety. Why couldn't Ace's description have been more accurate, saying “I have been getting correspondence from Andrew Johnson” or “I have been getting critical correspondence from Andrew Johnson” or even “Andrew Johnson asked me some questions about this, to which I responded.”? Anyone reading this article, and the e-mails can clearly see there is no “hate

correspondence” here. Additionally, it is not my style to indulge in such correspondence, as a study of my web postings, articles etc. will reveal.

He then discussed my website and how I posted the earlier articles in this series. He then referred to the e-mail that John Hutchison sent to Dr. Judy Wood (which she forwarded to me) regarding John’s attempted blog entry posting. Ace incorrectly states that John Hutchison contacted me directly – he did not, as the e-mail header shows.

Fetzer then read out the title of this article (“Ace in the Hole Part 2”), and the “subtitle” I posted on the front page (which read: “What is the real motive behind Ace Baker's new "Hutchison Effect Challenge?”) Fetzer then stated:

“Oh, that’s great, I love it when people start speculating on motives”.

Ace then adds:

My motive is to get people to believe that Hutchison is a fake – that’s my motive.

So, are Baker and Fetzer unconcerned with the large volume of evidence that John has amassed? (It seems pointless to ask this sort of question too many times.)

Ace Baker then reads out John’s e-mail, but fails to mention that this text is what John Hutchison attempted to post on Ace Baker’s blog, and that it was John’s best recall of it. (An entry posted on a blog is normally “lost” if the user does not make a copy, and it is subsequently not approved.)

Fetzer then re-asserts that his treatment of John Hutchison, when he appeared on Fetzer’s show, was justified, because of John’s background. He then says:

This is something that Judy Wood, Andrew Johnson and others don’t seem to have processed.

I think evidence presented here shows that I, and others, have very much “processed” what Jim Fetzer has been doing – and I have documented evidence to suggest what his motive could be.

In the second hour, a caller (John) from Canada rightly pointed out that just because Ace has produced a video which reproduces some of the aspects of the Hutchison Effect, it does not prove that John Hutchison is a fraud (Fetzer agreed with this logic). The caller then does a quite a good job of mentioning the additional evidence such as the metal samples and Dr. Wood’s comparison to the effects seen on 9/11 (but even though he appears to have read this article, he failed to mention Ace’s opportunity to meet John Hutchison in Seattle). However, Ace then responds and says:


.....
*I don't think that Dr. Wood believes in it [The Hutchison Effect],
unfortunately, I've come to the opinion that Judy Wood is... um... fits right in
to the model of disinformation.*
.....

Curiously, Ace then re-asserts his general support for the rest of Dr. Wood's 9/11 research and study of what happened at the WTC and states that she is "absolutely right" about the effects seen - such as dustification of the towers, the bent beams etc.

Perhaps ironically, most of the remainder of the show is taken up with Ace's discussion of his model of the ways disinformation can be promoted.

What was the purpose, if any, of this broadcast with Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer?

15. Press Release - New Study by former Professor Examines Hurricane Erin on 9/11/01



9/10/01

9/11/01

9/12/01

20th May 2008 – Clemson SC. - Dr. Judy Wood, a former Professor of Mechanical Engineering, has posted a new study which highlights the possible links between events on 9/11 and the occurrence in the Atlantic ocean of Hurricane Erin.

The new study, (posted at <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin>) considers the “Field Effects” associated with Hurricanes and energy effects involved in the destruction of the World Trade Centre complex in New York City on 9/11. Dr. Wood’s extensive research has already catalogued a substantial range of evidence of very unusual effects at the WTC site on and since 9/11. The preponderance of this evidence points to the use of one or more Directed Energy Weapons in the destruction of the WTC buildings. This general conclusion has been the focal point of her Qui Tam Case against NIST’s contractors. The defendants are accused of committing fraud, including "wilful indifference" which resulted in them presenting a deceptive analysis and false data constructs, which were then used to compile the NCSTAR1 reports (http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.html) .

Earlier, in January 2008, Dr. Wood posted a study on her website (<http://drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>), which relates effects seen in photographs taken before, during and after the destruction of the WTC complex, to effects seen in Hutchison’s ongoing experiments. Wood and Hutchison co-authored the study. The Hutchison Effect is primarily a “Field Effect”, seemingly created by a poorly understood interaction between electrostatic, magnetic and radio frequency fields.

The new pictorial study (which also relates to Field Effects) notes that Hurricane Erin was "born" on about 1 September 2001, and travelled up towards NYC. Hurricane Erin was the closest to NYC on 9/11/01 and was the largest on this date (although wind speeds were greater the day before). Close-ups from photos of Erin on 9/11 clearly show the plume of material from the destroyed WTC.

The development of Erin is considered, and a comparison made to Hurricane Katrina, for the reason that Katrina and Erin were of comparable size (Erin was bigger, by most measures). It is noted that the media reported very little about the potential risk Erin posed around the time of 9/11, compared to what was reported regarding Katrina – even before Katrina made landfall.

The relationship between 9/11, the Hutchison Effect, Field Effects and data regarding Hurricane and Weather Modification is introduced. No firm conclusions are drawn, data is merely presented to illustrate where highly significant common themes and patterns seem to be present. For example, a short comparison is drawn between some of the effects seen with the materials in collision (caused by the effects of Tornados and hurricanes) with the anomalous changes in materials seen with Hutchison Effect. Apparent levitation effects seen in some instances are also highlighted.

The development of “super cell” storms is examined and a comparison of their structure to that of a Tesla Coil (used to create high voltage electrical discharges) is considered. The possibility is suggested that the electrical properties of large storm systems may have some similarities to those of Tesla coils and that there is a possibility that technology exists to utilise or manipulate the energy in these storm systems for “secondary” purposes.

One of the most striking pieces of the data presented is that from a set of magnetometers monitored by the University of Alaska. Several instruments show significant deviations from “background” or “normal” readings as the events of 9/11 were unfolding. A further selection of this data is presented in relation to variations during the hurricane seasons of 2001, 2004 and 2005.

A later part of the study examines some of the data relating to patterns of earthquakes in 2008 and possibly associated unusual weather patterns, which may be related to secret or partially disclosed environmental modification technology (such as HAARP). However, the study does not establish any clear links between HAARP and the events in New York on 9/11.

**Here is a small selection of photos from the study,
which can be read in full at**

**[http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/
Hurricane Erin, September 11, 2001](http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/Hurricane%20Erin,%20September%2011,%202001)**

Introduction

In this pictorial study, information pertaining to the possible links between events on 9/11 and the occurrence in the Atlantic ocean of a Hurricane – Hurricane Erin – will be presented.

1. Development of Erin



Hurricane Erin was “born” on about the 1st of September 2001, and travelled up towards NYC. Hurricane Erin was the closest to NYC on 9/11/01 and was the largest on this date (although wind speeds were greater the day before). At the top of each page, the photo of Erin has an inset, where the plume of material from the destroyed WTC can be clearly seen. The crew of the International Space Station (ISS) can see "terrorist Carnage" in NYC on 9/11/01, they did not report seeing a hurricane that was just out of their camera shot (this video was shown on CNN).

Hurricane Erin, September 11, 2001




2. Comparison of Hurricane Data

The development of the Erin is considered, and a comparison made to Hurricane Katrina, for the reason that Katrina and Erin were of comparable size (Erin was bigger, by most measures), yet we heard almost nothing of the risk Erin posed near 9/11 compared to what we heard about Katrina. Erin was also the subject of an extended study mission which united researchers from 10 universities, five NASA centers and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration”.




3. Levitation, Material Effects and Storm Effects





A short comparison is drawn between some of the effects seen with the materials in collision in Tornadoes and hurricanes with the anomalous changes in materials seen with Hutchison Effect.



4. Storms and Tesla Coils



The development of “supercell” storms is examined and a comparison of their structure to that of a Tesla Coil is considered. It is therefore suggested that the electrical properties of large storm systems may have some similarities to Tesla coils and there is a possibility that technology



<p>exists to utilise or manipulate the energy in these storm systems for “secondary” purposes.</p>		
<p>5. Magnetometer Data One of the most striking elements of the data presented is that from a set of magnetometers monitored by the University of Alaska. Several instruments show significant deviations from “background” or “normal” readings as the events of 9/11 were unfolding. Further selections of this data are presented in relation to variations during the hurricane seasons of 2001, 2004 and 2005.</p>		
<p>6. Plume Study An adjunct of the study is that of the development of and changes in the plume of material seen rising from the WTC complex following their destruction. Its “thinning” is noted, and a comparison made to other significant smoke plumes observed from space. The comparison indicates that the plume did not behave like particulate smoke from a chemical or wood fire. The relationship of the changes in the plume to dust particle sizes is briefly considered.</p>		


7. Earthquake Links?

A later part of the study examines some of the data relating to patterns of earthquakes and unusual weather patterns, which may be related to secret or partially disclosed environmental modification technology (such as HAARP), though no direct link to the events on 9/11 is established.



8. Beaming Power, Magnetic Reconnection, Rocks, Planet Earth

The possible role of the compound Barium Titanate, is noted both in reference to the possible residue from persistent jet trails (usually called “chemtrails”) and those used in some experiments by John Hutchison and Thomas Townsend Brown. Could there be some role for this compound in the manipulation of field effects? (It is noted here that the X-ray opacity of the Barium compound taken by patients before tests may also be significant in this area of study.)



16. Mike Rudin's BBC Conspiracy File

In early January 2008, Dr Judy Wood contacted me to tell me she was asked by Mike Rudin of the BBC for a short telephone interview. Dr Wood contacted me to see if I knew anything about this fellow. He was the series producer of the BBC series *Conspiracy Files*^{clii}, which included a programme about 9/11^{cliii}. A video rebuttal was produced^{cliv}, although this itself is somewhat out of date/flawed. Here is the e-mail exchange that I had with him.

Envelope-to: lisajudy@nctv.com
Subject: BBC documentary
Date: Tue, 8 Jan 2008 11:30:03 -0000
Thread-Topic: BBC documentary
Thread-Index: AchR6c9UMSDfNuI2RNCARMyojP/YTw==
From: "Michael Rudin" < michael.rudin@bbc.co.uk >
To: < lisajudy@nctv.com >
Dear Dr Wood

I am producing a BBC documentary about the collapse of WTC 7 on 9/11 and I would like to talk to you when you have a moment. Would you be available for a quick chat on the phone today and could you suggest the best number to get you on?

Many thanks

Mike Rudin

Producer

BBC Current Affairs

Work: 020 8752 7204 (direct line)

Room 1161, BBC White City, 201 Wood Lane, London W12 7TR

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]
Sent: 08 January 2008 12:14
To: Michael Rudin
Subject: Interview with Dr Wood?
Dear Mr Rudin,

I am responding on behalf of Dr Wood, whom I have been working closely with for some time. Why are you contacting Dr Wood at this time?

At the end of this message, I have enclosed an e-mail I sent to you last year. If you re-read this, you will begin to understand why I have advised Dr Wood not to give you an interview. I do not trust you. You had an

opportunity last year to display to the British Public the truth about 9/11 - instead, you and your organisation, made a documentary which portrayed Popular Mechanics as some kind of academic authority. You put out false information. You painted people like myself who are trying to get to the truth as some kind of "conspiracy theorist". You employed a silky-voiced narrator so that the people who wouldn't bother to check the facts would swallow the morsels of disinformation without question.

What I wrote last year is now as true as ever. Or - maybe I am wrong? Perhaps you can produce some evidence that "things are different this time"? How about you arrange for Radio 2 news bulletins for a period of 24 hours to post an item, in a respectful manner, about the fact that Dr Judy Wood and Dr Morgan Reynolds have sued NIST for fraud over their NCSTAR reports:

http://www.nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=federal_case

http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.html

When you have got this to happen, I will know you are sincere, so we can talk - OK?

Yours Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

Upcoming 9-11 Programme From: Andrew Johnson <ad.johnson@ntlworld.com> To: <mike.rudin@bbc.co.uk> Date: 15 Feb 2007 - 11:14a.m.

(Note: Message Copied to Fellow UK Campaigners)

Dear Mr Rudin,

I am writing with regard to the broadcast of this programme. It is probably one of the most important broadcasts in recent years - maybe even ever. From where I am standing, due to the information sent repeatedly to the BBC over the last 2 years, the corporation's credibility is very much at stake.

If you broadcast a fair and balanced discussion of the evidence, it may go some way to allowing historians to look more favourably on the BBC's role. If it represents any kind of whitewash or debunking of the fact that 9/11 WAS an "Inside Job", history will not judge you or the people involved with your programme lightly.

Regardless, as campaigners, we will continue to reveal the truth about 9/11 to the British Public and I now personally regard the media as a controlled entity and one that is ducking its responsibility. It is therefore now MY responsibility to spend my own time and money to promulgate the truth about 9/11 being an Inside Job and I will, unless this programme changes things, continue to discuss my e-mail exchanges with BBC News Director Helen Boaden, who has blatantly ignored evidence and refused opportunities for us to present our evidence in some broadcast vehicle or other. This is now documented and will, if possible, be used to prosecute the BBC for a breach of its charter.

Thanks for reading, and I am hoping you realise the significance of the juncture at which you and the BBC stand.

Yours Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Rudin [mailto:michael.rudin@bbc.co.uk]

Sent: 08 January 2008 12:34

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: RE: Interview with Dr Wood?

Dear Mr Johnson

As I explained in my email I am contacting Dr Wood now because I am producing a documentary about WTC 7 with the NIST report due out later this year.

I would like to talk to Dr Wood and it would be a shame if I cannot speak to her.

You sent you email of 15 February to the wrong email mike.rudin not michael.rudin and I did not receive it.

Best Wishes

Mike Rudin

Producer

BBC Current Affairs

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 08 January 2008 12:51

To: Michael Rudin

Subject: RE: Interview with Dr Wood?

Dear Mr Rudin,

I am sure you received enough e-mails from various campaigners - and I may have even had word back that my e-mail was forwarded.

If can answer the points I made, then how can we proceed on a better footing. So, when I hear the broadcasts, then we can talk. How does that sound?

Yours Sincerely

Andrew Johnson

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Rudin [mailto: michael.rudin@bbc.co.uk]

Sent: 08 January 2008 13:04

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Cc: lisajudy@nctv.com

Subject: speaking to Dr Wood

Andrew

I am responsible for my documentary and it will accurate, fair and balanced like all the programmes I've produced. I cannot get BBC News to run a story if they don't want to.

I would still like to speak to Dr Wood if it is possible. I would be grateful if you could put my request to Dr Wood.

Best Wishes

Mike Rudin

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 08 January 2008 13:21

To: Michael Rudin

Subject: RE: speaking to Dr Wood

Dear Mr Rudin,

You haven't answered my first question - why do you want to speak to Dr Wood at this particular time? Her research has been published for over 1 year.

Don't you think the Qui Tam cases would be news worthy at all? I don't buy this "editorial decision" stuff which has been fed to me robotically for the last 3 years. You and I both know the War On Terror is fake and 9/11 was an inside job. What will your new programme say? That NIST was

right and WTC 7 collapsed due to fire? Will it ask popular mechanics to "verify" fires can cause a perfect collapse in 6.6 seconds?

You can see from Dr Wood's site she asks an additional set of questions about WTC 7's destruction that few if any other researchers are asking. My original statement still, therefore, stands. Can you understand a reluctance to grant an interview?

Isn't it also interesting how the J7 group refused to co-operate with you about the 7/7 documentary you are planning. Can you guess the reason? Perhaps it's similar to what I wrote in my earlier message?

Were you happy with your 9/11 Documentary last year? Do you think it was "fair and balanced" to contradict basic laws of physics?

So where did Towers 1 & 2 go, Mr Rudin - tell me your thoughts....

What happened to all the 500 miles length of steel, the glass, the computers, the cabling etc. How was it all turned into fine dust?

Does it concern you that I have sent out hundreds of disks, leaflets and booklets that show people this evidence and ask this question? Does it concern you I plan to continue doing this until I hear Radio 2 news bulletin broadcasts like the ones I mentioned?

This is all bothers me greatly. Does it bother you?

Regards

Andrew Johnson

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Rudin [mailto:michael.rudin@bbc.co.uk]

Sent: 08 January 2008 14:01

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Cc: lisajudy@nctv.com

Subject: RE: speaking to Dr Wood

Andrew

I did answer your first question - I am making a documentary about the collapse of WTC 7 now and the NIST report on WTC 7 is due to be published later this year.

I don't understand a reluctance to talk to someone trying to find out what happened.

Best Wishes

Mike

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 08 January 2008 14:16

To: Michael Rudin

Subject: RE: speaking to Dr Wood

Dear Mr Rudin,

OK - so you answered my 1st question - in general terms. So, how long has this documentary been in production? What is its thrust? What is the name of the production company being used? Who else has been approached and who will appear in the documentary?

> I don't understand a reluctance to talk to someone trying to find out what happened.

Let me spell it out for you:

- 1) Last year, the BBC 911 conspiracies documentary put out false information and by inference promoted a fake war on terror. (Same applies for 7/7).
- 2) The BBC won't (and so far hasn't) air any news stories or programmes which truthfully state what happened on 9/11. Richard Porter even claims "we've lost the tapes" of the event!!
- 3) Unless you can provide some evidence that you are going to "fight" your editors and make sure the BBC tells the truth about 9/11 (and the truth about the 2nd layer of the cover up), then we have tremendous concerns that your report/documentary will be false, flawed, mis-representative etc - pick an expression....

Now, would you want to be dealing with an organisation that has a track record like this in matters such as this?

Do you understand that you represent that organisation, by your e-mail address, and that's why there is "a reluctance to talk to someone trying to find out what happened." Or is the "someone" refer to not you, and someone who is genuinely interested in ending the fake war on terror, bringing the true perpetrators to justice and disclosing that almost infinite almost free energy, instead of being used to solve the world's problems, has been weaponised and used to destroy towers 1 & 2?

Is that any clearer at all?

Thanks for reading - I am getting on with some work now.

Regards

Andrew Johnson

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Rudin [mailto:michael.rudin@bbc.co.uk]

Sent: 08 January 2008 14:35

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Cc: lisajudy@nctv.com

Subject: RE: speaking to Dr Wood

Thanks

To be absolutely clear I am the person who wants to talk to Dr Wood. I am producing the documentary and I work for the BBC.

I remain keen to talk to Dr Wood.

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 08 January 2008 15:22

To: Michael Rudin

Subject: RE: speaking to Dr Wood

Dear Mr Rudin,

Thanks for the minor clarification.

> I remain keen to talk to Dr Wood.

I understand. However, we remain keen for you to produce some evidence and assurance that you will produce a fair documentary and make amends for the terrible damage that your 2007 documentary has caused in so many ways.

I will forward all this correspondence to Dr Wood, and if she feels any different, I am sure she is capable of letting you know in her own way.

We remain keen not to co-operate with organisations and individuals who knowingly promote and support a fake war on terror. (I take it that you do know the war on terror is fake, as you have not said you think the war on terror is genuine, nor have you provided any solid evidence to support this supposition.)

We are however, keen to talk to organisations who are willing to expose black technology, black budget programmes and their use in conjunction with sophisticated Psy-Op techniques in 9/11 and its aftermath. We are willing to co-operate with those programme makers who want to expose how brainwashing of the general population has taken place so that they (the public) believe they are under threat from an "invisible enemy" etc etc
Thanks for understanding,

Andrew Johnson

17. 9/11 Truth Seekers and Campaigners... "It's Your Lucky Day!"

May 2008

You want a new investigation into the events of 9/11? Well, it's your lucky day! There is one already in progress! However, it is ignored by almost all 9/11 researchers and posters around the internet. The RFC's and Qui Tam's presented by Dr. Judy Wood^{clv} and Dr. Morgan Reynolds^{clvi} against NIST and its contractors are independent – and they are investigations, but most 9/11 Truthers are not talking about them. In this article, I will ask why this is the case.

A Focus on The Truth of 9/11

I have been pondering on what seems to be happening to the effort, across various groups, to reveal the truth of what happened on 9/11. Some quite unusual things seem to have been transpiring over the last two years, as I have tried to document in previous articles posted on my website^{cxli}.

Last month, in mid April 2008, www.911Truth.org^{clvii} sent out an e-mail regarding a "Week of Truth" initiative, featuring fairly well-designed graphics and a prominent posting of Steve Alten's new novel *The Shell Game*. This work, seemingly written as a vehicle to further the aims of 9/11 Truth Campaigners, additionally has the laudable goal of raising money for the New York City First Responders who suffered greatly for helping others on the day of this most terrible tragedy. The accompanying message from 911truth.org suggested buying copies of *The Shell Game* (directly through www.WeekofTruth.org^{clviii}) so that a portion of the purchase price (it does not say how much) will go to the First Responders. Purchasing a copy will also, it says, help the book to enter the New York Times Top 10 best-seller list. Additionally, it suggests "e-mailing everyone you know who wants 9/11 truth to break through the corporate media blackout" and that people should write op-eds, and call in to radio shows, and otherwise tell people about the Week of Truth.

Who could argue with basic thrust of these suggestions? I certainly couldn't! However, if I may adopt a more lyrical (but critical) tone for a moment, I fear that this "Week of Truth" may have been "Weak of Truth". Why am I being so harsh in describing the efforts of kind-hearted people in selflessly promoting the knowledge that the Official Story (OGCT) of 9/11 is false?

Firstly, I think it is important to consider what *The Shell Game* actually says. For example, the plot of the story includes Iran's supposed nuclear reactor development (which is disputed^{clix}) and also discusses the issue of "Peak Oil" (also disputed^{clix}, but often cited by some 9/11 researchers as the main reason 9/11 was perpetrated). So, even if *The Shell Game* helps more people become aware of and think about 9/11 Truth issues (and I question whether it actually will), I would contend it is falsely suggesting that "Peak Oil" and "Iranian Nukes" are real issues of concern (in the same way that the official story of 9/11 suggests that international terrorism is an issue of real concern).

When, in the "Week of Truth" (or at any other time, for that matter), people make phone calls or send e-mail to tell others about 9/11 Truth and *The Shell Game*, what do they say? One of the easiest phrases to use seems to be "9/11 was an Inside Job" – meaning that the Government and probably other officials knew in advance that the event was going to happen and that they, in some way, planned and/or assisted in the execution of the operation. However, as shocking as this statement is to some people, that statement in of itself, moves us little or no further forward in finding or prosecuting the perpetrators. (Indeed, does purchasing a copy of *The Shell Game* help towards this goal?) Additionally, many people are already uncomfortable with the official story of 9/11 - according to an August 2006 Scripps Howard/Ohio University national survey, 36% of Americans believe 9/11 was an 'inside job', with government agencies complicit in what occurred. A Zogby poll in 2004 also produced similar results. With this in mind, and knowing what I know now, I am much more concerned about the longer term effect that *The Shell Game* may have – because it does not include important evidence and information related to what the latest 9/11 research has revealed.

9/11 – The Physical Evidence

One of the things that a study of 9/11 truth should teach us is to focus on evidence. This study of evidence can be applied both directly to the analysis of the events of 9/11 and it can also be applied to the study of events since 9/11. An important question that might be asked is this – what have the perpetrators of 9/11 been up to since that day? We know for sure that the media have been manipulated – key evidence has not been reported or discussed (for example, it is very rare to hear a discussion that the towers – including most of the steel - largely turned to dust). It is also almost unheard (anywhere) - in relation to the supposed WTC plane crashes - that thin aluminium wing struts cannot cut through steel girders (whatever speed they are travelling at). This is because of

Newton's third law, and the relative hardness of these 2 materials. (In a collision, the force on the aluminium is the same as the force on the steel, but aluminium wing struts are much weaker than steel, so they snap - and the steel does not!).

It often surprises me that only a small number of people appear willing to focus on and discuss the physical evidence. Mike Ruppert, it has been noted, was reluctant to discuss physical evidence when he started writing about 9/11^{clxi}. More recently, within the 9/11 Truth Movement (which can perhaps be regarded as "The 9/11 Official-Truth Movement") many people seem very reluctant to discuss the current legal cases of Drs. Wood and Reynolds even though information about their legally-based efforts has been in the public domain for well over 1 year. I would contend that the reason for this lack of discussion is that discussion and analysis of information within the 9/11 Truth Movement is being subjected to the same type of bullying, cajolery and name-calling that is present in the mainstream media whenever this topic is discussed. When any people appear, to question "the official story", they are attacked and ridiculed and discussion of their research is subjected to pernicious debunking. To try and document this activity, I posted an article which attempted to illustrate, using the evidence I had collected, how "factions" of the 9/11 truth movement were being manipulated and controlled. This behaviour continues today – unabated^{clxxvi}.

Video Fakery on 9/11 and Ongoing Psy-Ops

Comprehensive studies of evidence pertaining to video fakery and manipulation, such as those presented in September Clues^{clxii} illustrate, in a compelling manner, the scale of the Psy-Op which was employed in cementing the mythical hijackers tale into the psyche of the general population. Once an understanding is gained of how the video fakery and associated media spin and information manipulation has been working, it becomes much clearer to see how the Psy-Op tactics have also been at work within the 9/11 Truth movement itself. One such "success" story is that of molten metal – it is a story that has been repeated many times, but seemingly with increasing frequency since about late 2005 or early 2006 (in quite a similar fashion to the official "hijacker" myth). The story was one of the main points of Steven E Jones' February 2006 USVC Presentation, and his earlier paper "Why indeed did the WTC Towers Completely Collapse". Like the hijacker fable, the molten metal stories seem to make sense initially (and I was taken in by them both), but when you have been presented with only a subset of evidence, but once more evidence is analysed^{clxiii}, the fake story is exposed for what it is. When the evidence for thermite - and especially molten metal - is studied in depth

(thanks to the evidence uncovered largely by Dr. Judy Wood), I can only sensibly draw the conclusion that this particular story is as fake as the hijacker story^{clxiii}. Despite this evidence, most people in the 9/11 Truth movement – even some of those who might be called “figureheads,” still discuss thermite and molten metal as being the established “cause and effect” of the destruction of the WTC complex.

Challenging the CD'ers

Some regard the WTC destruction as being the result of carefully placed and precisely detonated explosives (i.e. traditional controlled demolition - TCD) – as well as there being various “flavours” of thermite in use. When I first started to research into 9/11 issues, I generally agreed that some type of explosive demolition was used, although the top-down demolition of towers 1 and 2 was peculiar. Thanks in large part to Dr. Wood's photo studies, I later became aware of new evidence such as:

- 1) Toasted cars approximately 1 mile away from the WTC.
- 2) Upturned cars in several locations.
- 3) At least 1 witness diving under an ambulance during the destruction of 1 of the towers then reporting the ambulance was "pushed off" during the destruction of one of the towers (but he didn't report he felt why it was "pushed off").
- 4) At least 1 spontaneous car fire at 9:46 (before the towers were destroyed).
- 5) No bright flashes seen as the towers were destroyed.
- 6) Severe powderisation of the buildings, leaving a debris pile less than 1 story high in many places.
- 7) A dust cloud which was not hot (no one got burned).

Now, as you'll appreciate, OGCT believers ignore a lot of evidence in maintaining their belief that "hijackers and planes" caused the damage on 9/11. TCD believers (I used to be one) ignore the evidence above - and such things as the hosing down of the WTC site as late as Jan 2008 (I video'd it myself^{clxiv}) and the ongoing "problems" with the Banker's trust building^{clxv}.

Of course, by ignoring any amount of evidence about anything (be it a scientific or legal matter), it is possible to come to almost any desired conclusion. However, the value of that conclusion is, of course, likely to be inversely proportional to the amount of evidence ignored.

Ignoring The Evidence – An “Active Denial System”?

I am sure there are a few people in the world who believe the Earth is flat - and they can continue to do this by ignoring the evidence that it is a sphere - for example brushing off all satellite photos as "fakes".

People in the 9/11 Official-Truth movement are vociferously critical of mainstream media figures, as well as other well-known figures, for not talking about the evidence. This very situation has recently been the subject of an article by the author Eric Larsen^{elxvi}. Yet, when it is pointed out that people even within the 9/11 Official-Truth Movement refuse to address evidence, a number of prolific internet/forum posters typically become very defensive – or even rude and desultory^{elxvii}. In trying to draw attention to some of the evidence and general conclusions that Dr. Wood and Dr. Reynolds have researched and posted articles about, I often seem to have experienced animosity and hostility. This mirrors the earlier experience of people like Rosalee Grable (Webfairy), Nico Haupt, Gerard Holmgren and others. Those that have been the most critical rarely focus on a considered analysis of evidence in question. Typically, the conclusions drawn from what has become known as “DEW” and “No Planes” research are often said to be “impossible to believe” by those in the 9/11 Official-Truth movement. (It can be observed that they frequently use disturbingly similar language to that used by OGCT believers who cannot accept that a conspiracy regarding 9/11 really does exist.)

Even when it is pointed out that the evidence for DEW and “No planes at the WTC” is so strong that it has been used both as a basis for two “Request for Corrections” and two related Qui Tam cases against NIST contractors, it is often not regarded as significant. I can say this of at least six “9/11 Truthers” that I have met and discussed these issues with. Some of them use such phrases as “I have seen no evidence of DEW” and “I looked at Dr. Wood’s website and saw no evidence of significance.” I find this so bizarre that I really do wonder what is going on. The following sample of correspondence I had with a European scientist is typical of some of the extraordinary exchanges I have been a party in:

1) *Toasted cars 1 mile away from the WTC*

“The cars were toasted by falling thermite and moved subsequently, so the rescue squads could get access to GZ.”

There is no evidence that this is true: How did the "thermite" travel 1 mile and spread over 100's of cars? Where are the photos or witness testimony that so

many cars were moved? I would be happy to see it! How did the thermite selectively react with only some parts of the cars?

To another point of evidence, Harrit makes a non-sequiter response:

3) At least 1 witness diving under an ambulance during the destruction of 1 of the towers then reporting the ambulance was "pushed off" during the collapse (but he didn't report he felt why it was "pushed off").

"If you can repeat that experiment I would like to see it."

Even sending a volume of additional evidence to this person was not enough to stimulate any further reasoned discussion. This person clearly seems to support the conclusions made by Steven E Jones regarding Thermate and Thermite. It cannot be noted often enough that Steven E Jones represents one of the key connections between the 9/11 cover up and the energy cover up (see below).

Twisting the Evidence

In one or two discussions I have had where I have attempted to discuss the powderisation of steel, it has been declared "Impossible", because the amount of energy required to melt and vaporise the steel would be so high as to not be deliverable. In one case, the person went to the trouble of calculating the required energy to do this (he came out with a figure in Gigawatts). This sort of "stunt" can be observed repeatedly. We discussed "dustification" or "powderisation", but this is twisted into "melting" and "vaporisation" and the process is then declared "impossible". If it was "impossible", then where are the steel girders? And if there really was molten metal, then where did the energy come from to melt the steel? The arguments presented in opposition to the evidence that the steel turned to dust don't stand up to scrutiny.

Exposing the Evidence

Recently, I asked someone I know here in the UK, who has repeatedly spoken out about a number of 9/11 truth related issues, for help in publicising the Wood/Reynolds Qui Tam cases, following comments this person made regarding an e-mail exchange I had with a BBC Producer called Mike Rudin^{clxviii} (Mike Rudin was the series producer of The Conspiracy Files, which included a program which did not properly address^{clxix} the key 9/11 evidence which contradicts the Official Story.)

I asked this person, who is quite well known in UK 9/11 Truth Circles,

How do we get coverage, at least of the existence of these two cases - even if not the details - not even the names of the people involved, for heaven's sake, into

the Daily Mail? Can you advise me please? ... So, can you help me publicise the Qui Tam cases somehow? That would be great.

This person (who has spoken out publicly regarding 9/11) does have some contacts in the UK media responded thus:

To do this, we need to be credible. To be credible, we need to avoid speculation. For the above reasons, I shall respectfully have to decline your request for help in publicising the work of Woods.

This response was interesting to me for 2 reasons. Firstly, it mentions "speculation". Both Dr. Wood's and Dr. Reynolds' Qui Tam cases focus on a range of physical evidence. They draw certain conclusions based on an analysis of this evidence. This is really the opposite of speculation. Indeed, who would initiate a Court Case based on speculation? (Who has this kind of money to waste?)

The second point that was interesting was that this person said they "would not help in promoting the work of Woods". This was not exactly what I asked - there are 2 Qui Tam cases and I did not specify that the names be mentioned (and, of course, it's "Dr. Wood" not "Dr. Woods").

Over the last 2-3 years, I have helped with the running of the UK 9/11 Truth forum. Previously, when I posted information or updates pertaining to the RFC's of Dr. Wood and Dr. Reynolds on the UK forum, they were moved out of the "News" Section and into a "Controversies" Section. So, moderators there seemed to be indulging in a kind of "soft censorship" – in a similar manner to how news editors move some stories to the "back pages" or put them in smaller print.

The Call for an Independent Investigation

I recently received a message from a friend who is now starting to realise what seems to be going on. In presenting his view to other people he wrote:

I [have] been pondering over a few things regarding what [we] are trying to achieve. We are primarily demanding a reinvestigation of 911. But what would we accept as a satisfactory investigation? What criteria would we use to measure or qualify any investigation, whether it is just a proposal or an actual investigation?

I didn't consider until recently that the Judy Wood Qui Tam cases are technically investigations since the cases brought forward have been accepted by the courts. Yet we have collectively chosen to ignore them as they do not fit some criteria that we must collectively all share (pls forgive the generalisation for a second). What are those criteria?

So this does lead on to a deeper question. What form would a truly independent enquiry take? Who would pay for it, if government bodies cannot be trusted (they cannot)? How about an organisation like Amnesty International – wouldn't they be able to do something? Well, seeing as AI have made no public comments about 9/11 truth issues in over 6 years, despite being asked^{clxx}, the prospects aren't looking too good. So perhaps we need individuals to come forward, fund their own research, build their own legal cases and submit them to the courts. At the moment, Drs. Wood and Reynolds, with the help of Jerry Leaphart, are the only ones doing this – as all previous 9/11 related cases have either folded or been withdrawn (so why hasn't anyone else tried to re-invigorate them?)

9/11, The Hutchison Effect and the Energy Connection

It has been said that “the flak is strongest when you are over the target” and I can't help thinking that this applies to our current situation, where, along with Dr. Wood, I have been involved with pointing out the similarities between some of the less well-known effects at the WTC and some of the effects seen in John Hutchison's experiments^{clxxi}. Using a maximum of about 4kw of power, Hutchison has carried out (admittedly, often in a haphazard fashion) experiments for the last 30 years and, in the process, generated about 500lbs of anomalous metal samples. This has attracted interest from US military industrial complex organisations such as Los Alamos National Laboratories^{clxxii}. It is therefore less surprising that he has submitted an affidavit for Dr. Judy Wood's Qui Tam case, now filed with the court of the Southern District of New York^{clxxiii}. This of course means that, if John Hutchison were to be called as a witness, if the case proceeded, he could go to prison if he committed perjury.

We have mentioned the similarities of some of the characteristics of the Hutchison Effect and what is referred to as Cold Fusion. In both cases, attempts are made to “debunk” the phenomenon by denying the reproduction of experiments. John Hutchison has replicated his experiments many times, and Mel Winfield has reproduced some similar effects^{clxxiii}. With Cold Fusion, there have been hundreds of replications – many of which have showed anomalous nuclear effects, excess heat – or both. Sometimes, the reaction appears to be “self sustaining” - for an extended period after the current was removed from the experiment. Further information is available at www.lenr-canr.org. And, of course, this is where Prof. Steven E Jones "enters the picture", as he was involved in matters which triggered the somewhat impromptu or even premature press conference of Pons and Fleischmann in 1989. It should be pointed out that, in relation to 9/11 not only is Prof. Jones' evidence unverifiable,

some of his statements are false or unsubstantiated^{clxxxvii}. His behaviour can, on scrutiny, also be justifiably questioned^{clxxxiv}. In the late 80's and early 90's Jones and others went on to completely ignore or deny the reality of excess heat production in a number of duplicate experiments. These matters are documented in Dr. Eugene Mallove's excellent 1991 book "Fire From Ice". Mallove was murdered in May 2004. Jones appeared on the 911 scene in about Sept 2005. Mallove worked with William Zebuhr at the New Energy Foundation. William Zebuhr was the Uncle of Michael Zebuhr, Dr. Wood's Student. Can it just have been a coincidence that Michael Zebuhr was himself murdered in March 2006?

“The normal no-planers are just completely nuts...”

Dr. Reynolds Qui Tam case focuses on the lack of evidence of plane impacts at the WTC on 9/11. In April 2008, “no planers” were accused of physically abusing one or more members of one of the New York “We Are Change” group. These accusations were made in a Prison Planet article^{clxxxv}, with a summary of which is shown below (emphasis added).

We Are Change To Release Assault Videos

After months of tolerating verbal and physical abuse from a fringe group of emotionally unstable "no-planers" at ground zero, Luke Rudkowski and We Are Change have had enough, and are set to release video showing the assaults and attempts to smear We Are Change as being complicit in the Times Square recruitment center bombing.

The use of the phrase “emotionally unstable” is somewhat revealing. In an earlier broadcast on Alex Jones’ radio show (referenced above), we seem to have another example of debunking, ridicule and desultory remarks where, instead, a sober analysis of the evidence included in Dr. Reynold’s^{clxvi} case would have been more appropriate and useful. In an earlier broadcast (around April 8th 2008), Alex Jones made his position on this evidence abundantly clear, saying:

And then who comes out and says the[re are] no plane[s] – former Bush administration officials – and Fox has ‘em on over and over again and Fox - whenever I am doing a debate they say ‘no planes – ha ha ha’.

The normal no-planers are just completely nuts – I mean they are completely out of their minds ... and vicious and aggressive and lying and slanderous and then they’ve always got former admitted spooks and former admitted people from CIA universities, running around spewing...

Attorney Jerry Leaphart, in a letter to Alex Jones, responded to this general accusation^{clxxxvi} and he included these words:

We hasten to acknowledge that we are not saying you accused Drs. Wood and/or Reynolds of such behavior, however we do say that they are known as "no planers" by some and we also know how guilt by association and categorization works, and we know that you know that too.

I am here assuming that you do not want any of us to come under surveillance by virtue of being thought to pose a threat of violence. You might not share the same degree of wariness about surveillance as we do, but we assume it takes very little in the way of publicly disseminated information to give rise to justification for surveillance. Posting videos proclaiming that "no planers" have instigated or participated in fighting could be used as a justification for scrutiny, in our view.

Alex Jones has been heard to say "Don't believe me – do your own research" (or words to that effect – for example at about 7:30 into this YouTube clip^{clxxvii}). I hope that in this particular case, people will do as he suggests.

The Common Thread

If one wants to find the truth of something which is not fully understood, one can only do so by continually collecting evidence, analysing it and drawing conclusions. Importantly, however, this is never a completely static process. An unconditional willingness to review new evidence is the only way to get the closest to the truth. Evidence, analyses and conclusions must be continually reviewed and refined – and this process is surely one of the fundamental pillars of the Scientific Method (which I prefer to think of more as "analytical thought").

In much of the activity documented above, there is a common thread: that of ignoring evidence. A friend of mine has an expression that is also appropriate here, he describes this mentality as "playing the man, not the ball". Another version of this is "if you can't attack the data, attack the messenger". There is of course a difference here between attacking people and asking questions of them (as I tend to do). Asking people questions is different to making rude or inflammatory remarks, describing them or their evidence, analysis or conclusions as "ridiculous" or "unbelievable". Perhaps it would be better if more people spent time analysing the evidence for themselves, and if they can't agree with the experts' conclusions perhaps they can simply say "I disagree" - rather than being rude and disparaging or claim to have "debunked" a reasoned analysis, as if it is something to be proud of.

If there is some honest criticism of the evidence, where it is felt that it is not strong enough, or it is felt that clearer or more powerful evidence has been found, then the sensible thing would surely be to offer to contribute

it to the studies which have been posted – collectively, making the case stronger and more overwhelming.

Instead of this however, we have seen a pattern of:

- 1) Promoting studies which don't explain all the evidence.
- 2) Ridiculing studies which explain the most evidence.
- 3) Ignoring, censoring or soft-censoring a discussion of evidence when those having the power of censorship (but a weak or non-existent science or analytical background) become "uncomfortable" with this discussion.
- 4) Classifying a group of people who choose to discuss certain evidence or conclusions as either being "emotionally unstable" or "completely nuts".
- 5) Ignoring court cases, important to our future, which focus on a range of evidence analysed by well-qualified people.

For myself, I now feel I have to strongly consider that the actions which have woven this pattern of evidence-denial and ridicule are not purely "ego-driven", or a simple result of people being "reluctant to change their minds". I am coming to the view that there is an active underlying "system" which is manipulating people into the behaviour that has been observed and documented here, which is very much another "can of worms" to open.

"So What is The Goal Here?"

Recently, when I was trying to discuss the evidence that some type of technology related to the Hutchison Effect was used to destroy the WTC,^{lxxxix} I was asked "What is your goal with this?" This, of course, is a very good question (which can also be asked of those promoting the Thermite explanations and those who continue to follow the pattern of making disparaging remarks).

My goal is to help pave the way for the Black Technologies, that have been used to hold the rest of the world hostage for perhaps 60 years or so, to be revealed. An additional goal is that those who are in control of these technologies can be identified and questioned as to what their goal is. My wish is that these revelations will transform our world into one that has more equity, liberty and peace than it does now. In that regard, attacking and ridiculing serious, reasoned and detailed analyses has no place – especially when some of the people doing this work have made (and continue to make) very significant personal sacrifices.

18. 9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - An Ace in the Hole – Part III

09 Sep 2008

In researching 9/11, I have tried to stay focused on aspects of “primary evidence” – analysis of what actually happened – for example, through examination of physical evidence and verified witness testimony. However, in this series of articles related to the Hutchison Effect and 9/11, I have felt the need to document communications that I have been involved with, in regard to ongoing research and the reaction to it. Analysis of these communications is, to me, quite instructive in determining the way in which the 9/11 cover up is being perpetuated and managed.

I (and others) have previously queried how the perpetrators might be working to sustain the 9/11 cover up. One way would be to shut down discussion or analysis of the most damning evidence pertaining to what really happened. Another way is to make repeated attempts to discredit or “trash” certain researchers - or even simply involve them in fruitless debates or “spit fights” of one kind or another – and this is precisely what seems to have happened over the last few years.

That Supposed Hate Correspondence

In *Ace in the Hole – Part 2*, I pointed out how I had been accused (live - on air) of sending hate correspondence to Ace Baker. This happened on a show I have (once) guest hosted – *The Dynamic Duo* on GCN Live. Now, of course, this in itself, is a very minor thing. After all, one has to be pretty “thick-skinned” to function in an environment that is populated in the way that it seems to be, so it shouldn’t be a “big deal”. Far worse things have happened to far better people, right?

Well, I decided to write this article to try and document how certain figures seem happy to create an injustice (however small), then fail to take responsibility for their own actions/words. They are then offered an opportunity to correct that injustice, in a dignified manner, but then they refuse, essentially stating that the person who was on the receiving end of this injustice was actually at fault in some way.

Request for Correction

This matter unfolded as follows. Following Ace Baker's statement that I had sent him hate correspondence, I sent an e-mail to both him and Jim Fetzer (CC'd to several others), stating the following:

I am writing to request that you broadcast a correction to the statement that Ace Baker had received "hate correspondence" from me. I have posted all the recent correspondence I have had with Ace Baker in the "Ace in the Hole 2" article, and none of it fits this description.

Alternatively, if Ace Baker can produce a message attributable to me (including e-mail headers which prove that it came from an e-mail server I use), then I would like to see that message, and there will be no need for such a correction to be read out.

So, I was basically asking Ace Baker to provide evidence of this supposed hate correspondence I had sent, or apologise to me. I decided to request an apology because this statement went out “on air” to a particular audience, and I knew the statement was wholly untrue. Of course, on various internet postings, there are a number of remarks posted about me – but I do not know these internet posters and have not previously been involved with them in the way that I have with Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer (both people I, at one time, trusted).

Ace Baker initially responded, saying:

I don't recall the passage in question from yesterday's show. If someone will send me a recording or an accurate transcript, I will respond.

In the same message, bizarrely, he also said:

While awaiting a review of my comments yesterday, and while on the subject of hate, you may quote me as follows:

"I hate Judy Wood. Judy Wood is a liar, a fraud, and a despicable human being. Judy Wood knows perfectly well that there is no Hutchison Effect. In my opinion, based on the evidence, Judy Wood is a conspirator to mass murder, participating intentionally in the disinformation campaign associated with the crimes of 9/11. Judy Wood is therefore deserving of my hatred, and the hatred of all good and honest people."

He made some other comments in this e-mail which were not relevant to the apology I had requested from him (a comment which had somehow slipped his memory). You can read the full message by clicking the link above.

Round about this time, there was a sequence of e-mails (not all of which are appended here) mentioning various topics, such as the Hutchison Effect, Molten Metal and various other things, but nowhere was the matter of me sending hate correspondence discussed, neither was evidence of it produced by Ace Baker (or Jim Fetzer). In one of these e-mails, Jim Fetzer said:

Something has gone wrong between Dr. Wood and me that I do not understand. I have stood by her through thick and thin and paid the price of ridicule and harassment. It has not been fun. Because I have believed in her, I have gladly borne the burden. If you can tell me why she abandoned me, that might be worthwhile. It's a mystery to me.

By the end of this article, perhaps the mystery Jim Fetzer referred to will be solved.

As the discussion seemed to have gone off my “request for correction”, I sent a message providing Ace Baker with a transcript of his statement and I also repeated the request that he or Fetzer (as the show’s regular host) correct it – or, they should provide evidence of the hate correspondence I had sent. When I had read through additional e-mails, I decided to send another message, requesting that a specific statement be read out by Fetzer at the start of his next show, which read as follows:

"I have a statement which Andrew Johnson has asked me to read out:

On 26th Aug, during a discussion with Jim Fetzer, Ace Baker said:

"I've been getting the hate correspondence from – from Andrew Johnson and so forth..."

Andrew Johnson has not sent Ace Baker any hate correspondence and Andrew Johnson would politely request either a written or on-air statement from Ace Baker to retract or correct his earlier statement about Andrew Johnson having sent Ace Baker hate correspondence, unless Ace Baker can provide verifiable copies of any hate correspondence which he thinks came from Andrew Johnson.

For further information and analysis, I request that all interested parties view the 9/11 Hutchison Effect series of articles posted at <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, where they can view the contents of all e-mails pertinent to these matters and listen to the audios of the various broadcasts.

Thank you.

Somewhat curiously, Fetzer responded saying I should call in to the show (which, in calling from the UK, could be potentially costly) when Ace was next on with him – scheduled for Tuesday 2nd Sept 2008.

Fetzer then sent another message, responding on Ace's behalf saying:

My suspicion is that Ace meant "hostile" and it came out "hate". That would not surprise me as much as making such a mountain of a molehill.

So, Fetzer was suggesting that Ace didn't mean what he said – why couldn't Ace speak up for himself? Fetzer then also offered various adjectives to describe the mail I had sent which are similar to “hate correspondence”. Was Fetzer trying to “muddle the issue”? I leave the reader to decide this for themselves.

Just Who is Sending Hate Correspondence?

I then responded to Fetzer that I disagreed with his ideas on this and I did not wish to argue about the very particular and clear cut-definition of “hate correspondence”. I had only sent Ace Baker e-mails, so I will now quote the definition of “hate mail” from my Chambers 20th century dictionary, 1996, CD ROM edition:

hate mail - correspondence containing anything from insults to death threats, etc.

I was asking Ace Baker to provide e-mail matching this definition (which everyone is clear about – and if they weren't, the definition is above – and the one to which evidence in this matter should be matched). I have not sent Ace Baker any e-mails with any insults or death threats or similar types of remarks. I have just asked him a number of probing questions about his own actions, conclusions and his motivations.

At this point, let us revisit the earlier message sent by Ace Baker to myself and several others in which he included the words:

Judy Wood is a liar, a fraud, and a despicable human being.

I will leave readers to examine for themselves these words, contained in e-mail correspondence - sent by Ace Baker, and consider them in the light of the definition of “hate mail” given in the Chambers 20th Century dictionary, 1996, CD ROM edition, (as above). Please read all of Ace's e-mail to check I am not quoting him out of context. The facts seem to be, then: Andrew Johnson did not send hate mail to Ace Baker and Ace Baker did send hate mail to Judy Wood. Jim Fetzer did not mention that Ace Baker had sent hate mail to Judy Wood and others. Why was Jim Fetzer struggling so much with definitions and “working out” who was doing what? He has edited many books and presumably has had to deal with such issues many times.

Request Denied

Fetzer offered me the opportunity to “call in and discuss” the issue:

*Reading a statement that is, in my opinion, wildly out of proportion to a remark made in passing is not. Call in and we'll see if I'm right. OK?
Thanks for asking.*

So he suggests that reading out a statement is “wildly out of proportion” to what was said by Ace Baker – he is therefore suggesting my request is unreasonable. In a subsequent response, Fetzer then went on to suggest that he didn’t know what the definition of “hate correspondence” was and he implied I was wrong to suggest I did know the definition of this term. (Most people in Jim Fetzer’s position do have access to various english language dictionaries). He said:

I am beginning to get the impression of a child throwing a tantrum. This is not becoming, Andrew. Even your fans may be a bit dismayed. Your demands are excessive and grossly out of line. In a word, "No!"

Here, he starts to call me a child (again), suggests my “fans” (who are they?) will not be impressed, and then he says my “demands” are “excessive and grossly out of line”. What I made were actually 2 requests, not demands – see the subject of the original message. Fetzer then - point blank - refuses my request. In the process, he tries to muddle what I said and suggest I am being unreasonable – all because I asked him to read out a 90-second statement to correct a false statement about my actions that was made on his broadcast with Ace Baker.

It should be noted that in a previous broadcast of the Dynamic Duo on 31st July^{exlvi}, where Dr. Wood and I had discussed the idea the Jim Fetzer was misquoting Dr. Wood’s research and attempting to “take ownership” of it (in the sense that he could “steer it” or more easily mix it up with other things – which is not the same as “taking credit” for it), Jim Fetzer took much of the first segment of the programme to read out his own statement about what was said. (This will be the subject of a separate article.) In other words, Fetzer gave himself the same “right of reply” that he refused me i.e. he did not offer to come on and “debate” the issue, he made a statement about what he thought. Why did he refuse me this same opportunity?

Ace Baker’s next e-mail then seems to go further by asking me to make corrections to my original “Part 1” article (to which I had already added a section at the bottom to include Baker’s responses to questions I posed in the article). Was his strategy to try and cover up or distract from his own false statements about me sending hate correspondence, as well as not

making an apology? Why would I want to spend time making supposed corrections suggested by someone who has made fake videos, said I sent him hate correspondence and sent hate mail himself? What's wrong with this picture?

Andrew Johnson – Redefined!

In a later e-mail from Ace Baker, he did not correct his statement and did not apologise to Andrew Johnson. He decided, apparently to redefine “Andrew Johnson” thus:

.....
"On Dynamic Duo August 26, I was speaking about my challenge to John Hutchison, offering him \$100,000 to reproduce his alleged 'Hutchison Effect' levitation. In sorting my thoughts, I began a sentence with 'I've been getting hate correspondence - from Andrew Johnson and so forth . . .' I should have said, 'from Andrew Johnson and company'.
.....

So, to try and avoid apologising to me, Ace has now re-defined “Andrew Johnson” to be any group of people Andrew Johnson is seen to be associating with. This seems to pair up “nicely” with Jim Fetzer trying to redefine the meaning of “hate correspondence”. With such fluid and muddlesome (a new word) definitions - of both people and well-known phrases - we could be faced with endless possibilities for redefining reality and truth!

I have included several other e-mails below, to allow people to see a fuller context of the remarks made, but have not included the entire thread, because it would be very long, and include many statements and remarks not relevant to the central issue in this article, which I have attempted to describe in the summary below.

Summary and Conclusion

- 1) Ace Baker made a false statement about me sending hate correspondence to him.
- 2) Ace Baker sent hate correspondence to Dr. Judy Wood.
- 3) I requested an opportunity to set the record straight on the Dynamic Duo, on terms I DEFINED (reading out a 90-second or so statement).
- 4) Fetzer suggested I call in to “discuss” it - I refused, because there was nothing to discuss.
- 5) Fetzer tried to say I did not understand the English language (or words to that effect). He tried to muddle the definition of "hate correspondence".

- 6) Fetzer redefined the word “request” to be “demand”.
- 7) Ace Baker did not initially respond to my request for an apology.
- 8) Ace Baker responded to redefine "Andrew Johnson" to include any group Andrew Johnson seemed to be associated with - so that Ace's refusal to apologise was (apparently) justified.

I would therefore suggest Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer allowed themselves to cause a small injustice to me by Ace lying about something I hadn't done. I offered them a simple opportunity to correct that injustice (twice). They refused the opportunity, tried to say they hadn't really done anything wrong and suggested it was completely inappropriate for me to request an apology. This is a bit like saying “Well, I don’t agree with your definition of ‘gun’ and ‘fired’ and in any case, even if I did, it was your fault for not moving out of the way when the gun went off”.

Perhaps Andrew Johnson should make a \$100,000 challenge to Ace Baker to produce the non-existent “hate correspondence”. Perhaps this would “win me some fans” as people would surely suggest to Ace Baker that he takes up my challenge?

If this is how Jim Fetzer and Ace Baker deal with such a miniscule injustice (i.e. their accusation that I sent hate correspondence), should we consider carefully the way in which they appear to dealing with a much larger injustice – i.e. the crimes associated with 9/11?


I do not like writing articles that focus on matters such as this, but I have tried to write this in a clear, focused and dispassionate manner. This is very difficult to do when there is so much at stake.

If people reading this article cannot now understand the behaviour of Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer with regard to Hutchison Effect being linked to 9/11, then there seems to be little hope they ever will. Therefore, I do hope that there is some truth in the phrase “Those who have eyes will see and those who have ears will hear”.

19. Perception Management of 9/11 Evidence

"Meet the New Boss"

November 2008



It seems that 9/11 was arguably the biggest crime against humanity in modern history. It was committed in peace-time and those who planned and executed it also worked out a cover story which was good enough to fool most of the population. However, they also realised that people think in different ways, ranging from those who accept something at "face value" to those who are more analytical. Additionally, even though there are many people who are analytical, and whose job it is to review data and draw conclusions, they are sometimes prone to discarding a conclusion on the grounds that it would take them into "uncharted territory". This is perhaps because "the bigger the lie, the more the people will believe it" (a saying attributed to both Adolph Hitler and Josef Goebbels). I would argue that this idea can be extended - few would believe that seemingly decent, honest people are actually engaged in an ongoing and often subtle effort to keep the cover up of 9/11 in place. The reason for this is that 9/11 is a "nexus point"- not just because of its political ramifications, but also its technological ones.

Having written a series of these articles, I am conscious that some people may think adding another one to the series may be "over-doing it". However, weighed against that, when there appears to be an ongoing effort to discredit serious research, or mis-direct the focus of attention from the core of this same research. Please forgive me for my attempts in trying to accurately document what I consider to be the harder-to-perceive aspects of the 9/11 and free energy cover up. As ever, in all of these matters, the reader is advised to "keep their wits about them" and watch out for mis-direction, subtle false statements or points where a mixture of true information and false information may be being mixed together – both in what is written here, and elsewhere.

Asking the Big Questions - Managing Perception

Once it is realised that advanced technology - almost unknown in the "white world" of military hardware - was used on 9/11, people will begin to ask questions such as "Who has access to this technology? Where did it come from? What it is capable of?"

One way to prevent or slow down the questioning process is to keep people in a state of confusion, doubt and/pr fear. If a person is in one of these states, it reduces the likelihood of them taking some kind of positive or effective action to change the status quo. Deliberately creating these states of doubt, fear and uncertainty could therefore be seen as a specific strategy for maintaining the cover up of 9/11 (and other crimes against humanity).

The "game" is therefore one of managing the perception of 9/11 by ordinary people. When this idea is considered in more depth, one can see, on a daily basis, how much perception management is a part of so many aspects of our lives.

9/11 The Key Evidence

In the last few months, Dr. Judy Wood has posted evidence linking 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect^{clxxxix}, and I have written about this in previous articles. Not long after she made this correlation, she came across something quite startling - the presence of a Hurricane in the Atlantic^{clxliii}. I have been involved in writing summaries for these Hutchison Effect and Hurricane Erin studies that Dr. Wood has posted and, because of that, I have been keen to review reaction to them. One way of getting reaction was through Dr. Wood's appearances on radio programmes.

Dr. Wood had appeared many times on Jim Fetzer's GCN Radio Programme "The Dynamic Duo"^{clxxviii} to discuss her ongoing research, since November 2006. In considering these many appearances, it would appear that Prof. Jim Fetzer who formed Scholars for 9/11 Truth^{clxxxix} supported Dr. Wood's research.

On 28th Feb 2008, Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison finally appeared together on Jim Fetzer's radio programme, to discuss this information. Analysis of this has been posted in the article 9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - Handling the Truth^{clxxx}. A few days later, Fetzer sent an e-mail to Dr. Wood, in which he said:

Just between us, if Dr. Wood were to back off her relations with Hutchinson, whom I consider to be a fraud, I think her standing can be salvaged."

At that point, Dr. Wood more or less concluded it was not worth speaking any more with Jim Fetzter on his radio programme, despite several invites he sent. (Again, here, I ask who is Fetzter to be making such statements? Does he consider himself to be some authority on unconventional experiments?)

However, in July 2008, when Jim Fetzter suggested that Dr. Wood and I do a broadcast on his radio slot, while he was apparently unavailable, we decided to take up the invite to enable us to freely explore and comment on some of the issues raised in this article. Readers, of course, will tend to think that this was a very magnanimous gesture by Fetzter, though I would argue, based on evidence gathered later, that the main reason he did this was to try and maintain a “perceived connection” or even a “perceived ownership” of Dr. Wood’s research, even though he had already threatened her reputation. This connection allows him to publicly state he is “a supporter” of the research, whilst privately, he seems to act in certain ways which contradict this position.

Presenting the Evidence - Dynamic Duo 30th and 31st July 2008

In the first broadcast by Dr. Wood and myself,^{cxlv} though we did want to clarify why Dr. Wood had not chosen go on air with Jim Fetzter since he had implied in e-mail that “Hutchison was most likely a fraud”, in part because of Ace Baker’s video fakery exercise,. Then, as covered in a previous article^{cxxy}, he did not question specific points of evidence in relation to the Hutchison effect - he merely agreed that Ace Baker appeared to have reproduced videos which look similar (but not the same) as some of those of John Hutchison.

When I spoke with Dr. Wood on GCN’s “Dynamic Duo” show, she said of her own research

“It’s so easily distorted and it seems that various folks try to take ownership of my research to distort it – the meaning of it – and where it’s going. You know, on various forums they refer to ‘Fetzter and Wood’s research’ and I don’t know how Fetzter has anything to do with my research.”

Further, Dr. Wood commented that there were instances where

“Fetzter has been invited to present my work but then it’s not presented quite right - he refers to lasers masers and plasmoids.”

Fetzter responded to this on the 31st, during the first segment in which he read out a statement including the following:

I completely reject the idea that I am taking credit for her work or "not getting it right".

(The statement Fetzer read out was sent to us earlier in an e-mail).

Dr. Wood did not suggest Fetzer was taking credit for her work – she said that it seemed like he was trying to “take ownership” of it. Also, to introduce lasers, masers or plasmoids is completely unnecessary - as there is no clear evidence which Dr. Wood has catalogued which directly implicates them. Further, her newer research makes an extremely robust case that Hutchison Effect-like technology was involved – and Fetzer already knew of this^{clxxviii}, but did not mention it in his statement.

Further, he said:

After having spent so much of my time and reputation in the defense of Dr. Wood's work, it is more than disappointing to have her make these malicious attacks on me--especially after going out of my way to have Andrew interview her to make sure her latest work was reported.

No malicious attacks were made on Fetzer – Dr. Wood merely stated she was not happy with the way he had interpreted certain things, introduced redundant and or confusing terminology and included these in presentations he had made.

Fetzer then pointed how frequently Dr. Wood had been on the Dynamic Duo, and of course, it is true that she was the most regular guest of all. One of the reasons that she appeared so frequently was because she is the person who had done the most original research. Also, by letting Fetzer discuss it, one side effect is that he appears to support it – and, indeed, this seemed to be true, right up to the point where she posted her Hutchison Effect Study, which soon resulted in her standing being threatened by Fetzer.

Was Fetzer’s Threat Later Carried Out?

Fetzer’s e-mail of 03 Mar 2008^{clxxxi} referred to Dr. Wood’s reputation “being salvaged”. It was therefore interesting to listen to certain things that Fetzer said on a later broadcast on his GCN programme - on October 16th 2008, where his guests were Ace Baker and CB Brooklyn^{clxxxii}. (Please listen to this whole broadcast to hear the full context of points I list below.)

Fetzer discussed a previous booking with Ace Baker and Dr. Wood and that he had invited Ace Baker on before Dr. Wood - despite Dr. Wood having done the research on the Hutchison Effect’s relationship to 9/11. Fetzer said^{clxxxiii}:

I had wound up booking Ace on Wednesday and Dr. Wood on Thursday but I'd also offered Dr. Wood on Wednesday and Dr. Wood discovered that Ace was going to say something about Hutchison's work – she wanted to come on with Hutchison – which I thought was great – so when I discovered that there was this concern about Ace coming on first, I invited her to come on Wednesday... and I could move Ace to Thursday. She declined to do that. She told me she couldn't make that change. Frankly, I don't believe that's true – I think she could've made the change.

So, Jim Fetzer is essentially accusing Dr. Wood of lying over this issue? Why? What evidence did he present that made him believe Dr. Wood's statement was “not true”?

Fetzer Blames Dr. Wood

Later in this same broadcast, Fetzer then repeats invitations to come on his programme^{clxxxiv}:

He suggests that Dr. Wood and John Hutchison go on his programme and discuss the evidence. This already took place, however, on 28th Feb 2008^{cxviii} – and has been discussed elsewhere. So why does Fetzer want to repeat this exercise? Does Fetzer think that blaming Dr. Wood for not contacting him, when he has threatened her reputation, and then suggested she is lying is conducive to having an open discussion with her on air?

Fetzer then says, of Hurricane Erin that it “fascinates him” but...

I've been very reluctant to say anything about it – particularly since she has attacked me for stealing her research – when all I was doing was saying “Dr. Wood has made this observation” and offering my interpretation of what it is supposed to mean. If I'm wrong about that, then it's the best I've been able to do, given the limited resources I have to work with because I'm no expert in these areas.

This is very peculiar, as Fetzer has previously been quite comfortable in repeatedly quoting PhD Physicist John P Costella in relation to his opinion of the Hutchison Effect. In any case, Fetzer has heard explanations of the suggested role of Hurricane Erin in 9/11 – it was made on 2 the broadcasts we did on his programme – and he called in to comment about the broadcast – so he must have heard some of it! If he didn't hear all of it, then why wasn't he apparently interested in this important new study?

Fetzer then repeats how Dr. Wood has attacked him – and Ace Baker, which is not, true. Rather, Dr. Wood has pointed out, as I have, how Ace Baker put out false information – stating he had reproduced the

Hutchison Effect, when in actuality he hadn't – instead, he had made a fake video. This is not an attack – it is pointing out what Ace actually himself admitted doing! Similarly, Dr. Wood had pointed out that Jim Fetzer had repeatedly used inappropriate terms to describe what she had said – i.e. the use of Lasers, Masers and Plasmoids – and that Fetzer seemed to be “steering” the discussion of Dr. Woods research – rather than “stealing it”. Note she did not say Fetzer had “stolen” it – this seems to be another instance of Fetzer using subtle changes in language to misrepresent what was said and what actually happened. That is, the word “stolen” is a very emotive term, whereas “trying to take ownership” is rather different – and more appropriate to what seems to have taken place.

Fetzer then says:

These are problems with Dr. Wood and her failure – her unwillingness to communicate with me places the onus of responsibility on her shoulders, not on ours.

So, again we see Fetzer deliberately painting Dr. Wood in a bad light – is he carrying out his threat? Is he making her reputation “unsalvageable”? To me, this is exactly what he is doing, but he uses some careful spin and subtle misrepresentation of what has actually been said and done. The result is that the main focus is shifted away from the study of 9/11 evidence and onto a character analysis of Dr. Wood.

I would say to Jim Fetzer: “What about the presence of the Hurricane on 9/11, Jim? What about it's path? What about the magnetometer data, Jim? What about the upside down cars, Jim? What about all the other correspondence of Hutchison Effect evidence and WTC Evidence? If Dr. Wood did come on your programme, would you be as silent as you were on 28th Feb 2008 on this evidence?”

Ace Baker Hates Dr. Judy Wood

In the broadcast Fetzer brings up the issue of Ace Baker's hate mail and says^{clxxxv}:

...you literally used the word hate [laughs], so I guess there's one definition by which that would fall under that heading...

Also in this extraordinary broadcast, Ace Baker states of Dr. Wood that

She's working real hard to destroy the case for molten metal... and err... hand in hand with Steven Jones – I think that was really their assignment – the two of 'em together – I would point out that Dr. Wood and Morgan were extremely viscous in their attacks on Steven Jones – and rightly so.

This is very peculiar – Ace presents no evidence to back up these very serious allegations – neither does he state whether he thinks there was indeed Molten Metal or whether there wasn't. He thinks attacks are justified and he has now gone on record to state that he hates both Steven Jones and Dr. Judy Wood. So, what about his ideas about what actually caused the destruction of the WTC? Is he going to take any time to talk about these?

Ace then says:

Yeah - you know what? I do hate her. If you can't hate conspirators to mass-murder, who can you hate?

Baker presents no evidence for this extremely provocative statement – couched in a most unpleasant manner and being aired on the Web radio station. So how does Jim Fetzer react? Does he say “Well Ace, are you sure that's not going a bit too far? Are you sure about this?” (When considering these questions, take into account that Fetzer counts himself as a supporter of Ace and a dedicated supporter of Dr. Wood.) Fetzer simply laughs out loud, then says he does not agree with Ace's views, but Ace has a right to hold them.

Some people don't see that there might be “some problems” with this sort of discussion on this programme. However, please consider the following - how would people react if Dr. Wood went on to Jim Fetzer's programme and said “I hate Steven Jones” or “I hate Ace Baker”?

By considering these sorts of ideas and looking carefully at the language and mannerisms employed in this broadcast, I hope the reader can begin to see how “Perception Management” works. I would suggest that whole perceptions of issues can be changed with a tone of voice, a laugh, a chuckle etc – and the listener's or readers psyche is distracted from the double-standards and “covert smearing” which are in operation.

Fetzer on Hutchison and Baker

In the same broadcast Fetzer stated

It's very difficult for me to imagine how anyone could just happen on these phenomena – that they would tend to require a high-level background and training – maybe no necessarily a PhD in Electromagnetism, but maybe something that was roughly equivalent. . .

John Hutchison did not just “happen on the phenomena” – it took him several years to generate effects that were repeatable – and he assembled more than 2 tons of equipment! What exactly is a “PhD in Electromagnetism”? What would be an acceptable equivalent? Does

scientific discovery necessarily follow on from obtaining a science certificate?

...and he was very evasive – he didn't really want to answer my questions

This is not really true – John answered the questions as best he was able, but Fetzer wanted to ask John about his entire background – dating back before the 1980's! This was not the same sort of level to which he interrogated Ace Baker. Fetzer stated that the reason he did not do this was because he had met him and had a very high opinion of his work (but this was even after it had been proved that Ace Baker had (a) stated he had reproduced the Hutchison Effect when actually he hadn't and (b) stated that Andrew Johnson had sent him hate correspondence when he hadn't. Additionally, Ace Baker had sent Dr. Wood hate mail and Fetzer had no real problem with this.

Muddling the Evidence

As if confirming the above concerns about use of redundant or confusing terminology, Fetzer himself, in a later broadcast on the Dynamic Duo on 05 Aug 2008^{elxxxvi}, said

“Now there's another group, championed by Judy Wood, who has been promoting the research that suggests it was some kind of directed energy weapon. Now Dr. Wood is so tentative about how it was actually done – that's about as far as she goes in describing it. I for specificity add that it could have been lasers, masers maybe plasmoids – something very sophisticated was going on here.”

Again, Fetzer failed to mention the Hutchison Effect related evidence and research that Dr. Wood had posted. In the same broadcast, he then went on to say:

“Dr. Wood is now suggesting the source of energy - this is my interpretation of her - what she is talking about - there was a hurricane off the coast of New York that was never reported to the American People on 9/11. This is bizarre. A hurricane could theoretically be used as a source of energy that might have been expended in the demolition of the twin towers if you could figure out how to transform it in a constructive, directed fashion”.

On the surface, this might sound correct, but sadly it isn't - Dr. Wood did not say the Hurricane was a "source of energy" nor that "the energy was transformed". Dr. Wood's study is about field effects which is a different idea - and it ties in exactly with John Hutchison field effect experiments. Indeed, Dr. Wood entitled the new study “9/11 Weather Anomalies and

Field Effects". Fetzter omits these ideas and clearly stated connections. So, I would therefore point out that Fetzter who, on the one hand claims he is "clever" because he has a 35-year academic career to prove this, on the other hand claims he is not clever enough to correctly pick out and focus on details like those I just highlighted here. In other words, he is muddling the evidence. I conclude, therefore, he is therefore helping to generate engineered ignorance.

In his Aug 05 2008 broadcast, he had plenty of opportunity to comment on any of the data or topics we covered in our broadcast - but instead chose to talk about infighting in the 9/11 truth community then he talked about Barrack Obama for a bit - all over the map... (Also, he didn't even mention the name of the Hurricane.) Just after the segment referenced above, he gives Dr. Wood some more "positive strokes", then says "go and buy the Madison DVD" (which, if you haven't seen it, is quite a confusing mixture of 14 hours of material).

Fetzter Discusses 9/11 on the 7th Anniversary

On the 7th Anniversary, Jim Fetzter appeared on Richard Syrett CFRB^{clxxxvii} (Toronto) talk show to discuss 9/11 research developments. Richard Syrett's (RS) first question to Fetzter was:

RS: Here we are 7 years on – any new information that has ... say... come down the pipe in the last ...um... 6 months, a year...

JF: Well, I think there's quite a bit including that David Ray Griffin continues to publish new books – he has one called 9/11 contradictions...

Fetzter pointed out that the WTC molten metal stories are implausible and later did indeed mention Dr. Wood's research in the broadcast, when he said:

I follow the work of Judy Wood here [website and qualifications listed] and who has offered the hypothesis that it was some kind of directed energy weapon. It turns out there are whole families of these and they're now beginning to admit that they have these weapons and they're using them in Iraq...

Fetzter then points out that the military industrial complex is therefore implicated in 9/11 (and this would seem to be true) and the conversation continues:

RS: What are we talking about? Like an electromagnetic pulse? Are we talking about Scalar Technology...?

JF: Well, there are a variety of possibilities, will I wish – ye know – if I were enough of a physicist, I'll tell you, when we gave the conference on the science

and politics of 9/11, when it was all done, I invited members of the audience to come up and say a few words and an elderly lady came up and explained she had a PhD in Physics, and she didn't know why she hadn't seen it before, but after watching Judy Wood's presentation, she realised that they had to have used masers. So something like lasers, masers, plasmoids – something going on here – very, very sophisticated...

So, Fetzer, even though he follows Dr. Wood's research (even though he repeatedly refers to her on this and other broadcasts as Judy Wood), prefers to quote someone anonymous (to us) person's opinion – and chooses not to mention:

- a) The Hutchison Effect (and it is worth mentioning here John Hutchison has been a guest on Syrett's show on more than one occasion^{clxxxviii}).
- b) Chooses not to mention Hurricane Erin, and the most recent research, featured on his own programme some days earlier (and in one segment he called in himself).
- c) Instead, he reports the opinion of an anonymous PhD physicist – given over 12 months ago, who stated she thought it that “masers were involved” and Fetzer discusses nothing else at this point.

Can anyone see anything wrong with this picture? Fetzer is giving his opinion, someone else's and omitting to discuss any of the important evidence already put on the table by Dr. Wood.

More Perception Management

One of the key things that can be confusing in the discussion of what was said is the idea of "taking the credit" - whether Fetzer said this or not, I am not sure, but it's all about perception. (The same is true of the official story of 9/11). Fetzer is trying to create the perception that Dr. Wood is complaining about Fetzer taking credit for her work. If you listen to Dr. Wood carefully, she hasn't said this - she said that Fetzer is confusing and misquoting her research - which is true - Fetzer has previously and repeatedly mentioned "lasers, masers and plasmoids" when discussing the evidence on his show - these are not terms that Dr. Wood has used herself. It is therefore easier for listeners to be confused and think that "lasers, masers and plasmoids" is what Dr. Wood said - and it isn't what she said. If a PhD physicist said "Thermite brought down the towers", should we assume he is correct?

Fetzer has created the perception that he is acting as a "host" and main supporter for Dr. Wood's research and therefore he can justifiably claim to be some kind of "spokesperson" for her - even though he would likely

never claim he is such a spokesperson. This is all very subtle psychology and difficult to see if you don't look hard. Knowing more details helps - such as the fact that Fetzer has not offered any financial support for Dr. Wood's research (I could go into more details here, but I don't think it is appropriate at this time).

Later, he complemented me on the article I wrote about Ace Baker and the Hutchison effect and he invited me onto his programme to discuss the Hutchison effect. I refused - citing the above message as one reason. He didn't apologise - he called me a child again (this is discussed in "Ace in the Hole Part III"). He then wrote to Dr. Reynolds and Jerry Leapheart and tried to persuade them to go on instead (they both refused).

A Magnanimous Act?

By the "generous act" of letting me host with Dr. Wood on GCN, Fetzer can be perceived as perhaps being magnanimous and therefore Dr. Wood and I "look bad" or ungrateful for criticising him or not thanking him. (The GCN audience is small, so it doesn't matter a great deal if information gets out. With someone like Ambrose Lane on the Power XM Channel, he had a much, much larger audience - which was, I would say, why Dr. Wood and myself never got onto the air.) I would suggest that this is a very subtle manipulation psychology. As another example, he complemented me on my hosting (which I think was arguably better on the second show than on the first) - why did he complement me then, when he had:

- (a) previously called me a child and
- (b) said in an e-mail:

I am sorry, Andrew, but your standards of credibility and mine simply do not coincide. I suppose that having a Ph.D. in the history and the philosophy of science and having devoted my professional life to logic, critical thinking, and scientific reasoning have given me a different perspective than your own.

To me, this "flip flop" behaviour doesn't make any sense. I have never been rude to Jim Fetzer, nor have I insulted him. I have, of course, been very critical of him and I think I have shown strong evidence that he is following some kind of agenda (there are those who disagree) – but I certainly don't have proof that he is, indeed, following an agenda.

Look into my Eyes! Look into my Eyes! (Not around the eyes...)

I recently described Fetzer's MO ("mode of operation" or "modus operandi") thus. (It may sound a bit harsh, but I think this is accurate.)

- 1) He gets puffed up with academic credentials (but ignores these when it suits him - we do not know if Ace Baker has a science degree, for example).
- 2) He is very articulate, a good orator (listen to the Syrett broadcast^{clxxxvii} to see how rapidly, fluently and succinctly he can deliver information). He is clearly a competent writer.
- 3) He takes an issue like 9/11 - pretends to analyse it or "consult" about it, then basically can't draw any firm conclusions about anything (this is quite similar to what Kevin Barrett and David Ray Griffin also seem to do).
- 4) He mixes things round and muddles things up.
- 5) He stokes the fighting from time to time (e.g. calling me a child, saying "shame on you" to Dr. Wood).

These actions can prevent people from seeing the real truth - the real evidence - because they are so distracted by his false authority. i.e. "I am clever, but I can't make a decision about what happened on 9/11 - so neither can you."

When this mask starts to slip, he does one of:

- 1) Plays the victim
- 2) Calls people stupid or picks a fight
- 3) Ignores the issue and distracts/diverts onto something else.

It's very effective when done well - and is entirely compatible with "freedom of speech and expression" – but people then don't know who's telling the truth...

So in summary, I would suggest that what Fetzer is doing is very subtle. You can't see it unless you look carefully. He also "turns nice" after being nasty.

Drs. Wood and Reynolds have attempted to prosecute NIST's contractors for wilful blindness. It now seems to me that, having looked at the evidence, that Fetzer is also being "wilfully blind" – over Hutchison Effect evidence and Hurricane Erin-related Evidence.

Why this is all important

Some might suggest that the information and commentary I have posted here is trivial or irrelevant – or “damaging” in some way. However, I would try to remind the reader of what is at stake. Thanks to Dr. Wood’s diligent study, I put it to the reader that we have conclusive evidence that advanced “free energy” and weather modification technology was used in the horrendous black operation that was 9/11. I put it to you that we have conclusive evidence that the cover up of this truth is being carefully managed, by people that you may seem reluctant to scrutinise, because they appear to be “white hats”. The 9/11 truth movement is being controlled and directed. Perhaps we should remember the words of “Won’t Get Fooled Again” – “The men that spurred us on sit in judgement of our wrong“ and “Meet the new boss.... same as the old boss”.

E-mails

E-mail 1

----- Forwarded message from jfetzer@d.umn.edu -----

Date: Wed, 30 Jul 2008 23:54:47 -0500

From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu

Reply-To: jfetzer@d.umn.edu

Subject: Fwd: THE 9/11 CONTROVERSIES

To:

Cc: jfetzer@d.umn.edu

Dr. Wood, Morgan, Jerry,

Listening to Dr. Wood and Andrew tonight was rather painful. Dr. Wood made several misleading statements. Obviously, if her research is being described as "Fetzer/Wood" it is because I have been her champion since November 2006, when we had (what I believe to have been) the first of our interviews. It was during this discussion that she suggested the source of energy could have been in space. She was already using the phrase "beam weapon" on her web site, which I knew was going to generate problems of the "space beam" and "death ray" kind, but she told me she thought it was appropriate and kept the phrase.

In addition, I have never been invited to present her research, so I have no idea where she got that. I do of course discuss her work, since I could not make a competent presentation on the World Trade Center with- out

doing so. But my presentations are of my views on these matters, including differentiating between conventional methods (dynamite, thermite/thermate, etc.) and unconventional (mini-nukes, lasers, masers, plasmoids, etc.). I even have a slide that shows all of the possibilities. There is no intimation that Dr. Wood has endorsed one or another of these possibilities but only that her work tends to disprove that conventional methods were enough to bring about the devastation. I mention them to lend some specificity to the discussion.

At the very end of our conference, a participant with a Ph.D. in theoretical physics reported that, after hearing Dr. Wood's presentation, she was convinced that masers were involved. I am unable to discriminate between the alternatives but only indicate that the mechanism seems to lie in this direction, which Dr. Wood and others continue to investigate. I completely reject the idea that I am taking credit for her work or "not getting it right". I will create an opportunity to set the record straight on these points. After having spent so much of my time and reputation in the defense of Dr. Wood's work, it is more than disappointing to have her make these malicious attacks on me--especially after going out of my way to have Andrew interview her to make sure her latest work was reported.

We have a practical problem regarding the book. I spent a lot of time and money setting up the conference and all that. It was with the understanding that we were doing a conference together, that a DVD would be produced from it, and that we would jointly produce a book. I need to know that each of you intends to contribute your chapter, as we have all understood would be the case. I do not expect to be stiffed by Dr. Wood for reasons that have scant or no basis in reality. If she has some other grudge of which I am unaware, she should share it. She has been uncommunicative with me for some time now, which I view as highly unprofessional. I need to know from all three of you that you are going to fulfill your commitments to this project and enable me to complete this new book.

Jim

P.S. You can easily confirm my depiction of my talks by reviewing one or more of them on YouTube. I would be glad to send copies of my PowerPoint slides, too, including the one that outlines the full range of alternative possible explanations. I discuss Dr. Wood's work but I do not misrepresent it and I certainly do not take any credit for it. If anyone else has done more to make her work a household word, I would like to know. I am not happy about this, but I can manage to deal with it as long as it does not interfere with the book.

20. Alex Jones and "September Clues"

On Sat 20th Sep, Richard Curtis was Kevin Barrett's guest on his WTPRN show "Truth Jihad Radio" - A caller - Robert from Arizona - called in to talk about the film "September Clues" and how he had decided to get Simon Shack to post it in high quality to a website. The caller^{clxxxix} basically said he wanted to be pleasant to everyone, even if they didn't see things the same way he did^{cxc}.

12 minutes later, after the commercial break, another caller comes on - "Alex from Texas". Kevin Barrett announces him as an "illustrious guest". After some pleasantries, in which Kevin Barrett says "take as many minutes as you want", Alex mentions he is driving into the hills and his cell phone may cut out. He starts to talk about the Pentagon and infiltration into peace groups.

But at 10:32 into this clip, Alex says the following:

That said, I noticed day 1, that the no-planers for tower 1 & 2 and that the space beamers would viciously attack anyone who wouldn't immediately agree with them and scream and yell at them and scream and yell at me - and try to bully me and others - and then viciously try to discredit the key researchers that were getting things ready for peer review - which they did - the key researchers that were really on the trail - that's now fleshed out with err - with Kevin Ryan and all these other people - and Steven Jones and yourself. I mean this is bombshell [inaudible] the thermite - it's just so incredibly err - ye know - on target. Just every step of the research continues and it's really waking a lot of people up. So I notice that not only did the bullies attack everybody 2 years ago and say "you've got to agree with us" - at that critical point when the establishment decided that 9/11 was a big threat to them - they then attacked all the key researchers savagely and then national TV kept giving them attention - kept giving ... and so now when I do a national TV appearance or I go on national radio they go "Oh you're the group that thinks Space Beams did it or you're the group that thinks there were no planes. And I would talk to these no planers [inaudible or "not the"] low level weak-minded people that follow them. I would talk to the high level - you know the progenitors of it and they would say err - 'well listen - I had family that was in New York and I saw the first plane or I saw the second plane or I had family or friends going back to college who saw it' and they'd say "Shut up liar! You're probably just a Fed (!)!"

And so it goes on... for quite a few more minutes. Just before the 2nd commercial break, at around 16:34 Kevin says "OK Alex, that's pretty well put - can you stay on and can I ask you a couple quick questions

after the break?" Kevin then says "We blew his cover" in reference to Alex Jones... Neither Kevin Barrett or Richard Curtis seem to take any issue with anything Alex Jones says. At about 22:10, Curtis says "Well, I think that he's making a very important point that everyone in the movement needs to be informed on COINTELPRO (which is what Alex had alluded to in some of his monologue).

Clearly missing from any of this discussion are:

- a. Evidence (such as steel being harder than aluminium)
- b. Any of the names of the supposed "weak-minded" or "progenitors" of the "no planes" research and court cases....

Question: How did Alex Jones know this issue was being discussed on WTPRN while he was "driving around"? Is he a big fan of Barrett's show? Why was it so important that Alex Jones stop his journey and call into the show?

Alex is "well into" fighting the New World Order – but hasn't taken anything to court. Maybe he needs to – to show how much more strong-minded he is than these "weak-minded space beamers" who have...? (And this is a statement related to *action and intent*, not the *outcome* of such action.)

In April 2008, Attorney Jerry Leaphart wrote to Alex Jones^{exci} suggesting he should be more careful about the language he used when referring to the group of people/researchers who have become known as "no planers". It seems like Alex didn't read it.

Earlier...

In 2007, Steve Jones Appeared on the Alex Jones show^{exci} and they discussed how some physicists had started to talk about 9/11.

S Jones:	...and both of these have written in the Journal of 911Studies dot com – I'll get a plug in for that Journal – because it represents all that research and these are Professor David Griscom – he's a fellow of the American Physical Society and I was so pleased to see him....
A Jones	We're not gonna find the "Marvin Martian" proponents over there...
S Jones	No, no... you won't [laughs]... David Gr...
A Jones	"Oh Dear!"

S Jones	[laughs] the other one is Greg Jenkins, PhD, a young PhD lives out in the Washington DC area – part of the DC911 truth group – a very, very good scientist as well...
---------	---

Related

In 2007, Webster Tarpley appeared in Bradford UK^{xcxiii}, asked a question about Dr. Wood's Qui Tam case against NIST, he responded and said:

I believe that research should be carried out – you cannot ban any research a priori. I've always argued for a research sphere separated from a political sphere – and what I think of as the political sphere is what we've seen [in his presentation] it has to with for example using 9/11 and the Rogue B52 to get impeachment going – because without 9/11 truth, you cannot defeat Bush politically. So I am always in favour of a political sphere which is separate from a research sphere. For a lot of people in the United States, the research sphere is all there is...


What do you think of the Directed Energy Weapons scenario?

*Hang on I am getting to it, but the political sphere for me is indispensable. Now, I would never say I won't co-operate with someone because they have a theoretical difference from me. **I don't think it's possible to talk about "men from mars"**. I don't recommend blaming it on the action of the holy spirit – much as I like the Holy Spirit -but short of this, I would not have any preclusion. Concerning her theory, I think her theory is something she has failed to prove. I don't see her successfully proving the "beam" theory and I like Fetzer very much and I try to co-operate with Fetzer on political matters, but I have not been convinced by the Space Laser or Beam Weapons or new Physical Principles argument. So, I think it's fine for them to continue with this but you have to realise that this is an unproven hypothesis. I think it is not wise if they get a chance to be on television to make that the leading edge. I would not do that....*

21. 9/11, Directed Energy Weapons and HAARP "...without Referring to Dr. Judy Wood"

The Ongoing Perception Management of 9/11 Evidence and Research

Dec 31st 2008



The depopulation matrix is designed to be activated by a 9-11 style false-flag state terror attack against a major urban centre in the US. Possibly using nuclear, biological weapons or advanced exotic weapons such as directed energy weapons – which I think Dr. Wood has done a magnificent job of... really holding her space and... [applause] ... bringing us to this.^{cxiv}

Alfred Webre at Madison, Wisconsin Conference

“Science and Politics of 9/11 – What’s Controversial and What’s Not”

Aug 4/5 2007

AW *...just run through [in] 5 minutes why you think HAARP was the instrument that caused the molecular dissociation and the controlled ... disappearance of the World Trade Centre.*

LM *Well, it was really Judy Wood’s presentation which had the physical evidence and the photos which are not available – they haven’t been ...*

AW *Without... without referring to Judy Wood – in your own words – why do you think HAARP caused it?*

Alfred Webre (AW) speaking with Leuren Moret (LM) on Sofia Smallstorm’s “Expansion” RBN Internet Radio Broadcast, 14 Nov 2008

In the last few months, I have written about how I think that key figures in what might be called the 9/11 Official Truth movement seem to be involved in a mixture of “cover up” and “muddle up” regarding the discussion of and general conclusions about the most important 9/11-related evidence of all – the Hutchison Effect evidence and that related to

Hurricane Erin. One other author has also written about some general problems with the 9/11 Official Truth Movement^{excv}.

In writing these articles, I frequently mention the concept of "Free Energy" – which means being able to extract useful energy from the environment, or from within materials themselves – without "burning" in either a chemical or nuclear sense. Nikola Tesla called it "radiant energy" (as he proposed it was present everywhere – as sunlight is on a clear day). Others call it "vacuum energy" or "zero point energy" or even, perhaps, "Orgone energy". Mainstream science usually states that "zero point energy" cannot be "extracted" and made to do useful work because that would violate certain laws of physics. Experimental evidence^{excvi} does call this conclusion into question, however.

Having written these articles, I conclude some of the people involved seem to have had 3 main objectives:

- 1) To try to tarnish or discredit the reputation of Dr. Judy Wood, as a means of drawing attention away from the evidence she has discussed in her comprehensive pictorial studies posted at <http://www.drjudywood.com/>
- 2) To prevent people from making the connection between 9/11 and Free Energy technology and the use of weather control technology on that same day.
- 3) To play down or ignore Dr. Wood's Qui Tam case against NIST's contractors^{excvii}, some of whom (SAIC, ARA and Boeing) just happen to be involved in directed energy weapons research, assembly or manufacture.

For example, on the 7th Anniversary of 9/11, Jim Fetzer appeared on the Richard Syrett CFRB (Toronto) talk radio show to discuss 9/11 research developments.

Fetzer mentioned none of the profound ideas listed above, preferring instead to mention a new book by David Ray Griffin.

However, despite efforts to obfuscate, discredit and muddle up discussion of 9/11, Hurricane Erin and the Hutchison Effect, more people are still becoming aware that this information is "out there", not least because of Dr. Wood's appearance on several regular and reasonably well known non-internet radio programmes such as those of Rollye James^{excviii} and Richard Syrett^{excix}. It is worth noting that Dr. Wood appeared on the Richard Syrett Show one week after Jim Fetzer – and at that time, Richard Syrett seemed particularly surprised to learn from Dr. Wood of the proximity of Hurricane Erin to NYC on 9/11.

The New Chapter

So, let us now turn to what seems to be a “new chapter” in this “ongoing saga” of the marginalisation of what, it can be strongly argued, is the most important and comprehensive 9/11 research that has been made public. The latest tactic seems to be to blame HAARP for the destruction of the World Trade Centre Complex and simply pretend that Dr. Judy Wood – and half of the research she has completed - does not exist. As you will see from the media referenced here, this tactic seems to have “come into play” sometime between August 2007 and November 2008, although further evidence narrows this period to between April and November 2008.

At this point, it should be noted that in the Press Release I posted to introduce Dr. Wood’s Hurricane Erin Study (see Chapter 15) and her associated presentations, I specifically stated:

A later part of the study examines some of the data relating to patterns of earthquakes in 2008 and possibly associated unusual weather patterns, which may be related to secret or partially disclosed environmental modification technology (such as HAARP). However, the study does not establish any clear links between HAARP and the events in New York on 9/11.

The Players

The two “main players” in this new chapter are Alfred Webre^{cc} an International Lawyer, peace and environmental activist, prominent in the nascent field of Exopolitics, and Leuren Moret^{ci} - a Geoscientist who has travelled the world to discuss and expose the dangers of radioactive contamination caused by the use of Depleted Uranium in modern artillery shells. With this starting point, it seems hard to imagine how two such people would play a role in actively covering up the links between 9/11, Free Energy technology and Weather Control.

Exopolitics and Depleted Uranium

I first came across Alfred Webre in 2004 or 2005 when I found out about his involvement in the controversial field of Exopolitics. He wrote about this in his book Exopolitics: Politics, Government, and Law in the Universe. A number of people shun him for his involvement in the field of Exopolitics, but my own views on this subject area may be substantially different to those of some people reading this article, so I leave you to explore other sections of <http://www.checktheevidence.com/> to find some reasons why I say this.

I became aware of Leuren Moret's work as a result of seeing a film called "Beyond Treason",^{ccii} and later I heard her speak as a guest on Jim Fetzer's Dynamic Duo programme in June 2007^{cciii}.

I had also communicated with Alfred Webre some time in 2007 following my cursory involvement with the case of UK Hacker Gary McKinnon^{cciv}. Here, I was glad to learn that Alfred Webre seemed to be trying to help with Gary's case, by getting several people in the exopolitics community to make a joint statement in support of Gary.

How could these 2 people possibly become negatively involved in the matter of Dr. Judy Wood's 9/11 research, in the manner which is described here? As I write this, I am again feeling very uncomfortable with what the evidence has shown me.

Madison Conference, Aug 4th – 5th, 2007

Both Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret attended Dr. Judy Wood's presentation at the Madison Conference, Aug 4th – 5th, 2007, which was organised by Kevin Barrett and Jim Fetzer. At the conference, also, Leuren Moret gave a presentation about Depleted Uranium^{ccv} and Alfred Webre gave a presentation about false flag operations and the setting up of an international war crimes tribunal^{ccvi}.

As already shown above, Leuren Moret agreed, because of the physical evidence shown in Dr. Judy Wood's Madison presentation, that something very unusual happened at the World Trade Centre. It is worth re-iterating that, at the time of the Madison Conference, Dr. Wood had only stated that some kind of Directed Energy Weapon had been used to destroy most of the WTC complex – she had not yet made the connection, through a study of the evidence, to either the Hutchison Effect^{lxxxix} nor had she considered the role of field effects associated with Hurricane Erin, which was present over the Atlantic ocean, closest to NYC on 9/11/01^{cxliii}.

During his Madison presentation, Alfred Webre discusses the problems we, as people, currently have and possible ways we can solve them. In relation to environmental problems, he said:

3. Shift to new breakthrough energy technologies - moving beyond petroleum and nuclear which are the principal tools of the war crimes organisation - to breakthrough fuel-less non-polluting zero point energy technologies that are now sequestered in the National Security State.

We shall see the relevance of his statement later in the article.

From Exposure to Cover-up, From Clarity to "Muddle-up"

I opened this article with two media clips, the second being recorded approximately 15 months after the first. Why did Alfred Webre "champion" the name of Dr. Judy Wood in August 2007, then instruct that it not to be mentioned in November 2008? What had changed in that intervening period? My conclusion is that it is to do with the association of Free Energy technology and the events of 9/11.

14th Feb 2008 / April 2008

On 14th Feb 2008, Alfred Webre, at his own home, interviewed Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison to discuss the relationship between their respective research^{ccvii}. The interview included a discussion of specific physical evidence relating to 9/11 – it was over 1 hour long, although Dr. Wood and John Hutchison spent a little longer speaking with Alfred Webre.

Links to the audios of the interviews were not, however, posted until Monday April 21, 2008 on Alfred Webre's Exopolitics blog^{ccviii}.

In the interview, Alfred Webre introduces Dr. Wood and John Hutchison as "two very distinguished guests" and then reads out basic biographical information. He said that they "will discuss that photographic and video evidence suggests that the world trade centre towers were destroyed using directed energy weapons." He then reads segments from the Press Release about Dr. Wood's Hutchison Effect/911 study, which I posted on 30th Jan 2008^{ccv}. Webre reads these statements

"In early January 2008, Dr. Judy Wood posted a new study on her website (www.drjudywood.com), which relates effects seen in photographs taken before, during and after the destruction of the WTC tower[s]"

However, Webre omits, at that point the words, "to effects seen in John Hutchison's ongoing experiments," as it clearly states in the press release.

He repeats that he had the pleasure of attending Dr. Judy Wood's Madison presentation in August 2007 and he described it as "like attending a college seminar because [Dr. Wood is] indeed a university professor".

During the interview, Alfred Webre was told of the connection between Hutchison Effect evidence and the effects seen at and near the World Trade Centre on 9/11. Webre even acknowledges that the Weaponised Free Energy Technology should be disclosed and used for Peaceful Purposes, thus:

At the 33:30 mark, Dr. Wood says:

"I don't know if it's the exact same thing as the Hutchison Effect, but what I've learned from this is that... here is something that does the same thing that we see..."

Alfred Webre says "yes" and Dr. Wood continues, "...so we know it's possible." Webre says "right".

At around 44:25 in the long recording referenced above, Dr. Wood suggests "an amazing technology was used [on 9/11]" and Webre says "yes". Webre also appears to agree when Dr. Wood suggests that the technology could be used for good things – he states that her suggestion is a "very profound statement". Webre then suggests (around 45:30) that behind the black budget projects there are these

"advanced technologies which have been developed, at taxpayer expense, for weapons applications, which could as easily be applied to new energy applications that would be to the benefit of the biosphere."

He says "whatever technology did this should be disclosed". John Hutchison also expresses his wish for the technology to be disclosed and that his method of "doing this" is to appear in TV documentaries about the subject and talk about his work and experiments.

Further, Webre suggested that Wood and Hutchison submit a paper to the IEEE (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers) about their findings.

This whole interview is analysed in more detail in an appendix to this article.

It is worth noting, at this point, that on Monday 10th March 2008, Alfred Webre had Richard Gage of Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth as a guest on his Co-Op radio broadcast^{ccix}. The Richard Gage interview is mentioned, because some severe problems with the type of evidence he has been involved in promoting can easily be discovered^{ccx}.

Strangely, though the Wood/Hutchison interview was recorded in Feb 2008, it was not broadcast until April 2008 – on the day before a TV interview with Richard Gage was broadcast in the Vancouver Area^{ccxi}.

14th November 2008 – "Expansion" on RBN with Sofia Smallstorm

The next development in this story took place a few months later when, on November 14th 2008, Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret appeared on Sofia Smallstorm's "Expansion" programme on RBN (Internet)^{ccxii}. (This followed an earlier appearance by Webre on 31st October 2008^{ccxiii}, where

Webre discussed the HAARP array.) Though there are many points of interest in this programme, the key segment from Nov 14th programme is repeated here for emphasis:

- AW *...just run through [in] 5 minutes why you think HAARP was the instrument that caused the molecular dissociation and the controlled ... disappearance of the World Trade Centre.*
- LM *Well, it was really Judy Wood's presentation which had the physical evidence and the photos which are not available – they haven't been ...*
- AW *Without... without referring to Judy Wood – in your own words – why do you think HAARP caused it?*

Leuren Moret is introduced as a Geoscientist and she states she once worked at Lawrence Livermore Laboratories (though it is not made clear what her duties there were). Alfred Webre is introduced as an “international lawyer”. (It can be noted therefore, that neither speaker shares technical qualifications equivalent to those of Dr. Judy Wood).

At 43:40, she describes the Aug 2007 Madison Conference as “the most important 9/11 Conference that has happened”. At 44:40, she then describes the 13+ hour DVD as being available and notes that

“Judy Wood’s presentation is the key to understanding how they carried out the destruction of the World Trade Centre Buildings.”

Leuren Moret then goes on to say:

“It involves Science – it involves the energy budget required to basically powder[ise] those buildings – huge buildings and the energy required to cause molecular dissociation of steel beams and concrete...”

Sofia then asks Leuren Moret to explain the term “energy budget” and asks

“how much energy does it take?”

to which LM responds (45:50)

“Well, huge amounts of energy – much more than chemical explosives would release.”

She then states that the buildings “turn to dust” – “going up in smoke” and she describes they were “basically being vaporised”. She states

“this requires very sophisticated beam weapons – huge amounts of energy.”

At this point, even though Webre had already discussed aspects of the energy question and 9/11 with Dr. Wood and John Hutchison some 9 months earlier, he does not mention any of this. It is worth remembering that at the time, he seemed very interested:

Alfred Webre said on Feb 14th 2008, "...advanced technologies which have been developed at taxpayer expense which are for weapons applications, which could as easily be applied to new energy applications that would be to the benefit of the biosphere."

Late in the discussion, Leuren Moret brings up the subject of the Minnesota Bridge Collapse and then states at 67:32 in the interview:

Judy Wood went up and looked at that bridge during the conference and she came back and reported to us at the conference that it was not a natural or a normal bridge collapse – she said it was taken down in sections.

We will see why this is noteworthy when a later broadcast with Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret on Co-Op (on November 17th) is discussed.

I highlight other "interesting" details in November 14th interview later, in an appendix to this article, but here I will list some points and questions.

Questions about Energy, Questions about Evidence

In the interview, why is Leuren Moret so focused on "the energy budget" for what happened at the WTC?

HAARP is a disclosed facility and its energy budget should be known or able to be known – in relatively specific terms. Leuren Moret does not give any figures for HAARP's power consumption, nor does she attempt to quantify the energy used to destroy the WTC. She quotes no figures – at all. One figure that could have been quoted, even if there was a reason to suggest it was wildly inaccurate, was 3 megawatts^{ccxiv}. Why didn't Leuren Moret discuss these figures and, for example, dispute them?

- Moret states that she has done research, but she, unlike Dr. Judy Wood, does not appear to have a website – she does not give the address of a website where her research can be found – it is therefore apparently not available for public scrutiny.
- If HAARP was used to destroy the WTC, wouldn't someone from the HAARP facility know this? If Moret thinks they would not know this, then why didn't she describe or suggest how or why HAARP's operation on 9/11 was covered up?

- Moret provides no evidence that HAARP was operational on 9/11, nor does she even describe any process by which she might have attempted to collect or discover this information.
- Moret states that she is a "Geoscientist", but does not state why her particular expertise or knowledge qualifies her to be certain that HAARP was used on 9/11 to destroy the WTC.
- Why does Leuren Moret not comment on Alfred Webre's instruction to her to "not mention Dr. Judy Wood"? (e.g. "Sorry Alfred, I am not sure why you are asking me not to mention Dr. Judy Wood?")
- Why does Sofia not comment on the interaction between Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret and why does she not ask why Dr. Judy Wood "should not be mentioned" - when Sofia knows full-well that this is all a discussion of the evidence collected by Dr. Wood herself.
- Why has Moret only now started to say that HAARP was responsible for the destruction of the WTC on 9/11? Not only did she see Dr. Wood's Madison presentation over 1 year earlier, she said she worked at Livermore Labs in the 1990's and knew that HAARP was developed there. Why wasn't she talking about HAARP and 9/11 months or even years ago?
- Leuren Moret seems to mix up laser technology and HAARP. She says that she witnessed a demonstration of the Shiva laser – but she does not describe any links at all between this project and HAARP. Indeed, lasers and HAARP are totally different systems and technologies – HAARP uses an array of antennae which generate Radio Frequency emissions whereas Lasers use a crystal or other source of radiation and generate a coherent, focused emission of energy. Is Leuren Moret confused about this, or is she trying to confuse the audience?
- Why doesn't Webre mention any aspects of his discussion with Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison from the February 2008 interview? This is especially curious in view of the fact that he suggested during the interview then that they submit papers to the IEEE about their research. In February 2008, he also made comments relating specifically to weaponised free energy technology.
- If Moret is sure that HAARP destroyed the WTC, then why, approximately 66 minutes into the broadcast (referenced above)

does she state that she considers that mini-nukes could have been used (because of radioactive isotope traces found at the WTC site)? Why bring this up? (We now have the suggestion of Lasers, HAARP and Micronukes in this one broadcast)

- If Moret is sure that HAARP destroyed the WTC, why didn't she propose some action in relation to this conclusion or "proof"? For example, Dr. Wood has compiled her evidence into a Qui Tam case against NIST's contractors. All speakers were aware of this too – why didn't they discuss it, or some alternative action?

November 17th 2008, Co-Op Radio Broadcast with Alfred Webre

The date listed above is probably correct, though I could not establish with certainty whether this broadcast took place on the 10th or 17th of November. This programme contains a very similar discussion to that given on Sofia's "Expansion" programme on the 14th of November, though there are some differences. One of the key ones is at 52:57, when Moret says:

You [Alfred Webre] were there with me at this conference in Wisconsin... just a day or two after the Minneapolis Bridge Collapse and some of the speakers went up to investigate the Minneapolis Bridge Collapse during the conference and they reported that there were similarities between that bridge collapse and events at the WTC or should I say evidence left at the World Trade Centre. For instance one of the engineers reported that looking at the Minneapolis Bridge Collapse, it was a collapse that had never been reported or seen before and this engineer said that every bridge segment failed at exactly the same moment.

This is a very peculiar description of the event – why is Dr. Judy Wood not mentioned this time? Only a few days ago, Leuren Moret seemed quite comfortable mentioning her name. Also, earlier in this broadcast, we did not hear Alfred Webre instructing Leuren Moret not to mention Dr. Wood's name. Why was Dr. Wood's name not mentioned? Was this a "dress rehearsal" for the next broadcast?

Webre ends the broadcast saying

You can go to www.peaceinspace.org to listen to this program and the audio archives of all the programmes. There will be there, as well, a complete outline with references... listed throughout this programme.

In an overview of the presentation^{ccxv}, no reference links to Dr. Wood's research are included in the list of evidence itself. Lower down, the page includes these words:

The views expressed on the radio program are entirely those of the guest, independent scientist Leuren Moret. Email: leurenmoret@yahoo.com^{ccxi}

Other Coop Radio guests who have conducted similar interviews in this area include Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchinson. See: <http://www.drjudywood.com>

COOPRADIO.ORG: Dr. Judy Wood & Canadian Inventor/Scientist John Hutchinson on 9/11 & The Hutchinson Effect

http://exopolitics.blogs.com/exopolitics_radio/2008/04/coopradiorg--1.html

Listeners should contact Leuren Moret, Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchinson directly with regard to any questions as to content, conclusions and overlap.

Why is this information right at the bottom of the programme listing and not at the top? Does Moret or Webre think “overlap” is a fair term to describe the way in which the evidence compiled by Dr. Judy Wood and some of it posted for over 2 years on her website(s) was taken and discussed by Moret for almost 3 hours (1 hour on 17th Nov, referenced above, and 2 hours on Sofia’s broadcast on the 21st Nov, referenced below) without any reference or credit to Dr. Wood? Is Alfred Webre trying to “duck responsibility” for being party to the copying of Dr. Wood’s research and trying to “offload the burden” onto Leuren Moret? Is he not capable of showing where all the points of evidence in the list were originally posted? If this was taking place in the sphere of conventional publication of materials – such as that related to music, literature, inventions or patents wouldn’t lawyers get involved with this sort of thing? Alfred Webre is described as an international lawyer so isn’t it amazing that he does not seem to have considered the ethics of this situation? Did he have a realisation of what he has condoned and participated in during this broadcast and in this web posting? Was his objective even to create a situation where Dr. Wood tried to further matters related to copying of material and ideas? It looks like this matter did not concern Alfred Webre at all, because a few days later, he completed a similar broadcast with Leuren Moret – and Sofia Smallstorm.

21st November 2008 – “Expansion” on RBN with Sofia Smallstorm

On November 21st 2008, Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret again appeared on Sofia Smallstorm’s “Expansion” programme on RBN (Internet).^{ccxii} The first 40 minutes, or so, of the programme is taken up with a discussion about the nature of the soul and aspects of how it is different to the physical body - and how parts of it may be electromagnetic in nature. Whilst this area is very interesting, and some of what Alfred

Webre says I would agree with, this is an extremely speculative area and not one I wish to associate in any direct way with the study of 9/11 and the very important evidence compiled by Dr. Judy Wood over the last few years.

At 40:06 Webre then mentions HAARP again and links HAARP to 9/11. He introduces Leuren Moret (who has not yet joined the discussion) thus:

She has prepared an extensive outline that goes into detail on the specific application of HAARP at the World Trade Centre and shows that the footprint of the event that occurred at the World Trade Centre – as a matter of science ... corresponds to an electromagnetic event not to an explosive event

Alfred Webre does not reference Moret's previous inclusion of "Micronukes" in this part of the description, nor the "Laser demonstration" Moret said that she witnessed at Livermore Labs.

Sofia then says:

I know that certain listeners are interested to hear how HAARP was the agent of destruction at the World Trade Centre because I received some e-mails this week – so that'll be good...

At about 44:20 Moret says:

I really appreciate Alfred and you discussing the energy issue – the electromagnetic issue. We can call it the energy budget and that is the very key to understanding what happened at the World Trade Centre on 9/11. There are many aspects of the energy budget that can be looked at and each of them gives us more information or clues about what really happened.

Two large problems soon become apparent in the ensuing presentation (almost a monologue by Leuren Moret). The first is that Leuren Moret uses no science or analysis to directly or even indirectly link the points of evidence she discusses to any of the disclosed or suspected capabilities of the HAARP array.

The second problem is that the detailed catalogue of evidence she recounts is, without exception, the list compiled by Dr. Judy Wood, one to two years before the airdate of this broadcast. It is referenced without any mention of Dr. Wood's name, website, or any of the additional studies she has compiled which have built on this evidence. To me, the strategy being employed here entirely fits with the concept of (a) muddling the evidence (b) attempting to "take ownership" of the research of Dr. Judy Wood and link it to something which it does not "fit" – at all.

Further details of this interview are examined in the appendix, but here, I will list, along with approximate time codes, the points of 9/11 evidence

that Leuren Moret discusses. To understand the full significance of this, the following pages need to be reviewed:

Dr. Wood's Madison Presentation – Part 1^{ccxvii} and Part 2^{ccxviii}, Dr. Wood's "Star Wars Directed Energy Beam Weapon" Series^{xl}, Dr. Wood's WTC Dirt Series^{ccxix}

44:39	Seismic Data
49:47	Says of the destruction of 1 of the WTC towers that it... "It just looks like a drinking fountain of dust..."
52:25	24 foot Circular holes evidence of beam weapon (refers again to Livermore 1990 demonstration again and says HAARP was developed there starting in 1976 with the Russians)
55:25	60 foot hole in Liberty street.
56:50	Dust stops and goes up - indicates molecular dissociation
56:35	Unburned paper, then toasted cars
60:20	Missing door handles in cars and missing engine blocks, paint effects.
61:30	She has discussed melted or missing metal and unburned paper and then she says "what in the world physically happened that could create phenomenon like this? And I don't have an answer, I don't know what happened." I thought she said it was HAARP...?
62:25	"Instant Rust" appearing.
63:25	Warner Brother figures and PATH train almost undamaged in WTC basements.
64:00	Detail on Cahill dust study. Moret then makes some comments on Cahill's dust study and includes reference to the same paragraph posted on a page of Dr. Wood's Erin Series ^{ccxx}
69:50	Dirt trucks
70:00	Scrubbing the streets and dump trucks and dirt piles getting higher.
71:00	Fuming without fires, boots, molecular dissociation of material.
72:00	Doctors reaction to "missing bodies".
73:02	Reports that William Rodriguez is a friend of hers and that he reported there were no fires in the building (however, Rodriguez did report explosions in the basement).

74:25	Moret states "iron rusts, steel does not rust" (technically not correct), she mentions USGS dust study not being trustworthy due to exclusion of sampling sites. References 1 micron dust particle size and states that it takes "huge amounts of energy" to create dust like this – this is not what Dr. Wood stated
77:00	States that photos have been altered and that this has affected the colour of the dust seen, but she does not give specific details.
78:00	Comparison of demolition of Seattle dome.
78:40	Lathering up of WTC 1,2 and 7 before collapse "it was probably the beam weapon or some kind of a physical process happening that was necessary for the beam to work properly."
79:20	"they were already preparing building 7 before building 2 went down"
79:40	Freon tanks.
84:30	Moret says: "I'd just like to read a comment - this came off a forum on the internet, so there's no author" she then reads Steve Warran's quote, as used in Dr. Judy Wood's Madison presentation - where she credited the author on her slide – as Dr. Wood does on her Website.

In all of this discussion neither Alfred Webre, nor Sofia Smallstorm make any mention of Dr. Judy Wood, her Madison presentation or her Website – let alone the later research about the Hutchison Effect and Hurricane Erin, which provides a far greater evidence-base to determine what actually happened on 9/11.

Why do neither Webre or Sofia, who both know that this is Dr. Wood's research - and have both been made fully aware of the later research, make any comments whatsoever? What's wrong with this picture?

So, again, what verifiable evidence is missing from this discussion? In considering this presentation and what it excludes, can we conclude that the cover up and muddle up is still in progress?

Sofia closes the programme saying:

Some day I will do another show discussing all that I have accumulated in my research and how it fits with some of what Leuren said and how it may not fit with other parts of that. . .

Again, there is no mention of the most profound and fundamental evidence that Dr. Wood has uncovered since August 2007. In relation to the Moret's conclusion that HAARP played a big part in the events of 9/11, it can be asked:

What evidence did Moret supply that HAARP was responsible for the destruction of the WTC towers?

What specific characteristics of HAARP did Moret describe that made her draw the conclusion HAARP was employed?

For example, Dr. Wood's study matches specific Hutchison Effect characteristics (bending of metals without high heat, levitation, rapid rusting of steel) to specific evidence at the World Trade Centre^{alxxxix}. Leuren Moret did no such thing! She simply listed Dr. Wood's evidence and then said "HAARP did this." How on earth can Sofia and Alfred Webre have failed to comment in any way on a presentation which was so weakly founded and so obviously copied? I leave the reader to make up their own mind.

Is this a Heist? Is this a Cover Up?

I repeat the question - why was Dr. Judy Wood's name or Website not mentioned at any point, by Webre, Moret or Sofia on the latter November 2008 broadcasts? Could this be seen, due to the amount of evidence presented and its important nature, to be an attempt to keep it all covered up?

My conclusion is that the Hutchison Effect and Hurricane Erin are the most important aspects of the studies completed by Dr. Wood – as these are the topics that almost no other 9/11 researchers will candidly discuss. I would strongly contend that, by repeatedly mentioning HAARP when they should "know better" and completely excluding any discussion of the Hutchison Effect and Erin the studies posted by Dr. Wood, Leuren Moret and Alfred Webre have decided to deliberately participate in the same "muddle up" of 9/11 research and evidence. Some will say "oh – it's just a disagreement over evidence and they're entitled to their own opinion and conclusion" – each person is, of course, free for themselves to have this view if they wish, but the catalogue of evidence I have presented here forces me to vehemently disagree with such a view.

Sofia's failure to mention Dr. Wood's work – when she has been advised about the Hutchison Effect and Hurricane Erin studies also tells me something. (Sofia also herself interviewed Dr. Wood on 10th March 2007^{ccxxi}. If you listen to the Dr. Wood/Sofia interview, they did, indeed, discuss things like the WTC dust, and the lack of material, the problems with the molten metal stories, straight vertical holes in the buildings and the street.) Sofia has also seen Dr. Wood's Madison August 2007 presentation – which contains all the evidence that Leuren Moret went through. Why then, in the interview with Moret and Webre, did not Sofia (or Webre) comment at all about this? Was it simply that she was afraid of

“creating conflict” with her guests? In view of the fact that Leuren Moret was happy to mention Dr. Judy Wood’s name on the 14th and did not do so on the 21st, this explanation does not seem satisfactory. Therefore, is Sofia a willing participant in the “muddle up”? Or did she just “not notice” what was going on in her radio broadcasts?

Dr. Judy Wood E-mails Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret

In an attempt to determine why Leuren Moret did not make sufficient attribution to Dr. Wood at the appropriate points, Dr. Wood e-mailed her and she further requested that specific attribution be made to her research in the future. Leuren Moret responded saying:

I believe your information presented at Madison is one of the most important ones ever presented on 9/11, I have made every attempt to widely circulate awareness about your information. I don't need to steal anyone else's information, this is something quite different, it's actually a strategy to get your information out.

Moret added:

As soon as I mentioned your name in the interview as the starting point for my comments - the electricity was cut off in my house and the phone line went dead. Any time your name is mentioned in interviews, the same thing happens.

As you will hear if you listen to the interview, and can see from the transcribed segments, on the 14th of November RBN broadcast, the phone interview continued even after Leuren Moret had mentioned Dr. Wood’s name several times.

Remembering the Goal

Let’s remember the goal of studies like Dr. Wood’s – it’s to establish what happened by examining the most evidence and then tying the explanation to known phenomena. Point for point, Dr. Wood’s studies and general conclusions explain the evidence more completely than any other study that is publicly available. Is Sofia relying on popularity rather than the best match of evidence to explanations? Or should we all simply “vote for truth” on these issues (as so many people seem to be doing)?

The Reality of Free Energy Technology

In relation specifically to free energy technology, why did Alfred Webre, at the Madison Conference in his presentation on 05 Aug 2007 (in relation to solving global problems), say this

3. *Shift to new breakthrough energy technologies - moving beyond petroleum and nuclear which are the principal tools of the war crimes organisation - to breakthrough fuel-less non-polluting zero point energy technologies that are now sequestered in the National Security State.*

...and then say this to Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison on 14th Feb 2008:

[behind the black budget projects there are these] "advanced technologies which have been developed, at taxpayer expense, for weapons applications, which could as easily be applied to new energy applications that would be to the benefit of the biosphere."

Later in the same interview/discussion he says:

"whatever technology did this should be disclosed".

So why would he completely omit any discussion of free energy technology and the Hutchison Effect in his November radio interviews/discussions? What changed between February 2008 and November 2008?

Conclusions

1. Having considered and analysed the evidence here, I can only sensibly draw the following conclusions. These conclusions will not be popular in some quarters.
2. There has been a deliberate and co-ordinated attempt to marginalise or even cut out Dr. Judy Wood's name from the discussion of 9/11 evidence and research.
3. There has been a deliberate attempt to cover up and/or muddle up the specific nature or characteristics of the Directed Energy Weapon or Weapons which were used on 9/11, by excluding discussion of John Hutchison's experiments in relation to key 9/11 evidence.
4. There has been a deliberate attempt to cover up and/or muddle up the evidence which strongly indicates a link between free energy technology or technologies which work, have been weaponised and used on 9/11. An example of this was when Leuren Moret kept referring to "the Energy Budget" and several times referred to "large" or "huge amounts" of energy being required to cause dustification and molecular dissociation of the materials from which the WTC was constructed.

5. There is a great reluctance to discuss specific legal action in relation to 9/11 – especially Dr. Wood’s Qui Tam case against NIST’s contractors.
6. In this matter, people that should “know better” have gone beyond any reasonable point where one might consider they just “disagree” with Dr. Judy Wood or “do not understand” what she has “put on the table”.

So, how will the “average person” know how to discern which Scientist is being truthful? How will they discern which scientist is discussing the most powerful and most complete set of evidence and drawing the most accurate conclusions?

To re-emphasise, I conclude that all the evidence documented above strongly suggests or even proves that there is a wish to cover up knowledge of Hurricane Erin’s presence on 9/11 and its likely role in the field matrix which was in place in NYC on that day. I also, therefore, additionally conclude these things:

7. Advanced Directed Energy Weapon technology was used on 9/11 to destroy most of the WTC complex – as Dr. Wood has been saying since September 2006 (when her “beam weapon” study was first posted).
8. This technology exploits “free energy” in a way similar to that discovered by John Hutchison – as Dr. Wood has been saying since about January 2008.

More importantly, what will you conclude?

Appendix – Further Notes ON and Transcriptions of Audio Presentations

Here I include further notes and transcriptions I compiled on the audio presentations relevant to this article.

Leuren Moret - Madison – 5th Aug 2007

Leuren Moret says:

50:45	“I worked in 2 nuclear weapons laboratories – I had no idea what I was doing there – I’m a geoscientist – it was just a job. A I worked at the Livermore Nuclear Weapons Lab from 1989 – 1991. And I had absolutely no idea what a nuclear bomb was – it was just something they made there..... In 1991 I became a whistleblower at Livermore and I survived the Karen Silkwood experience.
-------	---

Moret talks about culture of death in the Nuclear Weapons research and then she talks about Ghandi. She

talks about Hawaii who may start a DU bill. She mentions how people around the world are interested in 9/11 and that she went to Oct 2006 Tokyo conference. She said they’re crazy about 9/11 in Italy.

She shows a video of herself on Hawaii news in relation to the apparent use DU there by the US Military (for training or testing purposes).

She infers Alfred Webre gave her “legal information”. She says “don’t ask me how this happened ... I never plan anything.”

On 9/11, Moret says she called Janette Sherman 12 miles down-wind from Pentagon – Janet said radiation levels were elevated, but Moret showed no graphs of radiation or evidence of DU at the pentagon.

Moret she says she got involved in 9/11 and found that there are many players who want to “keep people focused on the WTC”. She mentions someone in the EPA by the name of Bellingham who apparently said that the Pentagon site was contaminated with radiation (probably from DU).

At 65:05 Moret states that The Pentagon is the Achilles heel of 9/11 [Applause] – because there’s no one else involved there except the military. She says Doug Rokke supplied photos of Pentagon to her – they agreed DU was in a cruise missile which hit the pentagon.

She references Patriot Act and the encroaching Police State and says 9/11 was about Oil and Resources and to establish a military presence in Central Asia.

Alfred Webre - Madison Aug 05 2007

Alfred Webre talks about the "Alien Invasion False flag". He mentions the role of the City of London and other entities, as well as the "depopulation agenda". He mentions Dr. Wood's presentation regarding Directed Energy Weapons at least 3 times.

The depopulation matrix is designed to be activated by a 9-11 style false-flag state terror attack against a major urban centre in the US. Possibly using nuclear, biological weapons or advanced exotic weapons such as directed energy weapons – which I think Dr. Wood has done a magnificent job of... really holding her space and... [applause] ... bringing us to this.

...we've had the terror attack in New York using, most plausibly, directed energy weapons of some sort. OK? We've had the Hurricane Katrina false flag operation using most plausibly directed energy weapons or HAARP to teleguide the Hurricane right into New Orleans...

"First of all I'd like to congratulate again Dr. Judy Wood because I think she's proved, prima facie, that 9/11 by itself tonight was a crime against humanity through the use of an advanced exotic weapon. OK?"

He references Minneapolis bridge being taken down with a Directed Energy Weapon. Webre refers to and demonstrates understanding of various laws relating to constitution.

He asks the question "How do we get out of this mess?" and says, as part of his answer:

3. Shift to new breakthrough energy technologies - moving beyond petroleum and nuclear which are the principal tools of the war crimes organisation - to breakthrough fuel-less non-polluting zero point energy technologies that are now sequestered in the National Security State.

He refers to space based weapons and talks about War Crimes tribunal.

"I believe that Dr. Judy Wood and the evidence she presented here will be a worthy witness at a citizens' international war crimes tribunal – so this is going forward."

He mentions of calling for a Truth amnesty process when he was to speak at the X-Conference in Washington DC on 14th Sept 2007.

Leuren Moret Speaks in the Q & A After Webre's Talk

Leuren Moret recounts the experience of witnessing the laser demonstration.

"It was an Amber beam 25 feet across going straight up into the sky and I said "what is that" and [the student] said "oh they're making a star" with a laser beam – making a star – and what I realised when I saw Judy Wood's presentation this evening is that that could've been the prototype for whatever the weapon was that they used at the world trade centre. And they kept all air traffic away from that beam for a 5-mile radius"

How is this truly relevant to Dr. Wood's presentation?

Webre's Co-Op Radio Show with John Hutchison and Dr. Judy Wood

This was recorded Feb 14th Feb but not broadcast until April 2008 ^{ccxxii}.

The original audio file that was posted was very large – over 90 MBs for a recording of 1 hour 7 minutes – it was sampled at 192 kbps. Other broadcasts were on his blog were sampled at 32 kbps – making them approximately 15 MBs in size (i.e. much easier to download). The audio was also difficult to listen to, with Webre and John Hutchison's voices being fairly quiet and Dr. Wood's voice being much louder. I therefore used dynamic range compression on the audio, once I found that it had been posted and Alfred Webre posted a link to the version which I processed and down-sampled to 32kbps to make it easier to download.

As far as I am aware, when it was broadcast on air (in April) in a 1-hour slot on Co-Op radio, the last few minutes was simply cut, with no closing remarks or suitable editing.

They commence by discussing the "boat video" and the instances of spontaneous combustion it shows.

Alfred Webre does cover a number of the key points of evidence, such as the buildings turning to dust. He does not really ask any detailed questions about things like the levitation or the transmutation of material (steel turning into iron and then rusting), though he observes it is "like a form of alchemy". Webre remains fairly quiet when Dr. Wood compares the rusting observed in the aftermath of the WTC with that observed in one of John Hutchison's stainless steel samples.

Around the 28-minute mark, John Hutchison describes the relatively low power levels used in his experiments (from 75 watts to approximately 2 kilowatts), and Webre acknowledges that this is a very significant finding. Webre mentions that he had spoken to a professional electrical engineer who had said it would require an enormous amount of energy to "poof" the WTC buildings.

John Hutchison then gives a general overview of his understanding of how the Casimir force and the Weak Nuclear force in

"What we're operating is 'key ways' into perhaps a Casimir realm and the sub-atomic realm. We have RF [radio frequency] generating equipment, electrostatic generating equipment along with weak nuclear forces, which are combining and linking up in time and space and opening up a 'gate' so that the Casimir energy can flow in and do whatever... energy is required to cause these effects, like taking bars and twisting them into knots. It's a key, using very little energy – a key to open up a sort of gateway, where this energy can come in – in time and space – to wherever it's needed."

So the energy issue has been discussed with and presented before Webre and he has acknowledged the significance of John Hutchison's findings.

Dr. Wood discusses the apparent temperature drop in some instances – where people described the WTC cloud as slightly cooler than the ambient temperature (rarely do they describe it as "burning hot") and John Hutchison confirms that in some cases, his own metal samples appear to be cool, immediately following one of his experiments. Webre acknowledges this aspect is "fascinating".

He does mention the legal challenge to NIST

Around the 41:50 mark, Webre says

"It seems to me that you now have documentation that you could put together in papers that would be published by... accepted journals such as the IEEE. I mean, you're dealing with comparisons between laboratory effects and field effects."

(Dr. Wood then alludes to the time it takes to compose such papers and Webre seems to acknowledge this.)

At 43:00 Webre says

"It seems to me that in this paper you achieve a new threshold and that is to have what we could almost call a laboratory control"

Dr. Wood adds "proof of concept" and Webre repeats this phrase. Webre acknowledges that this brings in a "whole new standard of expression" to the audiences for this material. He describes types of audiences such as a public audience, a judicial audience, a legislative audience, a research audience. And then he says, perhaps light-heartedly, "Gee, when are you guys going to make your first TV documentary?"

Around 44:25, Dr. Wood suggests "an amazing technology was used [on 9/11]" and Webre says "yes". Webre also appears to agree when Dr. Wood suggests that the technology could be used for good things – he says that her suggestion is a "very profound statement". Webre then suggests (around 45:30) that behind the black budget projects there are

these “advanced technologies which have been developed at taxpayer expense which are for weapons applications, which could as easily be applied to new energy applications that would be to the benefit of the biosphere.” He says “whatever technology did this should be disclosed”. John Hutchison also expresses his wish for the technology to be disclosed and that his method of doing this is to appear in TV documentaries about the subject.

Later at around 53:40, Dr. Wood revisits the issue of “weird fires”, but Webre makes no comments in this segment.

Dr. Wood and Webre then discuss (at around the 57:00 mark) the ongoing effects at Ground Zero and Dr. Wood discusses how she got a sore throat on a recent trip to New York and she considered this to be in part caused by the ongoing effects at Ground Zero.

At 60:15, Webre says “In a way, the attack is still continuing because the process is still continuing” and he agrees when Dr. Wood says this has got to be a “health risk”. He said that he felt this was also relevant at his appearance at a 9/11 anniversary conference in 2007 where there was a discussion about the refusal of government at all levels to compensate first responders and residents for damages to health caused by 9/11.

At the end of the interview, Webre says “This hour has gone by so quickly and I hope that you’ll come back and visit us again” and Dr. Wood says she would “love to”.

Expansion 14th November 2008

On 14th November 2008, Alfred Webre appeared with Leuren Moret on Sofia’s radio show “Expansion” on the RBN.

Sofia then states that she has invited her guests to discuss HAARP in relation to 9/11 and Leuren Moret states that she wishes to ask “who benefited” from 9/11. At 5:50 Moret says she wants to look at “where it happened – the Pentagon, The World Trade Centre and Shanksville and then how... that’s where you have to look at the science of molecular dissociation and the... energy budget required.”

Moret then says she concludes from various comments that “it was pretty clear it was the US, the UK and Israel – all 3 of these entities were involved in almost every aspect of 9/11”. Around 9:10 Moret mentions London bankers, but does not name specific individuals only “the London Bankers – the international bankers – the Rothschilds as the public and the oligarchs in the United States”.

At 24:54 Moret says that the strike on the Pentagon is tied into HAARP because the Navy have command and control of HAARP and it was one

of their intelligence offices that was hit. (However, she states that it was a missile that hit the Pentagon, partly according to information she'd received from Major Doug Rokke)

At 43:40, she describes the Madison Conference as the most important 9/11 Conference that has happened. At 44:40, she then describes the 13+ hour DVD as being available and notes that "Judy Wood's presentation is the key to understanding how they carried out the destruction of the World Trade Centre Buildings." She then goes on to say "It involves Science – it involves the energy budget required to basically powder[ise] those buildings – huge buildings and the energy required to cause molecular dissociation of steel beams and concrete..."

Sofia then asks Leuren Moret to explain the term "energy budget" and asks "how much energy does it take?", to which LM responds (45:50) "Well, huge amounts of energy – much more than chemical explosives would release." She then mentions the buildings turning to dust, going up in smoke and also basically being "vaporised". She states "this requires very sophisticated beam weapons – huge amounts of energy."

At this point, even though Webre had already discussed aspects of the energy question and 9/11 with Dr. Wood and John Hutchison some 9 months earlier, he does not mention this. It is worth remembering that at the time, he seemed very interested:

"...advanced technologies which have been developed at taxpayer expense which are for weapons applications, which could as easily be applied to new energy applications that would be to the benefit of the biosphere."

At the 48:00 mark, Sofia re-states her interest in the "energy budget", but also does not bring up the Hutchison Effect – which I had advised her about in e-mails sent in August 2008, which she had acknowledged receipt of. LM then discusses with Sofia the ideas of "Pancake Collapse" and Controlled Demolition and the associated energy budget – but neither of them brings up the relationship to the Hutchison Effect. LM mentions how Dr. Wood's presentation used various photographs to demonstrate there "was no collapse" of the WTC towers – but she incorrectly states the buildings "went up in smoke".

Sofia then asks (51:34) if there is

"any allowance for chemical explosives... RDX, thermite assisted...?"

Moret states

"there was physical chemical evidence that thermite was present, but when you see Judy Wood's presentation – the colour of the smoke was altered in photos to

... and people were conditioned to keep repeating thermite but she said the buildings were vaporised from the top down".

Sadly, Moret misquotes and muddles Dr. Wood's presentation – in which Dr. Wood notes the colouration of the smoke, but does not state that its colour was altered, nor does she state that the building was "vaporised".

Sofia mentions how Thermite was introduced into 9/11 research by Steven E Jones, but then Moret asks Alfred Webre into the conversation "because now we're going into HAARP and molecular dissociation and the energy budget". Webre then states he wants Moret to finish her presentation before he comments. He states that he thought the discussion had got caught up in "the semantics".

Moret then states it was the intelligence agencies from the USA, UK and Israel that carried out 9/11.

55:39 AW	...just run through 5 minutes why you think HAARP was the instrument that caused the molecular dissociation and the controlled ... disappearance of the World Trade Centre.
LM	Well, it was really Judy Wood's presentation which had the physical evidence and the photos which are not available – they haven't been ...
AW	Without... without referring to Judy Wood – in your own words – why do you think HAARP caused it?
LM	There were some... first of all where was that building rubble that should've been 35 stories high? Those were 500,000 ton buildings – that just basically went up in smoke... they just disappeared. And I know as a Geoscientist that a tremendous amount of energy was needed to basically vaporise or dustify those buildings and I observed in Livermore, as a Livermore staff Scientist - in the middle of the night - a demonstration of laser beam weapons, so I have actually seen a demonstration ... by Livermore – which is where HAARP was developed secretly in collaboration with the Soviet Union beginning in 1976, so I know the weapons exist, I know the applications – I have observed them and looking at the World Trade Centre destruction – as a geoscientist – I know that the keys to understanding what happened at the World Trade Centre are the energy budget needed to molecularly dissociate those two buildings. That's exactly what the physical mechanism was that was used to destroy those buildings.

Moret does not distinguish between the beam weapon she states she witnessed and the fact that HAARP is described as a "phased array" and

an "ionospheric heater" in the actual specifications which are available on its website.

At 59:20, Sofia asks Moret if she knows how Dr. Wood got access to photos that were not in the public domain. Moret then speculates that Dr. Wood went to conferences where "government representatives" were showing photos. She suggests Dr. Wood went to "NIST hearings" and "probably to the library of congress and went through their collections online".

Strangely, neither Sofia nor Leuren Moret actually think to ask Dr. Wood herself this question and neither do they refer to or visit her Website, where the majority of photos are referenced anyway.

At approx. 60:40 Sofia states that Dr. Wood

.....
"has seen, I believe, more than anyone on Earth more photos of the World Trade Centre demolition than anyone else that I've ever heard of."
.....

At 60:45, Webre states to Moret

.....
"You've shown of instances where HAARP has been used in environmental warfare such as hurricanes [yes], earthquakes, cyclones. We also know that HAARP is used for scalar energy warfare against land and population targets..."
.....

Moret then says

.....
"A very good example is the Kashmir earthquake of 2005."
.....

Webre interjects

.....
"No, not tectonic warfare [ob] not environmental warfare – scalar energy warfare against land and population targets including cities, industrial sites – to bring down portions of cities. To bring down buildings. To bring down industrial sites. OK? To bring down individuals."
.....

(Why is Webre asking Moret to describe this – it sounds like he has some information in front of him, so why can't he discuss it?) At the time of writing googling "leuren moret HAARP"^{ccxxiii} brings up only links to Alfred Webre's blog, and a few other blogs. Leuren Moret does not appear to have her own Website (unlike Dr. Judy Wood) and therefore I am not sure where she has "shown of instances where HAARP has been used in environmental warfare"

Also listen for the unusual reference to the Alfred P Murrah (APM) Building being destroyed by HAARP. At 63:25, Moret states

"There are indications that HAARP-type space weapons were used at the Murrah Building in Okalahoma City."

It is worth noting that HAARP is not a space weapon – it is a ground-based array in Alaska – but Moret is not given a chance to clarify or correct this statement –

Webre asks

If scalar energy weapons were used there, how would one know whether it was HAARP or not?

Moret responds

Well if... the particle size and the energy budget is the whole key to understanding what technology was used to destroy a building.

Webre says

Right, exactly. What other candidates would you have in mind, other than HAARP that would've been used at the Alfred P Murrah Building?

Moret then states that because of radioactive isotope traces at both the WTC and the APM building, she considers that mini-nukes could have been used and states that high levels of Uranium were found at the WTC site, but does not reference any specific data sources.

I have previously posted an e-mail exchange I had with another proponent of the WTC mini-nuke theory, and the same arguments and rebuttals apply to Moret's suggestion here^{ccxxiv}.

Sofia then brings up (at approx 66:00) the subject of the Minnesota Bridge collapse and Webre comments that it happened on the eve of the Madison Conference and that he had seen it from the air.

Moret then states 67:32:

Judy Wood went up and looked at that bridge during the conference and she came back and reported to us at the conference that it was not a natural or a normal bridge collapse – she said it was taken down in sections.

Interestingly, starting around 69:50 Webre states that one of his classmates at Yale was John Ashcroft whom he met in Washington DC following an appearance Webre made at the X-Conference. Webre stated that he had a conversation with Ashcroft (whom, according to Webre, some may have described as "the arch-demon") which was very civilised and that they came out of polarities into a "spirit of truth and reconciliation". Webre suggested that this may be where the future in all this would lie (and I don't disagree with this – but it does require people to be truthful).

Interestingly, at around 63:55 Webre states:

9-11 was planned going back to the early 1970's – if not before. The World Trade Centre towers were probably built already with 9/11 planned ... in mind... one was called David and the other was called Nelson – around the Rockefeller brothers. I grew up around these guys. Dick Cheney who was the chief operations officer of 9/11 was a year ahead of me at Yale... George W Bush was a couple of years behind me. I used to go up to Maine right up to Rockefeller's estate. I was inside on the Rockefeller operation and this inside board operates from an upper theatre masonry, such that they would be developing ... using their front companies like SSAIC [SAIC?], like the Livermore labs to develop the technologies like HAARP that would knock down their twin towers that they built in order to be knocked down...

77:00 Webre states that he became involved in “public interest counter intelligence” (which he states earlier in the interview is his elaborate name for researching ‘conspiracy theories’) on Nov 22nd 1963 as he was a member of the board of members of the Assassination Information Bureau.

At 79:05 Webre states

I'm fairly convinced it was HAARP because HAARP was a central part of all psy-ops – it's used for earthquakes, ye know, it's kind of like – it's good for what ails you if you're in the psy-ops business. 9/11 was the major psy-ops of the Bush era. It was in the planning... we have eyewitnesses that place Donald Rumsfeld planning 9/11 as early as 1971...

At 80:00, Webre states:

The Twin Towers themselves were designed for 9/11...

and then he goes into a discussion of the Kennedy Assassination. This does not really add anything to the discussion of how HAARP was used to destroy the WTC – which was what the topic of conversation was meant to be.

Webre then discusses how “the book is going to be closed on 9/11” with the change of US presidential administration, though he acknowledges that “it can't be forgotten about” when Sofia mentions “the larger picture.”

Are they interested in exactly what happened? Why have they discussed so little specific evidence – no specific documents.

Webre then suggests at 85:40

So now, I think that we're in an era of re-framing it [9/11] and so that's why I think it's necessary to really highlight it in terms of HAARP, in terms of the space-based weapon of mass destruction and really focus on HAARP and on banning HAARP as the principal weapon of the conspiracy, because as long as HAARP continues they'll have the human mind... they can make jelly and mince meat and carry out all of their plans to compromise elections to make governments jelly...

Webre clearly thinks HAARP is a formidable weapon. Sofia does not really pick up on any of the statements Webre makes nor does she ask him to substantiate them with evidence or clarification.

Expansions 21st November 2008

After the first 40 minutes, Webre links HAARP to 9/11 again and asks Leuren Moret:

She has prepared an extensive outline that goes into detail on the specific application of HAARP at the World Trade Centre and shows that the footprint of the event that occurred at the World Trade Centre – as a matter of science ... corresponds to an electromagnetic event not to an explosive event

Alfred Webre does not reference Moret's previous inclusion of "Micronukes" in this part of the description. Sofia then says

I know that certain listeners are interested to hear how HAARP was the agent of destruction at the World Trade Centre because I received some e-mails this week – so that'll be good...

At about 44:20 Moret says

I really appreciate Alfred and you discussing the energy issue – the electromagnetic issue. We can call it the energy budget and that is the very key to understanding what happened at the World Trade Centre on 9/11. There are many aspects of the energy budget that can be looked at and each of them gives us more information or clues about what really happened.

Moret references the Seismic data from 9/11 and how it does not show the sort of signal expected by the 2 buildings coming down. She references the kinetic energy that would have been liberated as the building came down and states at 44:39:

It's nowhere on the seismic record... Where did all that energy disappear to?

This represents a subtle change to the question "Where did the building go?" i.e. Moret references the expected energy of impact of the material before referencing what happened to the material itself. (The lack of

material is the more obvious problem, once video and photo evidence is studied carefully.)

At 44:53 Moret says:

The size of the of the dust particles in the material that was released as the buildings went down required tremendous amounts of energy to produce those very tiny particles – to break all the chemical bonds... in the building material... where did that energy come from?

She talks about the energy required to break the bonds and how this would be much greater than the kinetic energy involved in constructing the building (i.e. much greater than the energy released by a gravity-driven collapse) and she re-iterates the energy discrepancy.

Moret says at approx 49:47

It was obviously not a controlled demolition... the buildings erupted into an emulsion of dust particles – there was no rubble that hit the ground if you watch the videos... It just looks like a drinking fountain of dust from the top of the building down and much of the dust went directly up into the atmosphere and there are actually satellite images showing the dust going up into the upper atmosphere immediately...

Moret then mentions the paucity of debris and then she says

There were buildings very closely located right next to the World Trade Centre buildings and there was absolutely no damage done to them

Moret fails to mention the Banker's Trust building, its repair and subsequent dismantling.

She mentions the laser project called Shiva at Livermore – brief research I completed on this suggested that this was something used as part of Fusion research project rather than it being a weapon of some kind, although I would admit that with "black projects", the picture is never clear. Nevertheless, why is Moret bringing this into the discussion without more evidence? What, according to Moret, did the damage at the WTC – a laser or HAARP – or both?

At 55:25 Moret starts to list the evidence compiled by Dr. Wood. After the break, at 66:35 Sofia says

We are listening to Lauren Moret recount the many bits of evidence that suggest or point to electromagnetism as the demolition force at the World Trade Centre in 2001, rather than explosives... and I am itching to ask you questions because there are so many things I am hearing that do not connect with my own

experience – I did make ‘9/11 Mysteries’ – I was immersed in this research for a year...

Moret then makes some comments on Cahill’s dust study and includes reference to the same paragraph posted on a page of Dr. Wood’s Erin Series^{ccxx}. She then lists more of the evidence compiled by Dr. Wood without crediting Dr. Wood.

Note: HAARP isn’t a beam weapon – it’s a phased array of antennae! It is unclear if it has a weapons application. No contribution from Webre.

Sofia closes saying

Some day I will do another show discussing all that I have accumulated in my research and how it fits with some of what Leuren said and how it may not fit with other parts of that...

Webre and Moret on Co-Op Radio, November 10th or 17th 2008

Moret speaks continuously for over 15 minutes about “whodunnit” and references an article by General Ivashov - “International terrorism does not exist” (I agree with the thrust of this)

At 20:52 Webre states:

I think we should shift over to the issue of how HAARP was involved in 9/11 because I think that is the new information and also it’s the information that very powerful forces have desperately been trying to keep from public view.

Moret responds:

That’s for sure. That’s for sure.

She continues:

I am a Geoscientist so I am approaching the World Trade Centre event from an interdisciplinary scientific background...

The Chambers English Dictionary (1996, CD-ROM edition) defines Geoscience as:

any of the scientific disciplines, such as geology or geomorphology, which deal with the earth, or all of these collectively.

However, no one makes it clear what Moret’s area of expertise is, but Wikipedia states^{cci}:

She earned her Bachelor of Science in Geology at University of California, Davis in 1968, and her Master of Arts in Near Eastern Studies from University of California, Berkeley in 1978.

Does this qualify her to speak with authority on the details of how HAARP destroyed the WTC?

At 23:00 she repeats that she is looking at "The energy budget" and the molecular dissociation and the energy required to make this happen. Mentions kinetic energy issues (potential energy converted back to energy).

At 33:05 she talks about spontaneously combusting cars again and says

...that's also evidence of some new strange phenomenon that takes a lot of energy pumped into a large area to spontaneously combust 25 or 30 cars.

At 34:40 Webre says:

I think that what you're doing now is that you're beginning to show... those aspects of the evidence which demonstrate that what occurred at the World Trade Centre site on September 11th was most probably the result of a directed energy weapon like HAARP.

35:43 Webre continues:

It's an overwhelming case in my opinion.

At 44:47 Moret states

With a nation of scientists they could've called on to come in and help to analyse what happened at the World Trade Centre - instead they've used dishonest scientists to really cover up what happened.

At 47:23 she refers to USGS describing WTC beams as iron (as Dr. Wood did in her Madison presentation). At 52:57 Moret says:

You were there with me at this conference in Wisconsin... just a day or two after the Minneapolis Bridge Collapse and some of the speakers went up to investigate the Minneapolis Bridge Collapse during the conference and they reported that there were similarities between that bridge collapse and events at the WTC or should I say evidence left at the World Trade Centre. For instance one of the engineers reported that looking at the Minneapolis Bridge Collapse, it was a collapse that had never been reported or seen before and this engineer said that every bridge segment failed at exactly the same moment.

Moret doesn't say HAARP was responsible for the destruction of the bridge. At 56:20 Moret again incorrectly states that Steve Warran's quote is "anonymous".

[Steve Warran's quote] "We stand at the beginning of a new age. Our government has in its hands a method of disrupting the molecular basis for

matter, and its first impulse was to weaponize it. Is this so hard to understand? Like splitting atoms to create destruction was so hard to understand in 1945?"

She then "breaks into" the quote saying:

And so now Alfred instead of the Manhattan project, we have the HAARP project which is a new and improved model which makes it possible to carry out electromagnetic warfare – geomagnetic warfare.

Moret then continues with the quote thus:

Of course this new "invention" came when the United States ruled supreme. A weapon system of vast new power comes on line [Moret says "on time"] and we didn't have an enemy worthy of it, so naturally, we use it on ourselves, wag the dog."

At 60:19 Webre states:

Just in these last couple of minutes, could you summarise why it is that it's taken now almost 8 to 9 years for the information to come out that HAARP was used at 9/11.

Moret reads a quote from Richard Cooke regarding the control of world affairs by bankers

As the 20th century advanced, the financier elite became heavily involved in getting rich off world war and the manufacture of the new weapons of mass destruction that modern technology made possible. Warfare and weaponry, combined with control of credit manufactured through the leveraging of industrial production, were to be the primary means of putting nations and their populations into debt.

Then Moret simply adds:

That's exactly what's happening to us now and they've used HAARP to carry out 9/11

Webre responds with "exactly". Then he ends the broadcast saying

You can go to www.peaceinspace.org to listen to this program and the audio archives of all the programmes. There will be there as well a complete outline with references... listed throughout this programme.

E-mails between Dr. Judy Wood and Leuren Moret

E-mail 1

From: Dr. Judy Wood

Subject: COOPRADIO.ORG: ANALYSIS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE USE OF HAARP AND BEAM WEAPONS

To: alw@peaceinspace.com, leurenmoret@yahoo.com, peace@peaceinspace.org, webre@shaw.ca

Date: Monday, December 15, 2008, 10:11 AM

Dear Alfred and Leuren,

The referenced presentation relied heavily on materials that are copyrighted, as noted in my website and as noted in the actual content of the Madison presentation, attended by both of you in the month of August, 2007. The materials are intended for 'fair use' by others and I certainly do not object to such use. What I do object to is the use of the materials without attribution of the source. Will you please contact both your email list and Coopradio.org and issue an attribution statement stating as follows:

"The materials presented are based largely on the work of Dr. Judy Wood and, in particular, upon a presentation of hers entitled "The New Hiroshima," originally presented at Madison, Wisconsin on August 4, 2007. The copyrighted presentations can be found here:

http://drjudywood.com/videos/Hiroshima_videos.html

as well as in the material from her site, drjudywood.com ."

I also request that any future presentation that relies on that material or other work of mine should also contain a proper disclosure of source.

Thank you in advance for your anticipated cooperation in these requests.

In friendship,

Dr. Judy Wood

E-mail 2

Envelope-to: lisajudy@nctv.com

Date: Mon, 15 Dec 2008 10:24:52 -0800 (PST)

From: Leuren Moret <leurenmoret@yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: COOPRADIO.ORG: ANALYSIS OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE USE OF HAARP AND BEAM WEAPONS

To: alw@peaceinspace.com, peace@peaceinspace.org, webre@shaw.ca,

"Dr. Judy Wood" <lisajudy@nctv.com>, bob.bobnichols@gmail.com

Dear Dr. Wood - Because I believe your information presented at Madison is one of the most important ones ever presented on 911, I have made every attempt to widely circulate awareness about your information. I don't need to steal anyone else's information, this is something quite different, it's actually a strategy to get your information out. I am aware of extensive harrassment and bashing that you have been subjected to, and I know all about it because it happens to me all the time, especially on the HAARP interviews I have already done prior to the one you are writing about.

I have done a previous interview on "HAARP and 911" with Alfred on another station in November, fully acknowledging your information and contribution. As soon as I mentioned your name in the interview as the starting point for my comments - the electricity was cut off in my house and the phone line went dead. Any time your name is mentioned in interviews, the same thing happens. The host for the program I mentioned is "Sofia" on Republic Radio, and she also turned on me and started viciously attacking after I made her shut up while I presented the information without interrupting me in a second interview because the first one was disrupted by turning off my electricity in the middle of the interview. She also tried to ask a series of distracting and disinfo questions which would have blocked my presentation on the air of the 911 evidence that HAARP and/or beam weapons were used.

My presentation is quite different from yours, because you have never suggested that HAARP or beam weapons were used at the WTC as far as I know. I have never heard any of your other presentations or seen your copyrighted material so I am unaware that you tied 911 to HAARP if you did in previous material.

Did you contribute a chapter to Jim Fetzers 911 book he is putting together from our conference?

I think you like me are being heavily censored everywhere. The other HAARP interviews I have done are broadly dispersed across the internet, and there is a great deal of interest in them. I do not copyright my material because I want people to use it and write about it so that the correct information gets to the public. I give it to the public as a public service.

Leuren

22. The Baker Effect - A Rift and Disruption System

By Dr. Billy G. Gruff (Pseudonym)

With Profuse Apologies to Mark A Solis^{cxv}

People often ask, "What exactly is the Baker Effect?"

This brief essay is an attempt to answer that question to the satisfaction of the majority.

First of all, the Baker Effect is a collection of phenomena which appeared coincidentally in about Feb 2008, when research on the effects seen at the WTC on 9/11 was linked, by Dr. Judy Wood, to the effects produced John Hutchison in his earlier experiments. (This took place in a broadcast on WPFW in Washington DC) In other words, the Baker Effect is not simply a singular effect. It is several.

The Baker Effect occurs as the result of interference in ongoing research - in a zone of controversy where only a few people (and even less scientists – arguably only one) are maintaining a focus on looking at evidence.

The effects produced include depression of the quality of discussion, attacking research figures of similar opinions - such as Dr. Reynolds and Dr. Wood, the anomalous bleating of anonymous forum posters (often “churning” through irrelevant material), spontaneous fracturing of judgement (some people support the Baker Effect’s known promotion of false information – including on Web Radio programmes), and seemingly temporary and permanent changes in the behaviour of those involved in 9/11 research.

The disruption of important research by the Baker Effect does not seem to be the result of simple disagreements over evidence. Claims that this reason alone can explain the phenomenon seem almost ridiculous, and are also seemingly disproved by looking at the time when the Baker Effect was initially observed - when it has become most active. The Baker effect has been documented on YouTube videos, and has been claimed to be a reproduction of the complete Hutchison Effect (it is not). The Baker Effect has resulted in a “Challenge” to John Hutchison, involving anomalous sums of money. Some people claim that John Hutchison has not accepted this challenge – even though evidence has been presented that he has.

The diffusion of the tendency to focus on evidence in research, which is exceedingly remarkable, indicates clearly that the Baker Effect has a

powerful influence on reasoning. In a striking and baffling contradiction, previous conclusions over evidence presented in relation to what happened on 9/11 are "called into question" and a focus is shifted from this evidence to an individual's trustworthiness – even when no new evidence has come to light about that individual. A researcher named Dr. Wood can simply become the target of “anomalous attacks” – or accusations of “2 researchers being merged into one” can be made, yet Dr. Wood has not “come apart”. Also, there is evidence of a misplacement of trust in the source of Baker Effect (Ace Baker) – as promotion of false information^{ci} and the notion of “viscous attacks” is discussed openly by this source, without any evidence that such attacks have ever actually taken place^{clxxxv}.

The anomalous heating of forum discussions - without focusing on actual evidence - is a clear indication that the nature of this heat may not be completely natural. This has far-reaching implications for the state of the “alternative knowledge” and 9/11 research communities, which often hinges on the presumption of a search for evidence and truth - without baseless accusations and endless vitriol being introduced. It should be noted that credibility of much of the Science which underpins our current level of technology depends on keeping knowledge of the Hutchison Effect properly hidden, and it seems the Baker Effect has this overall result. The anomalous heating of discussion exhibited by the Baker Effect shows plainly that we have much to learn about what lengths a secret group, with black technology, will go to keep this knowledge obfuscated or covered up completely.

The spontaneous fracturing of judgement, as occurs with the Baker Effect, is interesting for two reasons: (1) there is evidence of an "external force" causing the fracturing, and (2) the method by which the judgement is fractured can be painful to observe - the intellect simply “comes apart”.

Some temporary changes in the personality structure and logical properties of opinions are somewhat reminiscent of the "truth bending" of Jim Fetzer, as he has been observed near the situation when the changes take place. One Baker Effect video shows juggling – like a circus act, yet people still take this phenomenon seriously. In the case of personality changes, a character will be “nice” at one end, like honey, and then “nasty” at the other end, like bitter lemon. Again, this could be evidence of a strong influence on personality by external forces.

The ongoing and seemingly timed interferences involved in producing these Baker effects are generated from as many as four or five internet radio and web sources, all operating at relatively low power. However, the zone in which the interference takes place is observed by many tens or even hundreds of forum posters and listeners.

It is surmised by some researchers that what Baker has done is tap into “Zero Trust Energy” – but it also seems to derive energy from internally generated spin. This energy gets its name from the fact that it is seen by oscillations in people’s views of prominent researchers, where it is assumed all honesty in a researcher ceases. The evaporation of trust is associated with a failure to keep focused on evidence – which could be a result of the Baker Effect’s spontaneous emission of negative feelings and an annihilation of careful analysis coming from what is called “the brain.” The density of the energy contained in the Baker Effect’s “truth vacuum” is estimated by some at 75 forum posts per hour, which is reportedly sufficient to boil off most peoples common sense and analytical abilities. Casual observers may wonder if this will result in “perpetual motion”, but with no useful work done.

Given access to such energies – part of the “Zero Trust Field”, it is small wonder that the Baker Effect produces such bizarre phenomena. At the present time, the phenomena are easy to reproduce with regularity – as several other figures seem to be doing. The focus for the future – for those wishing to cover up the truth about the 9/11 and energy connection is, then, first to increase the frequency of occurrence of “Baker Effects”, then to achieve some degree of precision in their control.

The work is continuing at this time. Before long, we shall see what progress can be made.

Oct 25th 2008

Copyright (c) 2008 by Dr. Billy G. Gruff

23. 9/11 Mystery – Sofia Smallstorm, Fluorine/Fluoride and The Destruction of the WTC

Apr 2009

On 16th March 2009, Sofia Smallstorm, maker of the film “9/11 Mysteries – Part 1 – Demolitions” and owner of the website www.911weknow.com appeared on the Mike Herzog show, “American Awakening”^{ccxxv} on the WTPRN network to discuss a new theory she had just proposed to explain some of the destructive effects seen at the World Trade Centre Complex on 9/11.

In this article, I will look at why this is significant, and ask the reader to consider the history behind this latest “episode” - in the ongoing muddle-up of 9/11 truth.

My motivation for writing this article is to document the activities of those people who seem, at first glance, to be helping to “spread the truth” about what happened on 9/11, but then when it comes to discussing or analysing certain key evidence, their attitude and behaviour seems to mysteriously change, or their direction of discussion or study seems to alter.

Sofia and The Fluoride Deception

On the Mike Herzog show, mentioned above, Sofia said that she had been reading a book called The Fluoride Deception (by Christopher Bryson)^{ccxxvi}. At time code 5:25 into this broadcast^{ccxxvii}, she said:

As I was reading this book, I just was connecting dots with 9/11 and I know it sounds bizarre...

She then talks about the element fluorine and gives an accurate description of its reactivity and how it forms fluorides. She also mentions how the state of California is to re-fluoridate water - at the order of Arnold Schwarzenegger^{ccxxviii}. Though this is a separate matter of some concern, it seems strange to link this to the events on 9/11 at the WTC. In the broadcast referenced above, Sofia continues and at 5:57 states:

I read in this book that fluorine cuts through steel like butter, burns asbestos and reacts violently with most organic materials.

Sofia does not make it clear if this is a verbatim quote (although the way she reads it suggests that it is). She then talks about more of the chemistry

of fluorine and fluorides and what she says is accurate. However, she omits 2 things –

- a) Elemental fluoride (F_2) is a green gas.
- b) In liquid (aqueous) form, it is an acid – Hydrogen Fluoride (HF) – or hydrofluoric acid ^{ccxxxix} - which is not the same as fluoride (she correctly describes fluorides as salts of fluorine). HF is highly corrosive (because it is a strong acid) and it is likely she meant that it is this that will cut through steel “like butter”. However, it should be noted again that HF is an aqueous solution - i.e. it’s a colourless liquid. Some readers may be familiar with Hydrochloric Acid (HCl) as this is commonly used in high school/secondary school experiments. HF is basically a much more reactive compound than HCl.

Hydrogen Fluoride is primarily used in industrial processes^{ccxxx} (how interesting it is linked under “Bioterrorism” in that reference.)

Sofia then discusses fluorine’s role as a reducing agent (something which grabs oxygen atoms from other compounds) in the smelting of metals (but she does not make it clear what this has got to do with 9/11). She basically says “fluorine and fluorides are toxic substances” (which is true) and “there were highly toxic substances at ground zero on 9/11 – therefore there must be relationship between these things”. She mentions that fluorine “dissolves steel” – which is not technically true – hydrofluoric acid (HF) will dissolve steel, not elemental green fluorine gas.

In common with Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret’s discussion of HAARP and the WTC destruction^{ccxxxi}, Sofia does not even begin to suggest how fluorine (a green gas) was delivered to the WTC nor does she estimate any of quantities involved. Neither does she suggest how Hydrofluoric Acid (the liquid form) may have been delivered. She provides no other evidence that it was used – she merely makes a weak comparison with 1 or 2 characteristics of some of the WTC evidence but goes no further.

If it were the case that Sofia were just a “newbie” to the 9/11 scene and therefore was someone who had not really spoken to other researchers or looked into related issues, it would seem more likely that bringing up fluoride’s role in the destruction of the WTC might seem to be more understandable. However, her presentation of this fluoride theory happened over 2 years after her well-produced 9/11 mysteries film first appeared (it therefore seems a reasonable guess to suggest that Sofia has been researching 9/11 for at least 3 years). Below, we will see and hear some of the evidence which shows Sofia has been speaking to other

researchers about 9/11 and other topics. She has also spoken about topics such as those closely related to Weather Control.

Dr. Wood and Sofia Discuss...

In Mar 2007, Sofia recorded an 85-minute long conversation with Dr. Judy Wood. Though this interview was recorded some months before Dr. Wood posted her Hutchison Effect study and about 1 year before she posted the Hurricane Erin study, it should have served Sofia well in familiarising herself with an overview of the evidence that Dr. Wood had already posted by then^{ccxxi}.

One of the interesting notes, about this interview, is that Sofia does not comment all that much when Dr. Wood points out the lack of building debris - following the 20-second destruction of the two 1350-foot tall steel glass and concrete edifices known as the WTC Twin Towers.

Dr. Erik Karlstrom and Sofia Discuss the Madison 9/11 Conference

In January 2008, following the release of the Madison Conference DVD set (14 hours of material), Sofia appeared on Eric Karlstrom's "Truth Quest" radio show^{ccxxxii}

On this show, they discussed a range of topics, including Dr. Wood's Madison presentation about the destruction of the WTC. (Eric Karlstrom had written a synopsis of the conference^{ccxxxiii}.) For example, at time code 36:40, they discuss the trucking in and out of dirt from the WTC site^{ccxxxiv}. They talk about decontamination of the site, then about white fumes (which look like steam) and the plume of material which rose from the remains of to the buildings. Karlstrom brings in (and essentially misquotes) the idea that lasers and masers were involved – (this is Jim Fetzer's vocabulary, not Dr. Wood's). Karlstrom quotes Dr. Wood's "New Hiroshima" analogy but incorrectly he seems to imply that Dr. Wood had talked of a Nuclear explosion at the WTC (rather than just a "nuclear process" – or just "molecular dissociation" – which is the key phrase used by Dr. Wood when describing what happened to much of the WTC material).

After this part of the discussion, Karlstrom says to Sofia "Can you fill that out any more?" Sofia responds:

"No – I'm not Judy Wood. I can only tell you that the pulverisation of the buildings was extreme and Steven Jones believes that thermite is powerful enough if it... if the... um... thermite is basically iron oxide and sulphur – [thermate] and aluminium and then with heat added the chemical composition

changes and it becomes aluminium oxide and iron – molten iron. So, he believes that if you add enough sulphur and if you granulate the compound... the thermite compound enough you can give it explosive characteristics. So whether it was thermite or whether it was something plus thermite, the pulverisation of the towers was extreme. And you see this is accounted for in the biological fate – the biophysical reaction of the rescue workers...

So here, we see that Sofia is quite happy to discuss Steven Jones theories in some detail (and quite accurately, it seems), but she is unwilling to discuss the Directed Energy Weapon evidence or technology (because she is “not Judy Wood”. So, by this logic, is Sofia Steven E Jones? This is not a serious question!)

After this, Karlstrom makes remarks that he thinks (paraphrasing) that Dr. Wood is on the “right track” to finding the truth and Steven E Jones is not on the right track. Sofia responds:

I think there's room for both of them. There's every possibility that thermite plus some other process was used and there are experts in all different disciplines. Judy Wood is someone who has been able to language more creatively when she says the buildings disappeared. This is something we would all laugh off and say “no they didn't” – nothing disappeared. But she's pointing out a very extreme... extremely quick pulverisation so it's an accurate word in some ways – not every one can talk like that. She shouldn't be criticised for speaking in this way because she's pointing out some very salient things.

Karlstrom then discusses Dr. Wood's description of how the towers “went away” and he points out that Dr. Wood is a scientist with an understanding of the behaviour of materials etc, but at 47:45 Sofia says:

Right, but Steven Jones is a physicist – he's capable of understanding the same things as well. He knows the melting point of steel – we have to give him credit – he's not “uncredentialed” – he's just operating – as I said on another part of the spectrum. The two are not mutually exclusive. That's my belief.

Of course the melting point of steel is not relevant when one realises that no large quantities of steel melted (at least, not by normal heating). Most of the WTC steel turned to dust.

At around 53:00, Karlstrom then starts to discuss Chemtrails and Clifford Carnicom's “Aerosol Crimes” film – which Sofia distributes through her online store “Avatar Products”. I mention this because it indicates Sofia's interest in the Chemtrail phenomenon – and its related apparent affect on the weather, which she specifically mentions in a later broadcast with Jim Fetzer (see below). One of the proposed ideas as to the purpose of Chemtrails is to assist with Weather Modification or control. Therefore,

one would expect Sofia to be very interested when, later, the Hurricane Erin study posted by Dr. Wood pertained directly to weather control.

Sofia and Jim Fetzer on Dynamic Duo – 9/11 and Chemtrails

On 05 Aug 2008, Sofia appeared on Jim Fetzer's Web radio show. (Interestingly, this was the first show by Fetzer after the 2 shows that Dr. Wood and myself recorded on the 30th and the 31st of July 2008^{ccxxxv}).

On this broadcast^{clxxxvi}, after some introductory pleasantries, at time code 02:20, Sofia begins to talk about Chemtrails and (she discusses them again at time code 30:25). However, at 14:58 Sofia states:

Arnold Schwarzenegger has just told the state of California the fire season was normally 3 months, but now, guess what now, it's all year. Now our fire seasons are year long, which allows them to engineer disasters which is state sponsored weather terrorism – for control of our lives. And this is all possible because of the electromagnetic preparation they have done in the ionosphere and the atmosphere – now all they have to do is throw the switch.

The fact that Sofia used the phrase “state sponsored weather terrorism” implies that she would accept that someone has the ability to control the weather. I therefore ask why is Sofia seemingly so reluctant to talk about Hurricane Erin? Even though it had been mentioned in the two previous Dynamic Duo broadcasts, and Fetzer had commented on the matter, it was not brought up until the last segment of this broadcast – when it formed part of his monologue:

"Dr. Wood is now suggesting the source of energy - this is my interpretation of her - what she is talking about - there was a hurricane off the coast of New York that was never reported to the American People on 9/11. This is bizarre. A hurricane could theoretically be used as a source of energy that might have been expended in the demolition of the twin towers if you could figure out how to transform it in a constructive, directed fashion".

On the surface, this might sound correct, but sadly it isn't - Dr. Wood did not say the Hurricane was a "source of energy" nor that "the energy was transformed". Dr. Wood's study is about field effects which is a different idea - and it ties in exactly with John Hutchison field effect experiments. Indeed, Dr. Wood entitled the new study “9/11 Weather Anomalies and Field Effects”. Fetzer omits these ideas and clearly stated connections. Neither does Sofia make any comments about the Hurricane Erin study or any other parts of Dr. Wood's latest research.

Andrew Johnson Writes to Sofia

Following this appearance with Fetzer, I was concerned that Sofia had said (29:41) "Steven Jones' work is 'fine'". However, I had already discovered what Steven E Jones was doing did not seem to be "fine". For example, he had been getting basic information about isotopes wrong^{ccxxxvi}, misquoting facts about Aluminium^{ccxxxvii} and using faked or massaged data in one or more of his public presentations^{ccxi}. This seemed to be beyond simple "slip-ups" or errors introduced through "rushing". On 28th Aug 2008, I therefore wrote to Sofia about this, and also about Chemtrails, which I have also done a considerable amount of study and research into^{ccxxxviii}. I sent her some of the links here, and I suggested to her that there was a lot of evidence that 9/11 was a much bigger event than the likes of Steven E Jones want to tell people. It employed technology far in advance of thermite and "other explosives" (still not fully specified by Jones or anyone else). Oddly, in the broadcast with Fetzer, Sofia said similar things herself. I also sent her links to Dr. Wood's Erin study and she asked for a further explanation, so on 30th Aug 2008, I wrote back to her, including a summary of my own interpretations and conclusions of the Hutchison Effect and Erin studies, and I suggested that she watch the videos I had edited together of the Ambrose Lane interviews about the Hutchison Effect study^{xcvii}:

In the video I made of the Ambrose Lane interviews, I tried to include visuals to explain the evidence. If you are able to watch them, it may clarify some things. I know that some of the concepts are not "every day ones" (in the way things "blowing up" is an everyday concept), but the phenomena we discussed HAVE been investigated by a small number of well-qualified scientists - such as Hal Puthoff, Robert Koontz (PhD Nuclear Physics) and several others. Much of this information was included in John Hutchison's Affidavit (which a lot [of] people seem keen to ignore) which was submitted (as was my own) to the Court Southern District of New York in Dr. Wood's case where she sued SAIC, ARA and others for their participation in the NCSTAR fraud.

*As regards the "Field Effects", what we are talking about is interferometry and resonance effects of some kind. Dr. Wood pointed out how resonance can be destructive - using the example of wind and the Tacoma narrow's bridge destruction. But these can, indeed, be difficult concepts for people to understand, but the evidence itself not difficult to understand. For example, some of the key evidence regarding field effects is the Alaskan Magnetometer data (Erin5). You can see significant variations in the earth's magnetic field *coinciding* with key events on 9/11. The data is clear and unequivocal (people I have presented to have had no difficulty in seeing the correspondence). Also, many people know*

that a storm has an associated field effect - as they can literally feel it approaching.

If you study some of the free energy technology experiments it seems that when you make high speed oscillations or use high frequency waves of [from] certain equipment in certain ways, various effects seem to "come out" - as if you are "tapping into" the zero point field. Nick Cook, UK Jayne's Defence Weekly correspondent explains this here:

<http://www.checktheevidence.com/Disclosure/Audio/NickCookonAntiGravityResearch.mp3>

No, we cannot name the exact "gizmo" or gizmos that did this - and that is a sticking point for many people. What we can say with certainty is that US Military Personnel (i.e. at least Col John Alexander) have known for 25 years of John Hutchison's experiments and technology and we have documents which prove this.

In November 2008, Sofia had Leuren Moret and Alfred Webre on her radio show, on two consecutive weeks, to discuss the destruction of the WTC^{ccxxxi}. Even though Sofia had been made aware of the information above (we exchanged several e-mails), she did not mention any of these things in these two long interviews. Why?

Questions and Conclusions

If the Fluoride Theory has any merit, why did she not get a scientist to comment on her “fluoride theory” before coming on air? How does she think it helps us get to the truth of 9/11?

Did Sofia ever stop to consider how the “Fluoride Theory” could comprehensively explain (and this is a very brief list)

- 1) Circular holes in the surviving WTC buildings.
- 2) Upturned cars and levitated witnesses
- 3) Steel being turned to DUST – (it was not dissolved in liquid!)
- 4) Hurricane Erin’s proximity to NYC on 9/11
- 5) Magnetic Field Effects –
<http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin5.html>

I am therefore given to wonder if Sofia’s “Fluoride Theory” – being as it is based on little or no firm evidence - is part of the ongoing orchestrated “muddle up” of 9/11 truth?

For a moment, let’s make a comparison - if I was to say “tobacco was involved in the destruction of the WTC” would people think it was a credible theory? My logic could be that “the towers turned to grey dust –

this looked very much like the ash from burning tobacco. I therefore think that somehow, the steel turned to tobacco then the fires burned it to ash”. Smoking tobacco also causes lung and other cancers – and many rescue workers have some form of cancer.

This theory has a similar style of logic to Sofia’s “fluoride” theory, but like Sofia’s theory, there is no additional supporting evidence – apart from a simple visual and circumstantial resemblance. More importantly, there is a great deal of other evidence the “tobacco theory” does not explain (only some of which is listed above). I might discuss such a theory privately, but if I was genuinely interested in the truth (and had already made a film about it), I would not go and discuss it on a radio show, without having some confidence that I had strong evidence to back up most or all of the things I was saying.

Why did Sofia make 9/11 Mysteries? She has said she spent a lot of her own money making it. Is she interested in 9/11 truth? Was she interested in examining all the evidence? One would assume she was, because she wasn’t forced to make the film. She has been made aware of the very strong evidence for Directed Energy Weapons – she knows that a qualified scientist, Dr. Judy Wood has taken this evidence to court. Sofia has discussed some of the evidence personally with Dr. Wood and Sofia’s Website sells a DVD with Dr. Wood’s 2-hour presentation on it^{ccxxxix}.

Sofia is interested in Chemtrails and one might safely assume she was therefore interested in their possible relationship to Weather Control. So why does she neither express any apparent interest in the Hurricane Erin study, nor has she discussed it any detail on any of her broadcasts?

We can see from the evidence above that Sofia is quite capable of researching and quoting facts accurately about Fluoride/Fluorine and Steven E Jones’ “thermite/thermate theory”. However, when Alfred Webre and Leuren Moret appeared twice on her “Expansion” programme, she did not seek to emphasise the evidence discussed was that of Dr. Judy Wood, even though Sofia was fully aware of this. Neither did she question Moret and Webre on some basic points of evidence, as already discussed in a previous article^{ccxxxi}.

I therefore, as ever, leave readers to draw their own conclusions – I hope it is clear what my general conclusions are.

Video Interview with Sofia

This interview ^{ccxl} aired on 20th Sept 2007 and here, Sofia is interviewed in relation to "9/11 Mysteries" by Harold Channer at about 3:40 into the above he says:

HC: *You said you travelled around the world, your family - was it a business thing or err military family that brought you around the world?*

SS: *It's not something that I'm really gonna go into...*

HC: *Oh, OK*

SS: *I had the opportunity to see the world as a child and see that different cultures thought in different ways*

HC: *Was the family involved in things that moved you around the world... as an infant...?*

SS: *No, as a child*

HC: *As a child*

SS: *Yes*

HC: *And so the family was moving around [yes] that's an unusual kind of thing - usually.*

SS: *Some people do it...*

HC: *Was your family with military?*

SS: *We're gonna move on here...*

HC: *Oh, OK...*

24. Questioning "Active Thermitic Material Discovered in dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe"

Why has this new paper been published now by Jones, Harrit et al? What important 9/11 evidence are Steve Jones and the Co-authors ignoring or unable to address?

This is a quickly composed article, posted as a response to the re-cycled and morphing thermite theory, which has again been "dressed up" in what appears to be an authentic Scientific Paper. As all 9/11 researchers should know, appearances can be deceptive. So, let's scratch the veneer of apparent credibility and look at the evidence and issues Steve Jones and his cohorts won't address.

Could Jones, Harrit et al have published this paper because too many people are finding out about the Hurricane (Erin) parked ^{cxliii} outside NYC on 9/11? Are they also realising the connection of the effects seen at the WTC to those of the Hutchison Effect ^{lxxxix}.

Exactly what is the Bentham Open Journal? It costs \$800 to get a paper published on there^{ccxli}.

Perhaps it is too much to expect or ask reviewers to look into the background of the evidence as a way of validating the paper^{cxlii}.

Though the editor in chief is listed, no other details about reviewers on the editorial board are available – apart from their name and country. I.e. their qualifications and areas of specialism are not listed (at least not on this page).

When studied closely, there is no verifiable evidence that thermite played ANY SIGNIFICANT role in the destruction of the WTC. (It MAY have been used in cutting some of small amounts of remaining steel in the clean up operation). If it were truly significant, why didn't Jones and his team submit his research in their legal challenges to NIST (see below).

2005	- Jones says "thermite carried in in loads"
2006/7	- Jones says "probably thermite AND superthermite"
2008	- Jones says "Paint on thermite"
2009	- Jones says "Active thermitic compounds"

So which one is correct? Or is this "morphing as we go" to string people along - and distract them from the verifiable evidence that thermite /

superthermite / nanothermite /DOD thermite/superthermate can never explain - such as

The severe lack of debris ^{ccxliii}.

Upside down cars at the WTC^{ccxliv}.

Straight-line hurricane movement ^{ccxlv}.

Magnetic field disturbances at the PRECISE moment of "1st impact"^{ccxlv}.

Recently, I compiled a list of questions and comments regarding Steve Jones and his research^{ccxlv}. I have reproduced slightly modified versions of some of the points here.

1) Steven E Jones and a group of people submitted an RFC to NIST regarding the NCSTAR reports for WTC 1 & 2 ^{ccxlvii ccxlviii}.

Why do these documents not mention Molten Metal anywhere in them? Why does it not mention Prof. Jones OWN thermite tests - which are said to be "conclusive"?

2) On May 8 2008, Prof. Steven E Jones suggests the towers could have been destroyed with the help of Paint on Thermite. Why?^{ccxlix}

3) Can the authors comment on or explain inverted cars near the WTC on 9/11 and the exploding cars reported by witnesses such Patricia Ondrovic and the exploding Scott Packs (oxygen tanks) reported by some firefighters?^{ccxlv}

4) Can the authors comment on the proximity of Hurricane Erin to NYC during the events of 9/11 (was he aware of its proximity and existence?)

5) Are the authors going to submit a Qui Tam fraud case against NIST's contractors as Professor's Morgan Reynolds and Professor Judy Wood have done ^{ccviii}. (Dr. Wood's case is currently under appeal)

Now let's have a look at some other things that Dr. Steve Jones has suggested.

Steve Jones suggests 9/11 Truthers should irradiate themselves (See Chapter 6.

30:05 -Jones: OK. One other exercise is that we have learned that with evidence we can learn a great deal so if there is an event and - we won't even name a city just say an American city - blamed on Iran, certainly there will be 9/11 truthers nearby and I hope they realize the importance of collecting a sample [right] whether that's dust ... [also radiation] right - having a radiation detector handy if you've got one - whether it's Geiger - if you send me a sample I'd be glad to look at it and I'm sure you would too, Bill. So, if there is such an event the point - the reason I'm emphasizing this is because it's a bit

*of a warning if there are perpetrators thinking about – such another 9/11
they'd better think twice because 9/11 truthers are out there – we're watching.
We will get samples – we know what to do – evidence-based studies – we can
do very quickly and we can put an end to lies - on the next 9/11 if it
[inaudible] ... which I hope we'll avoid... is what I'm trying to say...*

Steve Jones Denies that 70 stories of WTC Steel Turned to Dust - it
"Shook and Fell" ^{cxxii}.

Steven Jones Suggests it's Safe to Dip Wet Fingers in Molten Metal (what
has this got to do with what happened at the WTC)? ^{cci}

It's ALL about the Cover up of FREE ENERGY. But some people who
were previously involved in the Cold Fusion cover up don't want you to
realise that.

25. Free Energy, 9-11 and Weather Control – Ongoing Cover Up, Muddle Up and Censorship of Evidence

18 Apr 2009

With the publication of new articles and papers about a “new” study of the “evidence” of Thermite being used in the destruction of the WTC, the cover up and muddle up of the truth has again been enhanced.

For example, a new article by Dr. John Moffet on OpEd news criticises the new Thermite study in some detail ^{cc1}.

In this article, Moffet mentions Dr. Wood’s research^{lxviii}, but in common with many, many other internet posters makes a significantly mis-representative statement – thus:

Still others, like Dr. Judy Wood, believe that the US used directed energy weapons to destabilize the molecular structure of the buildings, thus causing them to collapse into atomic dust.

This is false. Dr. Judy Wood states that NIST’s contractors committed fraud in producing the WTC reports. They exhibited wilful blindness in not examining all the evidence. For example, they had a predetermined conclusion and fitted their computer models to that. Dr. Wood does not accuse the US (government or military) – or anyone else - of using Directed Energy Weapons (although someone definitely did, but it is certainly not at all clear who it was). Also, Dr. Wood mentions “molecular dissociation” not “atomic dust”. So again, we have a muddle-up by Moffet.

It can be noted here that Dr. John Moffet, who is an OpEdNews editor, in July 2008 censored a press release I wanted to post on OpEdNews (as an article rather than a diary entry) about the presence and relevance of Hurricane Erin on 9/11. John Moffet would not allow a Press Release about the Hurricane Erin study (see Chapter 15) to be posted as an article on OpEdNews.

Any guesses as to why? (See below for the correspondence.)

On the thread of John Moffet’s article we have the “usual crowd” of posters (some of whom have made 1000’s of comments) who are unable to mention 9/11, Hurricane Erin, the Hutchison Effect and the word “evidence” without getting some basic statement wrong, muddling something up or just being rude and disparaging.

Some of them say things like “we’ll never know what happened on 9/11” However, you can find evidence, thanks to Dr. Wood, and you can begin to get a pretty good idea of WHAT happened at the WTC, if you cannot get such a good idea of WHO did it.

In Moffet’s “thermite review” article above, another poster, Patrick Lafferty seems to have come a long way in 3 months ^{ccli}.

He has gone from mentioning controlled demolition to mentioning Directed Energy Weapons (DEW), but again makes no meaningful reference to Hurricane Erin and the Hutchison Effect – in common with Alfred Webre, Sofia Smallstorm, Jim Fetzer and almost everyone else. Perhaps commentary in one^{ccliii} or two^{ccliv} articles could be relevant to what is going on here.

I therefore posted a response in which I ask people to consider issues raised in “A World of Abundance or a World of Scarcity - A Call to Awareness - A Time to Choose”^{cclv}

Peer Review and Smear Review

Articles like Moffet’s and his previous actions seem to emphasise there is an ongoing effort to cover up the weaponisation of Free Energy technology - as I alluded to above.

Reading between the lines of posts and responses to Moffet’s article above, I see this message coming out loud and clear...

"WE HAVE TO KEEP THE REALITY OF FREE ENERGY COVERED UP AT ALL COSTS!!! IT'S VITAL TO MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN THE GLOBAL CONTROL GRID!"

This “hidden” message seems to be echoed on internet forums around the world, with armies (literally) of anonymous posters making false, disparaging or inaccurate statements about the research pertaining to Free Energy, 9/11 and Weather Control – both individually, but more acutely and specifically in relation to Dr. Wood’s collection of evidence and research.

But how else can the fear agenda ever be made to work? Knowledge of the reality of Free Energy Technology could neutralise much of the fear/scarcity-based agenda.

The cover up muddle works very well, because, crucially, what we see here for example is that Moffet criticises the thermite study, but does not acknowledge other scientific analysis based on other evidence not discussed in the study. Many posters then respond supporting the supposedly “Peer Reviewed” thermite study in some way, shape or form.

However, the posters themselves also ignore the evidence of the use of one or more free-energy based Directed Energy Weapons and they fail to point out the lack of huge explosions or the lack of heat generally, as well as the steel being turned to dust (not melted).

The ongoing and repeated pattern is that no posters are able to mention Hutchison Effect, Hurricane Erin, 9/11 and Free Energy in the same post without making rude or disparaging remarks. As can be seen in response to a post I made on the article above, William Whitten used the word "mud" in the title and body of his post. He proved my point yet again!

So I can only offer this advice - keep looking at the evidence – not the rhetoric and rudeness, or solely at the “Peer Review” process – which rapidly becomes a “Smear Review” process when certain evidence and websites are mentioned.

Trying to Run Things “into a Ditch”

This implies that if true information is heading toward exposure, like a freight train, those who want the information suppressed must get control of this freight train so they can run it into the ditch. Thermite was carefully used to divert people, unknowingly, into the ditch, who were beginning to ask questions about the unexplained anomalies on 9/11. Once on the thermite bandwagon, headed down a dead-end street, they are no longer a problem. It is those who won't be herded onto that bandwagon that become the next problem. They, too, must be rounded up and somehow diverted from where they were headed before the truth comes out. One common diversion is to distort the message (example: "space beams" and "ray beams from outer space") to deter people from considering energy weapons. When that no longer works, there is a struggle for control of that freight train. Is this where we are?

If there is enough muddle up and rude remarks, readers who have an open mind, but lack discernment skills or sufficient time to sort through all of the distractions will soon become disinterested and give up in trying to establish the truth in matters such as this. Without a truly unbiased, independent and open “peer review” system which doesn't feel threatened by vested commercial, academic and “credentialist” or ego-based interests, there is no obvious way to turn over the sorting of “the wheat from the chaff” to any organized group. Without this, the cover up and muddle up tends to work as planned – engineered ignorance is almost guaranteed. The only way around this, for the moment, is for each and every one of us to do the sorting ourselves. Clearly, there is a lot riding on this issue – perhaps as much as the very survival of this planet - and all life on it.

Appendix – Correspondence with Dr. John Moffet

This took place through the OpEdNews messaging system (hence the limited header information). I take full responsibility for spelling Dr. John Moffet's last name incorrectly!

-----Original Message-----

From: Administrator [mailto:nobody@www.opednews.com]

Sent: 20 May 2008 15:19

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: OpEdNews Status of article by Andrew Johnson: New Study by former Professor Examines Hurricane Erin on 9/11/01

Sorry, but we're going to pass on this article.

You submitted an article titled:

New Study by former Professor Examines Hurricane Erin on 9/11/01

This article was submitted with category Life_Arts_Science and tags Energy, Energy, Engineering, Fraud, Hurricane-Toronado, Trade

Op Ed News Administrator

P.S. Dear Andrew,

Thank you for submitting your article "New Study by former Professor Examines Hurricane Erin on 9/11/01" to OEN.

Dr. Judy Wood provides no evidence for her theories, and as such, they can't be taken seriously by scientist, like myself. Spreading her nonsense does not help the 9/11 truth movement, it hurts it, as I have written before.

Her poorly reasoned articles are found on her own website, and do not need to be re-posted elsewhere.

Best regards,

John Moffett, Ph.D.

OEN managing editor

Your Original Submission is attached to this email

Please do NOT reply to this email; no one will see it.

If you'd like to reply to the editor, you may click the following link

to enter a message for the editor:

<http://www.opednews.com/Messages/Anon1778-5408>

=====

Dear Mr Moffat,

I don't think you have examined the evidence posted. I'm sorry, I can't take you seriously as a scientist if you refuse to examine evidence. As you should be aware some of this evidence has been taken to court.

I suggest you read my OpEdNews diary entry about ignoring evidence. I think it is very widely applicable.

<http://www.opednews.com/maxwrite/diarypage.php?did=7429>

Your statement that "Dr. Judy Wood provides no evidence for her theories" is false backs up the conclusions of my article (now posted far and wide). Firstly, she has provided more evidence than most if not all other researchers in her STUDIES. She has not quoted a particular "theory" - she discusses evidence. The press release also discusses evidence, and a clear distinction is made within it.

You do truth no favours in ignoring evidence. Good luck in your continued ignoring of evidence. As you are probably aware, NIST's contractors are now being sued for ignoring evidence - and lots of it.

Finally, our press release has also gone far and wide - no thanks to you.

Yours Sincerely

Andrew Johnson

BSc in Computer Science and Physics

<http://www.checktheevidence.com/cms/>

----- Original Message -----

From: Andrew Johnson

To: John R Moffett

Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2008 10:07:36 AM

Dear Andrew,

I am a well published scientist, with over 45 peer-reviewed journals articles that I have authored. Dr. Wood has none. Sorry to inform you of that. What are her credentials? Ex teacher?

Dr. Wood does not follow any of the basic tenets of science, such as performing experiments, and collecting and analyzing data. Where are her graphs and tables of data?

She is not a scientist, she is a crackpot.

I have read Dr. Woods web pages, and they are disorganized, rambling and lack any semblance of scientific data.

Please let me know what this evidence is you speak of.

Dr. Wood only posts photographs taken by others in lieu of actual data. What studies has she done? Looking at photos is not doing experiments. Why hasn't she analyzed the "dust" she speaks of by mass spectroscopy or other analytical techniques? Because it would just turn out to be regular dust, that's why.

Fuzzy blobs? Alka Seltzer? You've got to be kidding. Do you know of a single scientific study that merely posts someone else's photographs, and calls that data?

Please don't insult me by suggesting that I don't know what I am talking about. I do. There are no such things as DEW which can disintegrate buildings, and you know it. That is from science fiction movies. You know, those things are called "fiction" for a good reason.

Dr. Wood's so-called "evidence" has not gone anywhere in court, and you know that as well. It is not evidence. Are you a scientist? What is the definition of "scientific evidence" that you are operating under?

Sincerely,

John Moffett

OEN managing editor.

Dear Dr. Moffat,

I don't know if the 1st version of this message got sent as the browser didn't respond properly after clicking "Send", so here is another version.

I guess by your speed of response you read my article, and Dr. Wood's study and checked all the evidence (NOAA Weather Data, Alaska magnetometer Data)? Any comments on this data?

Now I will briefly address some of your questions/comments:

> I am a well published scientist, with over 45 peer-reviewed journals articles that I have authored. Dr. Wood has none. Sorry to inform you of that. What are her credentials? Ex teacher?

See below.

> Dr. Wood does not follow any of the basic tenets of science, such as performing experiments, and collecting and analyzing data. Where are her graphs and tables of data?

False and False. She does collect data and has posted tables and graphs (see the latest Erin study for examples). If you can get SE Jones to release his dust sample, then perhaps we can perform an experiment on physical 9/11 evidence. She did perform an experiment with aluminium to refute the claims of SE Jones. Result? Well, you know the answer.

> She is not a scientist, she is a crackpot.

False. This not a comment based on EVIDENCE therefore it is unscientific and just plain rude. Provide a psychiatric or similar report before making such false and libellous statements.

> I have read Dr. Woods web pages, and they are disorganized, rambling and lack any semblance of scientific data.

More disparaging remarks - without actually highlighting ANY data which is incorrect.

> Please let me know what this evidence is you speak of.

How about steel turning to dust? How about empty basements? How about upside down cars? How about spontaneous car fires before the destruction of the buildings? Have you (a) an honest critique of this evidence (b) an explanation for it?

> Dr. Wood only posts photographs taken by others in lieu of actual data. What studies has she done? Looking at photos is not doing experiments. Why hasn't she analyzed the "dust" she speaks of by mass spectroscopy or other analytical techniques? Because it would just turn out to be regular dust, that's why.

See above - and also this statement is essentially false anyway - we both visited NYC on 17th Jan 2008 and Dr. Wood also visited in October last year. We have both posted photos of our own in this regard.

> Fuzzy blobs? Alka Seltzer? You've got to be kidding. Do you know of a single scientific study that merely posts someone else's photographs, and calls that data?

More disparaging remarks. The names are distinct from the data and she explained her reasons for using them. You ignore that too. How about studies of Astronomy - many of those use only photos taken by others. Are they "unscientific too"? So, another false statement here.

> Please don't insult me by suggesting that I don't know what I am talking about. I do. There are no such things as DEW which can disintegrate buildings, and you know it. That is from science fiction movies. You know, those things are called "fiction" for a good reason.

Yet another totally false statement. I did not suggest you don't know what you are talking about. I stated you ignored evidence (I actually think you do know what you are talking about, but are wilfully ignoring evidence, as indicated by your rudeness towards Dr. Wood). One activity is passive the other is active. But, your specialism is not in Directed Energy technology so how can you make accurate pronouncements based on no evidence? That's not science that's "truth by pronouncement" (just like they use to do in the church).

> Dr. Wood's so-called "evidence" has not gone anywhere in court, and you know that as well. It is not evidence. Are you a scientist? What is the definition of "scientific evidence" that you are operating under?

This statement is also essentially false. The Qui Tam case is in the SDNY and you know that - so why do you state otherwise? I am not a scientist, and I make no claims to be one. My background however is in a scientific discipline - software engineering, which involves collecting data, analysing it, drawing conclusions and solving difficult problems.

Very sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

Date Sent: 05/20/2008

Subject: Andrew

Message:

As I mentioned, I have been to Dr. Wood's website many times over the last several months, and have written an article about it. We have received many Dr. Wood stories, and as the science editor at OEN, it is my job to check out articles that claim to present scientific evidence.

I did not need to go back and look at her lack of evidence again.

Please send me one of Dr. Wood's peer-reviewed science papers (email to: john@factinista.org). I have searched high and low for them in places like PubMed, and have found nothing. I can only find articles on the internet that are not in science journals.

What is your definition of scientific evidence? That it leads to truth? That is not what science is about. It is about generating and testing hypotheses

about nature or events. But if you just make the hypothesis, and never test it, you are not doing science. You're just talking.

Science doesn't claim to provide the truth, it claims to make ever better assessments of reality, ourselves and the universe around us. Truth is for courts of law.

Best regards,

John M.

Sent 14 Jul 2008

Dr. Moffat,

I have only just got around to seeing this. Dr. Wood's papers are, to my knowledge, only accessible through journals with membership and as some of them are quite a few years old, they may not all be online. Dr. Wood compiled a list here:

http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJ_troll_challenge.html#judywood

She did not include other authors because she knows that they will be contacted by naysayers, such as Dr. Greg Jenkins and they will try to discredit her.

[Edit: That is the naysayers will harass her colleagues and try to discredit her to them.]

None of this detracts from the presence of Erin on 9/11, nor the Scientific Magnetometer data which you were happy to ignore, as I already mentioned. This is the main problem and issue that you have responsibility for so let's not digress onto other much less relevant issues.

Good luck

Andrew Johnson

UK

26. The Mysterious \$5000 Bet Sent to Andrew Johnson

08 May 2009

Some time ago, I had an e-mail exchange with someone and posted part of it on a web page here on this site.

For some reason, this person didn't seem happy with what they had written and asked me to remove it. I complied – as I didn't know enough about this person to decide what their motivation was.

Today, this same person contacted me again – and after a fairly normal exchange where this person followed the usual pattern of making disparaging remarks and ignoring evidence^{cclvi}, they seemed to be making a bet for \$5000! Wow! Was this another Ace Baker in the making?

The e-mail exchange is reproduced below. (Why did he respond again after I had said I would report him for spamming me?) H

Isn't it strange this person thinks I should trust him when:

- 1) He went back on his word (contacted me soon after saying “bye”).
- 2) He ignores evidence.
- 3) Offers me a bet of \$5000 (does he think I respond to those e-mails from Nigeria?!?)

Further Considerations/Analysis

This person starts off by saying:

.....
you seem like a nice man (I listened to a few of your interviews online)
.....

However, later he says:

.....
I submit that your 9/11 pursuits are really about exploiting a tragedy for your own personal gain (fame? money?)
.....

So, am I a nice person or not? The query makes me sound like a pretty amoral and nasty person. So why the switch in opinion? What changed

me from seeming nice into seeming amoral? What evidence is there that I am after “fame” or money? People looking here:

<http://tinyurl.com/911dvds>

see probably the cheapest DVDs on the internet. Do I have any links to any books I have published? [Note: this book is being sold at cost price.] Do I charge a lucrative fee for international talks? Are there any adverts on my website? People who know me understand if I give a talk, I request only a fee to cover expenses – and have actually spent thousands of pounds of my own money on attempting to deliver information to people, or I make it easily available. Am I famous? Well, not when I last checked...

The Similarity to the Ace Baker Challenge

At this point, it is worth mentioning the similarity of this “bet” to the Ace Baker challenge^{echvii}. This ploy can be effective at “sucking people in” if they don’t think clearly. Does the issue of evidence reduce to bets over money? Are court verdicts decided by a bet? How much betting is there in real scientific analysis?

Though some of us suggested John Hutchison not take up Ace Baker’s, he did actually do this and on Nov 1st 2008, he levitated a wrench ^{echviii}.

This person said:

Ace Baker....a complete ninny. No further comment necessary.

So why is this person adopting a similar tactic? Why is he behaving in a similar manner? People may wish to research the “stunt” which Ace Baker pulled on a radio show in early 2008

The only thing I did was to ask him to talk about evidence. Instead, he chose to reduce the issue to one of personalities and money.

Does this person think I can predict the outcome of the legal case? I am sure of the evidence, and what it indicates, but the implications of it will shred all of our current institutions reasons for existence. And in the case of John Hutchison, he could control the outcome of his experiment – because he knows how to set the equipment up, how to operate it etc. This is a much, much different scenario to gaining a criminal conviction. Indeed, the initial signs are heavily weighed against a successful outcome – for a start, only 4 or 5 legal cases related to 9/11 have been brought. Also, anyone who looks at the progress of Dr. Wood’s case so far is not

given a cause to have high hopes – the Judges ruling, in line with what is discussed here, simply ignored most of the evidence, misquoted things and made disparaging remarks. The ruling even included reference to the Moon Landings and the JFK assassination – which have little or nothing to do with the evidence discussed here (though questions can, of course be legitimately raised about those topics as well, once separate evidence is gathered and analysed).

A Reminder – The Evidence To Be Explained

As a summary, it is worth reminding ourselves that in all of this – whether Andrew Johnson is a good person, a bad person, confident or not confident of winning a bet (some of the reasons have already been touched on above), whether the bet is increased to \$10,000 or \$1 million, there is still the evidence to be explained. A list of questions to be answered and a set of accompanying photos has been posted by Dr. Judy Wood ^{cclix}.

Whether this person is part of an orchestrated campaign to remove the focus from this evidence, or whether they are just “doing their own thing” for their own reasons does not change the evidence which has to be explained.

The problem is that the general conclusions that Dr. Wood and I have placed "on the table" really are profound indeed – they are so profound, I would contend, that not only is it impossible for organised institutions to deal with them, many individuals will also be unable to deal with the consequences. This again means that the only alternative is to consider the evidence for oneself – and if you cannot agree with the conclusions outlined here and elsewhere, then you are not required to do anything. If you do agree, then perhaps you will see a world of opportunity – as I tried to illustrate here^{cclv}, and can therefore decide on your own way forwards.

E-mails

The anonymised e-mail exchange is posted below. I leave you to draw your own conclusions.

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 08 May 2009 19:40

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Re: Active Thermitic materials

Hi Andrew,

Just visited your website today to look at your response to Steven Jones anti-thermitic paper. You haven't yet added that the chief editor of the OCP Journal resigned recently. You may also be interested to know that a special thread has been started at JREF looking at the paper. There is some excellent analysis there. (title: New Thread to Discuss The Excellent Analysis of Jones latest paper)

'Professor Marie-Paule Pileni has resigned as editor-in-chief of the Open Chemical Physics Journal over the publication of the Niels Harrit et al paper, Active Thermitic Material Discovered in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe, which she says she was unaware of'

btw, I noticed that your current efforts are getting so little traction that there isn't even a current thread at JREF regarding the silly Hutchison pseudo-science and Judy Wood.

Andrew, you seem like a nice man (I listened to a few of your interviews online) but you're utterly wasting your time with this 9/11 conspiracy crap IMHO. Looks like you guys may have a chance to latch onto John Hutchison's Hollywood career and make some money though - his 'back to the future' science experiments are perfect for TV, I think. John is a very smooth talker, very engaging - I'm sure he has you quite convinced.

Have you ever visited his lab? I live quite close to him, since i live in downtown Vancouver and he's in New Westminster. Strange huh?

BTW I spent a fair amount of time looking at the substance of Dr. Wood's 9/11 claims, in case it would be worthwhile to rebut some of them. My conclusion is that it isn't even worth rebutting, most of it is so amateurish and idiotic. Forgive me for the scorn, but you guys bring it on yourselves.

Y'know, if you guys were just exploring the possibilities of 'free energy' without the baggage of 9/11 conspiracy, it would actually be kind of cool. I suspect 9/11 is a convenient and seductive subject to latch onto, to get attention from, in a kind of vampirical way, but I predict that you and Dr. Wood will fail in the quest to prove anything, since what you are currently proposing is exceedingly unlikely to be true.

I also predict you guys will steadily refocus on general pseudo-science, especially free energy stuff, since there's a decent market to exploit. That actually makes sense to me. But solve the mysteries of 9/11? Nope. You guys are barking up the wrong tree, big time.

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 08 May 2009 20:04

To: Truthers

Subject: RE: Active Thermitic materials

I know about the JREF thread and the resignation.

Andrew, you seem like a nice man (I listened to a few of your interviews online) but you're utterly wasting your time with this 9/11 conspiracy crap IMHO.

OK - so who did 9/11? Do you care? Al Qaida? Bush? It doesn't bother you?

What's your explanation for the evidence?

Looks like you guys may have a chance to latch onto John Hutchison's Hollywood career and make some money though - his 'back to the future' science experiments are perfect for TV, I think. John is a very smooth talker, very engaging - I'm sure he has you quite convinced.

Have you ever visited his lab? I live quite close to him, since i live in downtown Vancouver and he's in New Westminster. Strange huh?

BTW I spent a fair amount of time looking at the substance of Dr. Wood's 9/11 claims, in case it would be worthwhile to rebut some of them. My conclusion is that it isn't even worth rebutting, most of it is so amateurish and idiotic. Forgive me for the scorn, but you guys bring it on yourselves.

Thanks for proving me right again!!

<http://www.opednews.com/populum/diarypage.php?did=12917>

No discussion evidence, just disparaging remarks! I can add your e-mail to my archive of "rude anonymous (or semi-anonymous evidence ignorers)".

Why are you wasting your time writing to me? What do you want from life? You want to maintain the corrupt system we live in - or do you want something different? In either case, there's little point in writing to me with sorts of remarks you are making

Goodbye and good luck - I'll feel sorry for you tonight.

ADJ

-----Original Message-----

From: On Behalf Of Truthers
Sent: 08 May 2009 20:11
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: Active Thermitic materials

I should add that I'm sure we agree on a few basic things:

Jim Fetzer has to be one of the most scholarly idiots on the airwaves today - truly breathtaking in his rapidfire delivery of nonsense.

Steven Jones is clearly desperate to prove something which never happened, and probably never could happen.

Ace Baker....a complete ninny. No further comment necessary.

etc etc.. the 'leadership' of 9/11 'truth'.

It's a pretty sad spectacle, Andrew, overall. I hope you disengage from it asap. At the very least you could credit yourself with ceasing to exploit the deaths of 3000 innocent people for personal gain. That's worth a lot in itself.

It occurs to me that if you and Dr. Wood really WERE onto something big (regarding 9/11 vast conspiracies with the military/industrial complex), you'd both be dead by now.

Perhaps you would disagree, but then you guys have a special talent for coming to wrong conclusions. I don't share that gift apparently.

best

-----Original Message-----

From: On Behalf Of Truthers
Sent: 08 May 2009 20:31
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: Active Thermitic materials

Hi Andrew,

It's 12pm or so in Vancouver. You needn't feel sorry for me. I have a good career as a musician and composer, and just last night performed Salome to a sold-out house.

There's no need to interpret my comments at all. I speak as plainly as I can, as unambiguously as possible.

Honestly, the poor quality and general incompetence of Dr. Wood's analysis precludes me wanting to dissect it point for point. I'm not interested in wasting the time, when 1) I doubt you'd be able to perceive it correctly 2) very few people seem to care what Dr. Wood thinks, so it's not very important.

The main reason I wrote was because

a) I happened to notice there were no recent threads on JREF regarding Judy Wood

b) I think it's hilarious that you and Dr. Wood have splintered off from the other raving lunatics of 9/11 truth to pursue your own separate insane quest.

c) I think you guys are true idiots. You constantly seek to bring attention to yourselves by spouting pseudo-scientific nonsense, then wonder why people like me respond.....hmmm.

It was a mere accident that we first corresponded a while back. I didn't even know what your site was really about when I requested that you link to some of my videos. I recall that, instead of simply saying 'yes' or 'no', you replied with some convoluted set of conditions before you'd do it. I think you wanted me to answer a whole bunch of questions (and hinted that there would be more following) before you'd do it.

So you actually invited me to engage in discussion. You seem to have completely forgotten that you brought this upon yourself. Incidentally, it wouldn't surprise me at all if you have a habit of doing things like this - you likely have some cognitive dysfunction in order to be involved in the things you are.

Remember, if you can, that my initial protest was that I never agreed to discuss Dr. Judy Wood's research. That was something you tried to impose on me. I merely stated that I thought she was a nutcase or a nutbar, something like that. That's my honest opinion. Nothing I've read or heard from her or you subsequently has significantly altered my

opinion, and in fact your current obsession with the Hutchison effect only adds to my healthy skepticism.

So, for the record, I think that Dr. Wood is basically incompetent. I'm not going to write a paper about it. I'm not even going to bother making a video about it. I have better things to do.

bye

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 08 May 2009 21:15

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Challenge

OK Andrew,

I just had an idea, thought I'd run it by you. You seem convinced that some shadowy government conspiracy used DEW to destroy the WTC buildings. Yes?

You seem to believe that you're actually going to accomplish something (god knows what) thru your activities. Yes?

You know I think you guys are acting like a couple of twits going nowhere fast. Yes?

Ok, here's the challenge. You have your 'evidence' and I have my skepticism. I'd be willing to put \$5000.00 in trust if you'll do the same, on a simple wager: If you and Dr. Wood can come up with a criminal conviction in a US court of law (probably supreme court) of a government agent or agency for using some kind of 'molecular dissociation' beam weapon to bring down or damage ALL the WTC buildings, turn cars and other vehicles upside down and whatever other bizarre and novel effects you claim, within, say 3 to 5 years from the start of the challenge - then you can have my 5K. If you can't do it, I get your 5K.

We could modify the wording as mutually agreed. Let's see who the real idiots are, Andrew. You or me? I'm not worried about losing a fair wager since I know you guys don't have, and never will have, the kind of evidence that could produce a conviction in a US criminal court.

In other words, you've got nothing but some cheap talk and pseudo-science, and you never will. Put your money where your mouth is if you dare. I don't think you have the balls to do it, frankly.

Put this up on your website if you want, let your readers see that I've made the challenge. I submit that your 9/11 pursuits are really about exploiting a tragedy for your own personal gain (fame? money?) and are not about getting justice for anybody.

I'll make some quick predictions now:

- 1) you will either not respond to the challenge, or you will not accept a challenge along the lines I have proposed
- 2) you will find excuse after excuse for avoiding the challenge, perhaps imposing some impossible condition which I can't accept.
- 3) you will instead choose to return to your current modus, feeding on the fringe of science, making vague pseudo-scientific claims but taking little responsibility for them, and appearing on conspiracy talk radio shows. In other words, little more than building some kind of career in fringe science.
- 4) your 9/11 work will never result in the criminal conviction of any alleged government agents or agencies for destroying the WTC towers and other buildings

Think it over. I could use an extra 5K so I hope you will take the challenge.

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 08 May 2009 22:08

To: Truthers

Subject: RE: Challenge

Summary of your last three messages:

- 1) Going back on what you said (i.e. "bye")
- 2) Offering money in a bet (just like Ace Baker did to John Hutchison).
- 3) Being rude and disparaging whilst discussing no points of evidence.

Please stop e-mailing me now - persistent further messages to me will be reported to Google mail as spam abuse.

Thanks.

Andrew

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 08 May 2009 23:09

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Re: Challenge

Andrew,

Like I said, you're putting yourself out there as some kind of legitimate inquiry - 'check the evidence'.

I offer a simple challenge to let you show your confidence, and you're threatening to complain to google? Yikes! You're much weaker than I expected. I have to admit, I hadn't predicted that response. I figured you'd be too chicken to take up a financial challenge, so in that regard at least one of my predictions has already been proved correct. Thanks for confirming this so quickly.

I'll be sure to report your response to others online, so they can see how totally gutless you people are, and how you are parasitically feeding off a real tragedy to make careers for yourselves.

As the saying goes, if you can't take the heat.....

best regards

-----Original Message-----

From: On Behalf Of Truthers

Sent: 08 May 2009 23:42

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Man to man talk? Or too strong for you?

I just read thru the page you have on 'Why can't people mention 9/11, Hurricane Erim, The Hutchison Effect and Free Energy and/or Dr. Judy Wood in the same post or paragraph without making rude or disparaging remarks' etc.. which you linked me to.

I read your correspondence with Dr. John Moffet. I think you are validating the age-old observations of the difference between a wise man and a fool; I believe your cognitive dissonance stems from the conflict of

trying to adhere to good science while believing in 9/11 conspiracy theories. The two things are not compatible - good scientists, wise people, long ago abandoned the very same lines of thinking that you and Dr. Wood now employ.

If you can't stand the harsh language, just try to imagine how we feel about people like you. Just try, if you can, to imagine how offensive your constant propaganda efforts are to knowledgeable people. I doubt you can, otherwise you'd stop your activities in shame - but apparently you feel no shame. That is a grave error on your part, sir.

If my opinion is too strong for you, i'm sorry. If you must complain to google, because you've published reams of materials, yet cannot accept the judgements of those who disagree, then so be it. It is your failure, then, not mine. I will start a thread at JREF on this subject shortly where you will be free to discuss your ingenious theories with anyone you care to, but where you do not have veto power. A more even playing field, so to speak.

Meanwhile,

I am still here, still willing to stand by what I say, and put my money where my mouth is. Unfortunately the same cannot be said for your character. Apparently.

Therein lies the difference between us.

I won't send anything else to you for now unless in reply to another email from you. I wish you godspeed in your quest to bring your fantasy perpetrators to justice; may you have the results you deserve.

-----Original Message-----

From: On Behalf Of Truthers

Sent: 09 May 2009 00:30

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Re your link to this correspondence

Hi Andrew,

I wasn't going to write anything else to you, but then saw you have now put a link up with a few of the emails we've exchanged today. That's great. Seeing as you have done so, I am now responding, in the hopes

you will include this email as well - you have made some public statements which are incorrect or false, that need addressing.

Hopefully your readers will encourage you to take up my offer. Try not to confuse this with Ace Baker's activities if you're able.

I'll restate the offer for clarity:

'You have your 'evidence' and I have my skepticism. I'd be willing to put \$5000.00 in trust if you'll do the same, on a simple wager: If you and Dr. Wood can come up with a criminal conviction in a US court of law (probably supreme court) of a government agent or agency for using some kind of 'molecular dissociation' beam weapon to bring down or damage ALL the WTC buildings, turn cars and other vehicles upside down and whatever other bizarre and novel effects you claim, within, say 3 to 5 years from the start of the challenge - then you can have my 5K. If you can't do it, I get your 5K.'

We can discuss the details. If you guys think you're up for it we can set it up through an attorney anytime.

Again, I'm not here to argue your 'evidence' or whatever it is you think you've found. I'm here to challenge you to do something concrete with your 'evidence' - take it to court and prove something with it, if you dare. It's not me you need to convince, it's 'the authorities' that you'll need on your side to win a case. I'm just demonstrating that you don't have a real case - a few round holes in glass and some 'toasted cars' aren't going to convict anybody of anything, and thus are virtually meaningless in terms of justice and truth, IMHO.

To your surprise that I wrote again after you threatened to complain to google, I say 'so what?' So I don't show much respect for you? Big deal. You're not much different from what I can see. Now that you've published some of our correspondence, I think you've demonstrated that you have accepted it, and are now using it for your own purposes. What's to complain about? You've now got some more material, some recognition, perhaps even a bit more notoriety.

Finally, as far as your incorrect (false) claim, now made in public, that 'He went back on his word (contacted me soon after saying "bye")', perhaps you do not understand how letters or emails work. Let me explain it to you: one writes an email, then signs off 'ciao' 'regards' 'bye' etc.... There is no explicit or implicit declaration that one is not going to

write another email following the last one. And none was made in my email.

You have apparently read into the word 'bye' something that wasn't there in the first place. Your mistake. Don't make the further mistake of defending the first mistake.

best regards and bye (again!)

-----Original Message-----

From: On Behalf Of Truthers

Sent: 09 May 2009 17:18

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Re: Challenge

Hi Andrew,

Thank you for posting the follow-up emails. I would like to respond to some of your comments.

1) you have not corrected the false claim that I somehow went back on my word. Nor have you posted the email where I challenge that false statement.

2) You claim I ignore evidence, but you have no evidence yourself to demonstrate this. I choose not to comment on Dr. Wood's findings in detail. That does not mean that I have ignored the findings, does it? You seem to leap to conclusions very rapidly (at near freefall speed....that's a joke btw)

3) I have offered to put some of my own money on the line, under MUTUALLY AGREED UPON conditions, to test your outlandish claims. You of course are going to find any excuse not to do this.

4) Are you a nice person? I wrote 'you SEEM like a nice person' that is you appear to be, in your manner. But does that mean you are above a moral or intellectual weakness? No, it doesn't. You are demonstrating, even in our limited correspondence, an ability to misinterpret simple statements, to play word games and to exploit the exchange for your own purposes.

You tell me what kind of character that suggests. Perhaps I was in error by making my initial observation. I am learning more about you as time goes on.

5) I suggested you seem to be motivated by personal gain (because I'm speculating) fame?/money? as possibilities. You have focused on money and ignored fame (notoriety?). But you are clearly an attention-seeking individual. Perhaps this is your main motivation for exploiting the tragedy of 9/11.

6) I would prefer not to get dragged into the thicket of nonsense you inhabit, but referring as you did to Ace Baker and his proposal (I was only vaguely familiar with this info, btw), you wrote 'Though some of us suggested John Hutchison not take up Ace Baker's, he did actually do this and on Nov 1st 2008, he levitated a wrench.'

OK. Let me just correct you on this: Unless you were personally there on Nov 01, 2008 to witness the levitation, you are not factually correct to claim he actually DID levitate it. If you are using yet another crappy, amateurish video as evidence, then god help you, Andrew. The video you link to is inexcusably poor evidence - there is no pretense of a neutral third party observing and documenting the event, and the camera quality is pathetic (the camera appears to be dangling and moving).

This does not rise to the level of serious scientific proof at all. You should be aware of this, but apparently don't give a damn. Shame on you.

7) My conclusion thus far is that you're diverting further and further away from addressing my challenge, by introducing irrelevant footage of John Hutchison, and trying to imply that this is some kind of ploy. You are avoiding the challenge by use of word games, Andrew.

My challenge is simple and clear. It is based on mutually agreed conditions. That means you would have to agree to the conditions. If you feel mentally incapable of understanding such conditions, perhaps you should decline for reasons of incompetence. Don't blame me for something I haven't done, though, please. That is pure intellectual dishonesty. This is not a trick - it is a man-to-man challenge. Your word, your claims against a legitimate court system to evaluate them, and a wager on the outcome.

Your persecution complex is showing, dude. Maybe you're not the man you thought you were.

best

ps I noticed that you have now removed the google-spam comment. How convenient that you can edit your remarks - they just went poof! molecular dissociation? Absolutely!

-----Original Message-----

From:

Sent: 09 May 2009 19:52

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: A road leading nowhere?

Dear Andrew,

I think this current exchange has gone far enough, I have carefully read your last remarks concerning a possible legal actions arising from the evidence you are so sure of. I will quote you, then summarize my POV on your antics:

'Does this person think I can predict the outcome of the legal case? Apparently you are not at all confident that you have a good legal case. I think we've established that now. Perhaps it shows your evidence is not nearly as good as you would hope. You might want to reconsider the convictions you hold, if you are a wise person.

I am sure of the evidence, and what it indicates, but the implications of it will shred all of our current institutions reasons for existence. This is a bizarre and apocalyptic viewpoint, fairly typical for a paranoid conspiracy cultist.

Indeed, the initial signs are heavily weighed against a successful outcome – for a start, only 4 or 5 legal cases related to 9/11 have been brought. Also, anyone who looks at the progress of Dr. Wood's case so far is not given a cause to have high hopes (perhaps this is an indication that the cases are too weak!) – the Judges ruling, in line with what is discussed here, simply ignored most of the evidence, misquoted things and made disparaging remarks. I read through some of the legal remarks made in the motion to dismiss the case presented by Dr. Wood and Morgan Reynolds. Interested readers can find the document here: <http://reynoldslitigation.googlepages.com/100Judgment-Dismissedwithprejudice.pdf>

I would respectfully disagree with Andrew's misrepresentation of the ruling. The problem, Andrew, is that it is one thing to bamboozle casual observers with DEW/Hutchison pseudoscience. It is quite another to establish REAL, SOLID evidence which can be used in a criminal

case.....you know, which would actually be able to accomplish something concrete.

This is something you appear to be partially aware of, but unable to correctly perceive. The fact that your convictions are based on very shoddy science is not trivial - it is fatal to their veracity.

Since you've already convinced yourselves that your claims are true, you have nowhere to retreat but to a fantasyland of persecution complexes, grandiose thinking and desperate measures to salvage your self esteem. These antics do not lead to truth, Andrew. The 'system' is not conspiring against you and Dr. Wood, it is responding largely in a healthy way, mainly:

- 1) by ignoring your silly claims
- 2) heaping scorn on same foolishness
- 3) providing legal smackdowns when necessary

The sad thing about fools is that they don't know they're fools. They can't recognize their own shortcomings, they can't recognize wisdom. Rejected by wise minds, they surround themselves with the opposite - good science becomes their foe, and pseudoscience their friend. Your actions and beliefs are self-defeating. The best you can do is continue to rail at the 'system' for something it didn't do, and be laughed at by serious thinkers. That's the path you've chosen, Andrew. You aren't even strong enough to meet a simple \$5000.00 challenge - now THAT is weak. So much for you and your evidence - it's almost worthless, as you've demonstrated.

best regards,

27. Press Release - 9/11 *Qui Tam* Case Will Have Its Day in Court

23rd June 2009 – Manhattan, New York – The *Qui Tam* Case of Dr. Judy Wood - Docket Number 08-3799-cv), DC Docket Number: 07-cv-3314 is to have an Oral Hearing.

In 2005, a number of reports were issued by NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) which were the result of a study, mandated by congress, to "Determine why and how WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed ...". In April 2007, Dr. Wood, with the help of a Connecticut Attorney Jerry Leaphart, lodged a "*Qui Tam*" complaint against some of the contractors employed by NIST. This complaint followed an earlier "Request For Correction" (RFC) with regard to the same NIST WTC reports, establishing her as the first to address the fact that this report did not even contain an analysis of the collapse of the WTC towers. Dr. Wood's original RFC defined how NCSTAR1 is "fraudulent and deceptive" because it does not address the profound level of destruction of the WTC towers that seemed to violate the laws of physics. NIST denied Dr. Wood's RFC, admitting they did not analyze the collapse. That is, the spokesperson for NIST admitted that they did not fulfil the mandate by congress. (The title of the report is "NIST NCSTAR 1 – Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers," yet they did not analyze the "collapse" or even determine if it actually did collapse.) Dr. Wood's subsequent appeal to NIST was also denied, though the *Qui Tam* case - against some of the contractors that NIST employed - went forward.

In the original RFC, Dr. Wood stated that "NIST cannot make a statement that the World Trade Center towers came down in 'free fall' on one hand", and then say "that doing so is a form of collapse." Wood also stated that "Use of the descriptive word 'collapse'" is incorrect and points out that according to NIST's own data, their explanation of how the towers were "dustified" does not satisfy the laws of Physics. Dr. Wood uses the word "dustify" because she has identified a new phenomenon where the building was turned to dust - it was not vaporised by high heat nor was it smashed by kinetic energy. She concludes from her study, that a new type of Directed Energy Weapon was used to destroy most of the WTC buildings. This weapon appears to utilise "field effects" in its operation and so is fundamentally different to known types of directed energy weapons such as lasers and masers. Contrary to what Dr Wood's critics say, her *Qui Tam* submissions do not discuss the use of "ray beams from space", but they focus on a number of pieces of evidence which

indicate the presence of field effects in and around the WTC complex on 9/11.

Dr. Wood also points out that Applied Research Associates (ARA) – one of the defendants in the Qui Tam action - were one of the contractors for the NCSTAR reports and that they are a significant developer and manufacturer of Directed Energy Weapons and/or components of same. This therefore would be one example of where there was a “conflict of interest” in producing a truthful report.

Dr. Wood’s Qui Tam documents include a study of additional evidence to illustrate that NIST’s contractors exhibited “wilful blindness” when they produced their part of the NCSTAR reports. For example, the contractors’ own explanations did not address the fact that much of the steel in the towers turned to dust before it reached the ground. Dr. Wood’s submissions include a study of some of the effects seen in the aftermath of the WTC destruction (anomalous dust effects, anomalous rusting) and anomalous effects seen on some of the surviving WTC steel girders, pictures of which were included in the original NIST reports. The girders are bent and deformed in unusual ways – and because the towers turned to dust, the effects on the girders cannot be explained as being caused by a “gravity-driven collapse”. In Dr. Wood’s submission, certain effects on metals and on objects near the WTC are also considered – such as inverted or flipped cars, and cars which are “toasted” – but show damage inconsistent with a hot fire. Dr. Wood’s later research has also documented the presence of Hurricane Erin, which was closest to NYC at about 8am on 9/11.

Though Judge George Daniels initially dismissed Dr. Wood’s case in June 2008, his ruling did not address the evidence that Dr. Wood’s Qui Tam case was based on. A decision was therefore made to lodge an appeal and another round of submissions took place. This appeal is now scheduled for oral argument on 23rd June 2009, in the Ceremonial Courtroom (9th Floor), Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse, 500 Pearl Street, Manhattan, New York City, and is open to attendance by the general public.

For more information: Jerry Leaphart, Jerry V. Leaphart & Assoc., P.C. 8 West Street, Suite 203 Danbury, CT 06810 phone - (203) 825-6265 , fax – (203) 825-6256, e-mail: jsleaphart@cs.com

Dr. Judy Wood/Qui Tam Case:

http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.shtml

NIST’s filings of the RFC’s and responses can be found at:

http://www.ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002_619

28. Manufacturing The Apocalypse

June 2008

For at least two millennia a number of religions have, in various ways, and to somewhat varying degrees, been predicting that there will a great cataclysm or great cataclysms which will befall mankind, planet Earth or both. This idea seems now to be being framed in more secular ways, through the mantras of “Global Warming”, “Climate Change”, resource depletion and the threat of “Nuclear International Terrorism” or a renewed threat of global nuclear warfare, bio-terrorism or widespread disease such as “avian flu” (which has seemingly existed for hundreds of years, but has never been a significant threat to humans). In some quarters, even the threat of an alien intervention or alien contact (which the evidence suggests has been ongoing for some time) is being mooted as yet another reason for global upheaval or catastrophe.

In order to find the truth of something, or if we wish to try and predict the future (which I don't intend to do in this article), we should spend as much time as we can gathering information and examining pertinent evidence, before deciding on some conclusions. I have been attempting to collect information and evidence for over 5 years, ever since I “opened the door” to the seemingly limitless information resources available to all those with an “always-on” internet connection. I have tried to venture into many areas and have posted some of my thoughts and conclusions at <http://www.checktheevidence.com/> - along with the thoughts of a few other people.

Recently, I have begun to see that a number of fields of research are now “crossing over”. I would contend that there is mounting evidence that a large-scale, secret, global operation has been underway for some time which, in summary gives the “control group” the ability to “manufacture the apocalypse”. I would cogently argue that the supposed threats our species faces, listed above, are either manufactured by this control group, or are exacerbated by them from their “naturally occurring form”. I say this partly because I conclude that the research of Dr. Judy Wood into the destruction of the WTC Complex^{xl} proves that advanced, undisclosed weaponry exists. some of the effects of this weaponry are similar to those seen in experiments performed by John Hutchison^{lxxxix}, but the full capabilities of this technology are, to a lay person like me, unknown. However, I now have to ask myself some difficult questions, related to the limits of this technology.

Dr. Wood's latest study, regarding Hurricane Erin and 9/11 has uncovered some important data – which seems to add even more weight to the conclusion that some type of “field effect” energy technology was used to destroy the WTC complex. What else is this technology capable of?

More than one or two people have posited that the May 2008 earthquake in Sichuan, China was somehow engineered. Does technology exist that could induce earthquakes? Some people wouldn't even bother to ask this question. However, let's consider what Defence Secretary Cohen said in 1997 ^{cclx}:

"Others [terrorists] are engaging even in an eco-type of terrorism whereby they can alter the climate, set off earthquakes, volcanoes remotely through the use of electromagnetic waves... So there are plenty of ingenious minds out there that are at work finding ways in which they can wreak terror upon other nations...It's real, and that's the reason why we have to intensify our [counterterrorism] efforts."

This speech was made before the Al Qaida myth had been fully cemented into the wider public's consciousness – before the illusion of large-scale international terrorism had been created. What terrorists was Cohen referring to? The Russians? Why didn't he name this apparently very powerful group? My own personal view is that he was referring to the terrorists who are already running the world. The terrorists who have access to advanced technologies and who have the ability and resources to keep knowledge of these technologies mostly hidden. These are very probably the same terrorists who turned most of the WTC towers to dust on 9/11/01.

It seems that we can occasionally get disclosure of various information about these secret technologies, for example in the statements of people like Col Tom Bearden ^{cclxi}.

We can examine the data provided by Stan Deyo which appears to show an "earthquake grid" in Nevada^{cclxii}.

Deyo highlights an unusual pattern of earthquakes that was seen in Reno^{cclxiii}.

Some time ago, I was taken aback to learn that the earthquakes in Bam (Iran) and the Sumatra quake happened a year to the hour apart. It was on 26 December 2003, at 01:57 hrs UT, when an earthquake struck the city of Bam ^{cclxiv}, On 26 December 2004, 00:58 UT, the Sumatra Earthquake struck ^{cclxv}. Clearly, these facts on their own prove nothing – but if it were

easy to prove what is being suggested here, then the powerful forces who are controlling things would not be able to hide their activities.

In the case of the Sumatra quake and resulting Tsunami, there are also a number of questions as to why warnings were not promulgated widely enough.

As regards the China earthquake, we have video and photos of unusual cloud patterns which were filmed immediately prior to the quake^{cclxvi}, as pointed out by Benjamin Fulford^{cclxvii}

We also have a satellite photo showing what I consider to be a very unusual cloud pattern spreading across the region near the time of the quake^{cclxviii}

Some people have suggested that the US's HAARP facility^{cclxix} could be involved in the inducement either of earthquakes or weather patterns. I am unsure, as I don't currently know if it is possible to obtain HAARP activity data that could be correlated with the time of the Sichuan earthquake (or any other). It would seem rather too obvious, however, that HAARP was involved in creating such large scale events. So, it is either not involved (too many people likely know about it) or the data regarding its daily operation will be classified or not available for public inspection.

In considering if it is possible to use directed energy technology in weather modification (which would involve manipulating quite large amounts of energy), as mentioned above, attention should be drawn to Dr. Judy Wood's latest study - of Hurricane Erin on 9/11. Erin was closest to NYC on 9/11 but was barely reported - even by Space Shuttle crew who reported seeing the "smoke" from the WTC towers. I feel that Hurricane Erin may have been used in some way in manipulating the energy involved. Additionally, I suggest that whoever did 9/11 needed clear blue skies to see what was going on, on that day. Manipulation of Erin could have provided them^{cclxx}. Please pay special attention to the magnetometer data from 9/11.

Additional evidence of weather modification on other occasions can also be taken into account^{cclxxi}.

Once you have reviewed the evidence, you may agree that advanced weather modification technology is real. Some people, such as Col Tom Bearden and Scott Stevens, believe that this technology is being used in a secret "weather war" between Russia and the USA. Even though it is true that operations like "Operation Popeye^{cclxxii}" were used to induce heavy rainfall in the Vietnam War, I do not believe that the current evidence supports the "USA vs. Russia" Weather War conclusion. I say this

because severe weather events and earthquakes seem to have been triggered more frequently in recent years in the USA, the UK, Europe, China and Japan. This pattern therefore suggests that a trans-national secret group is at work. This general conclusion is also supported by the existence of the global chemtrailing programme. Chemtrails have now been documented in many countries around the world^{ccclxxiii}

One further feeling I have is that this trans-national group knows human psychology very well and they know how to get people to acquiesce by adequately disguising their advanced capabilities – this again is proven by the fact that it has taken 5 or arguably 7 years for someone to begin to “get a handle” on what their technology can do even when it has been used in plain site. The other main ways in which this advanced technology is hidden is using fear – which inhibits people’s intellectual capacity. Additionally, in many quarters, a “culture of ignorance” has been created. For example, in western popular culture, it is sometimes frowned upon when someone demonstrates a detailed technical understanding of a subject – in such instances, terms such as “nerd” and “geek” are not always used in a complimentary way.

I would also contend that a further way to induce acquiescence among the general population, far-fetched though it may sound, it to “write in” to ancient scripture, the idea of an apocalypse and then continually suggest that a cataclysm or several cataclysms will come about – for example, because it is “God’s way of punishing man for his sins”. From a more New Age perspective, this can be attributed to Gaia or “Mother Earth” - acting to self-correct the “imbalance” caused by human greed and folly. In saying this, I do not discount that consciousness could be an attribute which the earth itself possesses in some form – and that some people are able to interact with this consciousness in certain ways.

The preponderance of the evidence, once it is gathered, shows that free energy technology is real^{ccclxxiv} and, rather than being used to give us clean air and a clean way of fuelling our activities, it has been stolen, weaponised and used to both to destroy the environment and kill large numbers of people. Such environmental modification technology could perhaps be considered, therefore, to be a “silent weapon of a quiet war^{ccclxxv}”.

On the flip side of this issue, free energy technology has been perniciously suppressed^{ccclxxvi} and we have therefore been conned into destroying our own environment far more than greed and profit fuel industry, because we have not been allowed to know the reality of this technology. I very much wonder if this overall situation has been brought about by the persuasion and influence of a controlling group, the nature of which may not be all that dissimilar to what Marshal Vian Summers^{ccclxxvii} describes

(though I don't think of things in terms of "God" – so my vocabulary is different to his in this respect).

At the present time, I think only a few would people would agree with the thrust of what I am saying. Perhaps they would agree, as Dr. Leonard Horowitz^{cclxxviii} has suggested, that we are on the receiving end of the tactics of bio-spiritual warfare. I think that one of the main aims of this is to compress human consciousness into a tighter and tighter enclosure and discourage us from being open to a wider, or even universal perspective about who we really are, where we came from and where we are capable of going.

Other people, who have not seen the evidence like that referenced above have no chance of realising that we may be victims of an extremely sophisticated and far-reaching psychological operation – the manufacturing of an apocalypse.

29. A World of Abundance or a World of Scarcity

A Call to Awareness - A Time to Choose

Oct 2008

But we have a choice. And this choice is real. Live happily ever after or destroy the planet. This is why I have been pursuing the issues of 9/11. These issues are central to it all. 9/11 was a demonstration of free energy technology. It can be used for good, but we need to make that choice and help others to as well.

-- Dr. Judy Wood

Over the last 25 years, I have come to realise that the world is not as I thought it was. For me, the pace of realisation rapidly increased with advent of the Internet and was catalysed by the ability to do accelerated research and correspondence with people around the world.

I write this piece as a call to all readers, researchers and activists – particularly in the “alternative knowledge” community - to realise connections – and research a wider set of evidence than they might have done up to now. I say this because I strongly feel there is a great need to raise awareness of the choices we now have available to us. I have given the title “alternative knowledge” to all the types of topics that are rarely taught in schools, college or universities but nevertheless there is strong evidence to demonstrate the validity of this knowledge.

If we are to change our future, the first stage must be to realise – as fully as possible – the predicament we are now in. Whilst it is true that existing power structures and institutions will not acknowledge the truths discussed here (in any meaningful way), it is also true that the “alternative knowledge” community itself does not seem able, on the whole, to “deal with” some of the evidence which these truths can be deduced from.

I now feel that there is sufficient evidence “on the table” to state, with confidence, that parts of the alternative knowledge community are being “managed”, in subtle ways, so that the rate at which information flows - and connections are made - is slowed down, or that same flow is abruptly arrested or even reversed, in certain quarters. Seemingly, confusion and fear is injected at regular intervals and “in fighting” among various “factions” is deliberately started. This can prevent curious people from discovering the truth, as they are distracted from (or do not have time for) peering “through the clouds of confusion” that have been wafted around.

I have concluded elsewhere that one of the best ways to determine who is telling the truth is to focus on evidence – verifiable pictures, measurements, practical “real world” knowledge, volumes of publicly available witness testimony, data and video gathered even by oneself. Indeed, in science and in legal matters, this is (or should be) the way truth is established.

But what is the truth? What is my motivation for saying all this? In 2003, I became much more aware of black projects involving advanced technology, such as anti-gravity – discussed by people like Bob Lazar^{cclxxxix}, David Adair^{cclxxx}, John Hutchison^{cclxxxix}, Nick Cook^{cclxxxii} and many others. Not long after, I became aware that the official story of 9/11 was completely bogus and, later, that no hijackers or planes were involved in the events which caused the destruction at the WTC, The Pentagon and Shanksville. It still took me over 2 years more to realise there was a connection between black technology and 9/11. This connection was made for me by the research of Dr. Judy Wood^{lxxxix}. She has shown a large (and still growing) body of evidence that the World Trade Centre complex in New York was destroyed using some type of directed energy weapon (DEW). To those who consider this conclusion “outlandish” or “unsubstantiated”, I reference Dr. Wood’s legal challenges to NIST - in the form of a “Request for Correction” (RFC)^{cclxxxiii} and a “Qui Tam” case against NIST contractors^{cxviii}. In both of these, she includes the evidence that leads to the conclusion that an undisclosed type of energy weapon was indeed used to destroy the WTC complex.

Dr. Wood’s later research now strongly implicates a class of technology which operates on principles similar to those discovered by John Hutchison^{lxxxix}, whose experiments were investigated by a team from Los Alamos National Laboratories – headed by Col. John Alexander – in 1983^{clxxxii}.

Of similar significance, Dr. Wood discovered the unusual proximity of a Hurricane to New York City on 9/11/01^{cxliii}. Not only that, but the path the Hurricane took was very unusual^{cclxxxiv} – travelling in quite a straight line from Bermuda, North West, towards New York.

The importance of the evidence that Dr. Wood has uncovered, when put in context, cannot be overstated – it forms a nexus point – joining several areas of research and crystallizing an overall picture to a level of clarity never before realised. It exposes the operation of a global group – one that employs black technology to achieve its objectives.

Problems and Solutions

Over the last few years, there seems to have been a trend on the TV and Radio news bulletins to put out stories which instil fear, rather than explain, enlighten or provide information. We seem to be constantly reminded of various “threats” that face us, such as a terrorist attack, climate change, bio-warfare or virulent disease outbreak, fuel shortages or increased prices, food crisis and global economic collapse. One can perhaps be forgiven for suggesting that the control group is trying to “manufacture the apocalypse”^{celxxxv}. We also appear to be offered false or woefully inadequate solutions (such as increased security measures).

The latest “trick” seems to have seen a manufactured “credit crunch” debt crisis. This could even be viewed as an “economic 9/11” which has led to calls for a “more regulated” financial system and perhaps a global body to “manage” world financial interests. Yet we already know, if we look at the evidence, that the whole banking system is run by a few families such as the Rothschilds and the Rockefellers – they have started wars to make money. They engineered the last great depression, starting in 1929 (only 16 years after the creation of the federal reserve – the threat of which previous US Presidents had either warned of or acted against).

We are constantly reminded of the ongoing wars against “the Taliban” or unnamed “insurgents” in Iraq and, almost daily, hear reports of allied troops being killed in roadside bombings or other tragic incidents. We also hear of the “nuclear threat” posed by Iran, North Korea and now even Pakistan. Russia is angry over US missile defence plans – on and on...

However, when we learn what really happened on 9/11, and the evidence referenced above, our view, based on new evidence, of all these “threats” should be transformed because:

- 1) Some group has the technology that can turn 3 buildings to dust in 10 seconds or less each (and cause various anomalous damage to other buildings nearby).
- 2) It appears that some group can steer hurricanes and use their field as a component of a weapon.

So why are we “being fed” this nuclear threat? Why is it being implied that fossil fuel will become depleted and there will be wars over resources? Why are we being told that the money supply has now become “unstable” or that the banks need to be “bailed out”? Why are we told that the climate is such a threat to us (or that we are a threat to the climate...)?

Based on the evidence now available to anyone, I can say with confidence that these threats, without exception, are either exaggerated or manufactured. The realisation must now be that what happened on 9/11 proves that technology is available to remove or at least substantially mitigate all of these threats. So why are we not told this? Seemingly, because the “control group” understand that a wide knowledge of these things would destroy their power base.

For example, free energy is the main key to global control of the masses – all those people that live in organised cultures, fuelled primarily by oil – can be controlled by controlling their access to energy. So, people need to realise that free energy is real (not just some theory or science fiction fantasy). People like John Bedini know that “radiant energy” can be exploited^{cxlxxvi}, allowing us to (essentially) get “energy from nothing”. There are many other examples of effective technology. However, everyone also needs to be aware free energy technology has been weaponised - by a covert trans-national group that has no loyalty to individual countries. I would argue that this group also has orchestrated the conflicts between different regions, groups and countries over a long period of time, and that the nature of this group or even the idea of its very existence remains largely hidden. Many names are attached or given to this group, but I personally do not feel I can identify the group in anything more than vague terms, because I am not currently aware of specific evidence linking these various named groups (e.g. Illuminati, Bilderbergers, Zionists etc) to the technologies that we now have some fingerprints of.

It does seem that fear is required by this control group – not only to reduce or remove people’s abilities to think for themselves, and discourage them from exploring the evidence, but it also seems like someone is “feeding off” our fear, as people like David Icke have discussed in some presentations.

It seems that the goal of the control group is to keep “the masses” in ignorance and fear – to keep them “on the treadmill of life” – with a sufficient amount of their time filled so that they do not look for “the big picture”. For those that do have the time to look at evidence, it seems that a number of social mechanisms and psychological factors are in place to discourage them from venturing “out of the box”. So most people, at the current time, are confined (or even straight-jacketed) into a paradigm that assumes scarcity, war and continual conflict are the norm. “Realists” claim that those with the biggest armies and the most “open democracies” are most likely to win the wars and preserve their way of life – their “freedom”. They might say something like “In the end, it all comes down to military might and being able to defend yourself”. But again, realising

what happened on 9/11 calls this idea into question too – because some group has access to and has used advanced weapons technology – way beyond anything any “rogue nation” is supposed to have – and most people are still not aware of the reality of this sort of technology.

Organisations such as Amnesty International, CND, “Stop the War” have, of course, done some good work in promoting issues relating to peace, non-violence and the preservation of human rights. However, their track record in making public statements or offering analysis on any of the evidence discussed is, well, blank^{clxxx}. They will seemingly have none of it – are they fixated that the world’s injustices are purely the result of warlike tendencies of the super-powers? It seems, then, that members of these organisations are also “straight jacketed”, with the result that there is too much inertia in even the most progressive NGO’s (Non-Governmental Organisations) who pride themselves on being “pro-peace” and “defending human rights”. They assume the sorts of topics discussed are “outlandish conspiracy theories” proposed by dubious people, with no ability to examine evidence rationally – which is exactly how the control group want them to react, it would seem...

A Table of Assumed Realities and Available Realities

In the table below I summarise my interpretation of portions of the current “reality” which is thrust upon us by a combination of organisations. In the right-hand column, I present an alternative available reality – which can only “materialise”, once the true causes of the destruction on 9/11, and other disparate collections of evidence, are studied.

Mainstream View (Old Awareness)	Reality (New Awareness – based on new evidence)
Global Warming/Carbon Footprinting/Climate Change – an uncertain future.	Weather being controlled and manipulated, all planets changing. Chemtrailing in progress almost daily. ^{clxxxvii}
Acts of Terrorism Imminent – they are an ongoing threat.	False flag operations are the work of secret groups and sometimes use black technology ^{lxxxix}
9/11 was “inevitable” due to either the growth of religious fundamentalism, or the divide between “the haves and the have-nots”.	Black technology – using free energy – was used by a secret group to destroy the WTC ^{clxliii}
Fossil Fuels being depleted,	Free energy readily available and can

environmental destruction, increasing cost of resources - hence ultimately – inevitable wars over resources.

“Credit Crunch” will make life miserable for everyone

Cancer is an increasing problem that will affect more and more people and there is no cure. However, millions or even billions of pounds are spent on research each year, with various “Miracle drugs” being announced every so often. In the UK, it is illegal for anyone outside the medical profession to claim or offer a cure for cancer (Cancer act 1939)

Space Travel is limited by current technology – chemical rockets and relatively low power Ion Thrusters.

There may once have been liquid water on Mars (it has a red sky, as well as a red surface) and possible life – but only in bacterial or simple form.

No one in any highly organised, well-known group (say, one which funds regular media advertising or has regular mainstream media coverage) is talking seriously about any of the options (based on evidence) available in the right hand column. Discussion of the evidence listed is, therefore, mainly limited to a few books and websites and people regard it as a curiosity or “a possibility” – but not a reality. I think this situation illustrates that the control of knowledge has been successful. There is clearly a great deal missing from the right hand column too – such as the evidence and analysis which seems to show that aliens have been interacting with us^{ccxcviii} (clearly this also changes many conventional assumptions and beliefs). There is also strong evidence that our consciousness survives physical death^{ccxcix}. (See the books by Dr. Raymond Moody^{ccc} and Dr. Peter Fenwick^{ccci}.)

be used now. The Bedini motor, Tesla^{ccclxxxviii}

Fractional reserve banking system allowed the crunch to happen and it was engineered over a period of time, manipulating people into taking on larger amounts of debt.^{ccclxxxix}

There are number of cures for cancer which have been suppressed or even crushed out of existence – glyoxylyde^{ccxc}, krebiozen^{ccxci}, B17^{ccxcii}, essiac^{ccxciii}, The Hoxsey treatment^{ccxciv}, Rife Treatments^{ccxcv} etc.

Advanced Antigravity technology has already been developed in “black projects”^{ccxcvi}.

Mars has liquid water now. The available evidence shows advanced structures as well as fossils!^{ccxcvii}

Why Are People in the Alternative Knowledge Community Not Speaking Out?

It seems that even within the alternative knowledge community, fear of reprisals and/or fear of ridicule inhibits or prevents people from speaking the truth and discussing the most important information of all – about use of weather control and the use of advanced undisclosed free energy technology on 9/11. Many of them know that free energy technology is real – and that it works. They may also know that 9/11 was an “Inside Job”. However, they have either failed to make or actively avoid making the connection between these issues. In some cases, knowledgeable researchers even come out in support of the official story of 9/11 when there is no apparent “need” to do so. [Audio Clips: Case 1^{ccci}, Case 2^{ccciii}, Case 3^{ccciiv}]

There seems to be a fear of discrediting oneself or a fear of “not being an expert”. So, how different is the psychology operating within the “alternative knowledge” community than outside of it? Are people being “intellectually herded” - in just the same way as everyone else? Why is this happening? Is it “human nature”? Is it accidental? Or is it being orchestrated? How sophisticated is the operation to keep these truths covered up or obfuscated? Is the implementation of the “New World Order” inevitable? Are some figures ignoring important evidence, and/or not offering us any of the alternatives that are illustrated here^{cccv}?

A Call to Alms and to Expanded Awareness

So, I suggest it’s time to re-double one’s study – a time to speak out - and realise what is at stake. Give your time – give your energy – give away your knowledge and pass on your understanding. Those who are already immersed in studies of “alternative knowledge” should find it easier to see why 9/11 is so important – now that enough of Dr. Wood’s studies have shown the evidence so clearly.

I might suggest it is also a time to put out “positive intent” and use the “law of attraction” to influence the “light forces” that some of us can feel are close by – helping to guide us and give us clues as to “what to do next”. I would site examples of “light forces” as those beings who helped Travis Walton in 1975^{ccvii} and those whole helped Wilbert Smith (in the 1950’s) to build various items of technology^{ccviii}. I contend that knowledge of experiences like those of Walton and Smith can force a change in consciousness to occur. It seems that knowledge of this altered or expanded consciousness is a threat to the “control group”. For example, though they did not openly talk about any of the topics covered here, prominent people such as John Lennon, Ghandi (and to a lesser extent

comedian Bill Hicks^{ccviii}) and a number of others who seemed to speak from a knowledge of this expanded consciousness all seem to have ended up either being assassinated or they ended up dead at an early age.

At the same time, we must reject violence, hatred and revenge and put out the intent we will, using peaceful methods, individually each control our own destiny. Through a collective effort to reveal and disclose the truth that the evidence here leads us to, the rule by secrecy, fear and ignorance – will end. Believe this, feel this, know this and action this – in small or large ways.

Choose Abundance or Choose Scarcity

So, what will you choose? Will you choose to “go with” the left hand column of the table? Or will you choose the right hand column – representing a new paradigm, “new” solutions and new possibilities. Choosing the right hand column is tricky, as no institutions and few people will support you. You may additionally be ridiculed or told you are “an idealist” or a “utopianist”. Or will you “choose” some items from each column? As I see things, changes must come by consent – they cannot be forced upon anyone.

We, the “Information Rich”

Those people reading this are members of the “information rich” elite – with access to more information via the internet than it is possible to read or digest in a single human lifetime. We are in a special, privileged position – whilst most of the world live in poverty, destitution and ignorance. Therefore, is it not our duty to speak of the facts and evidence related above? Is it not our duty to help move our species out of the “era of slavery” into the era of physical and spiritual freedom? Will you attempt to accelerate this transition by studying, analysing, questioning and then speaking out? Will you attempt to advance knowledge of the reality of the control group – and its activities (especially in regard to 9/11). Will you aim to finally expose the identity of this control group – and put out the intent that their control and tactics will then become outmoded and ineffective?

At the risk of sounding trite, let’s push through the darkness and towards the light. Let’s create a new future. Start here – start now.

Thank you for reading this far.

30. Letters Sent to UK Authorities in 2008 Concerning 9/11 and Other Evidence

Letter Sent to UK Police In November 2008

Re: The Fake War on Terror, New Information About 9/11 and Common Purpose

Dear Chief Constable,

It is now almost 3 years since I completed a nationwide police force mailing about important issues relating to the perceived threat of terrorism. Both my mailings to you have been motivated by the knowledge that the official stories of events on September 11, 2001 and the events of July 7, 2005 are bogus – in ways only a few people seem willing to examine in any detail.

Since 2006 I have been involved in ongoing research and campaigning and I have even had ancillary involvement in US-based legal action relating to the 9/11 cover up. During the same period, we have seen an increasing number of laws relating to terrorism either created or amended and “hardened”. This has essentially resulted in the removal of habeas corpus and a general erosion of certain civil liberties. The consequences for our freedom are already far greater than any small illusory group of Muslim fundamentalists could ever have created. Thankfully, there are an increasing number of people who are beginning to wonder just what is going on in the world – and they are beginning to look at the “bigger picture”.



Another part of this picture seems to have been exposed during a recent incident in Liverpool and it is primarily this that has triggered my wish to write to all UK Police Chief Constables again. This incident took place on Church Street in Liverpool on the 11th of October 2008. I have already written to the police Chief Constable of Merseyside police to express my dismay at learning of events of 11th October on Church Street in Liverpool city centre. The main

instigating officer involved was P.C Wilson – he and others seized leaflets and property of a peaceful group of people. (Mr Howe was kind enough to respond and advise me the he had asked another Officer to look into

the incident and write back to me, but that Officer has not yet responded to me).

I was most surprised that so many officers were suddenly able to show a complete disregard for the law and seize property and suppress freedom of expression. There seem to be some problems in the training of those officers – in that they did not know that they were breaking the law – how is this possible? Was it Merseyside Police’s policy to just break the law for “something to do”? What I mean is, we can clearly see from the video record (google it) that it was a completely peaceful situation – basically people walking around, just talking, discussing “the state of the world” and officers casually walk in and seize property from legal and pre-authorized street stalls! One has to wonder if these officers have attended Common Purpose training courses (yes, some of us know all about this – see below!) It does seem like this sort of policing policy could have been dictated by Common Purpose Graduates rather than according to laws already voted on by elected representatives.

Now, you must at some point realise that all this nonsense about terrorism (which is likely what the Merseyside police action was somehow, some way – vaguely, probably, potentially related to) is soon going to be fully exposed. For example, we have a video clip of Sir Ian Blair saying "If London could survive the Blitz, it can survive four miserable bombers like this.... I'm not saying there are four bombers.... four miserable events like this." And there is much other incriminating evidence that shows the 7/7 bombings were not the work of mythical “home grown” Muslim fundamentalists. The train that the suicide bombers were supposed to have caught was cancelled, Bruce Lait described how he saw no one with a rucksack – nor did he see a bag where the bomb was supposed to have been. Peter Power of Visor Consultants stated that he was running a simulation of bombs going off at the exact same stations where the actual events took place – at the exact same time. I could go on.



At some point your policies for matters relating to supposed terrorism will need to be scrapped (as they are based on a scam). It is often said that terrorists attack because “they hate our freedoms”. Judging by what happened on 11th Oct, some members of Merseyside Police seem to dislike certain freedoms, even if they don’t “hate them”. Would you be

concerned about this if a similar incident or situation arose in your own force area?

I have included a couple of leaflets here for you I suggest you study and research the topics that they cover. You will then realise “you’ve been had” and someone is lying to you – and to the rest of us. Look at what is really going on in the world – if you want a future, that is. As a suggestion, contact me for more leaflets and booklets to use on a new training course for your officers (or just distribute them to all stations). It will be far cheaper and far more important and valuable than any Common Purpose training – of that I can assure you. Feel free to copy the leaflets, which I have posted on the Web for easy download (<http://www.checktheevidence.com/pdf/>) For the moment, I want to discuss the link to Common Purpose – Cressida Dick, the senior officer described as the "decision maker" on the day that Jean Charles de Menezes was killed, is a Common Purpose graduate.

According to Wikipedia, “Common Purpose UK is an influential educational charity delivering a range of leadership training programmes to decision-makers drawn from all sectors of society.” Common purpose’s own website makes it less clear whether it is a charity, a trust or a company. One somewhat troubling statement found on their “about” page is:

“Common Purpose programmes produce people who lead beyond their authority and can produce change beyond their direct circle of control.”

Does this sound like they are encouraging people to trample over the authority of others? It sounds to me like something akin to megalomania. Indeed, Brian Gerrish has documented a number of examples of Common Purpose Graduates behaving in a way which could be described as being like megalomania. A response to an enquiry about Cumbria County Council’s use of Common Purpose training contained this:

The information is specific to the courses held by Common Purpose. It details the content and structure of the training provided by Common Purpose. If this information were disclosed to competitors, this could allow others to emulate their programme style, undermining its ability to provide unique leadership training. It would therefore be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of Common Purpose.

(This was in response to an FOI request about how Common Purpose training was being used). Why does a charity have commercial interest? Are charities now in competition with one another? Surely CP’s aims are purely altruistic if they are a charity? I trust that your Force will consider carefully the evidence presented by Brian Gerrish and others as to what

the real agenda behind Common Purpose is – and thereby review its policy regarding the use of their “training” programmes.

In relation to 9/11, since January 2006, I have learned a great deal about what happened. I would contend that this knowledge is important to our very survival, impinging as it does on political, technological and even environmental matters.

In early 2006, I had already calculated the time of freefall for an object dropped from the top of the WTC towers and found that the towers came down in almost that same time – about 9 or 10 seconds. Back in 2006, I had assumed that explosives were responsible for the destruction of the towers. By the end of 2006, however, I had begun to see that explosives could not explain the complete powderisation of most of the steel (which gave the towers their immense strength - a total of over 250 columns). In 2007, I got to know former Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Dr. Judy Wood, and became involved in her attempts to sue NIST’s contractors for fraud. NIST (The National Institute for Standards in Technology) were tasked with producing 1000’s of pages of reports to explain the “collapse” of the WTC towers. They used external contractors. It turns out that at least 3 of these contractors are involved in the development of Directed Energy Weapons technology (SAIC, ARA and Boeing). Funnily enough, Dr. Wood, in preparing her case against the contractors, had already come to the conclusion that a Directed Energy Weapon of some unknown type had been used to destroy most of the WTC complex. All her legal documents are posted online for anyone to review. Later, Dr. Wood’s research uncovered the presence of Hurricane Erin – a Category 5 storm, which was closest to NYC at about 8am on 9/11 – this is not a coincidence. All this information was sent to the BBC and all UK media outlets. Without exception, they have remained silent on the legal case and on Hurricane Erin. In January, I advised Dr. Wood not to agree to an interview with BBC producer Mike Rudin who asked her to have a “quick chat” in relation to the documentary he produced called *The Third Tower* which aired on the BBC earlier this year and was repeated more recently. I asked Mike Rudin to make sure Radio 2 News Bulletins included news the NIST’s contractors had been sued for fraud by Dr. Wood. He said he was not able to do this. When I said to him that the BBC was promoting a fake war on terror and asked him if he could produce any evidence that it was genuine, he was either unwilling or unable to do so – he did not even argue that the War on Terror was genuine. (Adam Curtis’ important documentary series, *the Power of Nightmares* provides plenty of evidence that any threat from the mythical Al Qaida “ sleeper cells ” is either grossly exaggerated or entirely fabricated.)

As a summary, I will say that there are quite a few people have become aware of the information laid out here before you. This number is not decreasing. At some point, you will need to deal with the very fundamental issues set out here – and you will either do it by serving the people above you or by serving the people below you. Therefore, in the final analysis, I hope you will ask yourself who are you (and your officers) serving? I hope you can answer that question comfortably enough to sleep at night.

Yours Most Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

Letter Sent to over 70 UK Military Bases/Offices etc

Re: The Fake War on Terror, Obsolete Threat of Nuclear Weapons and Common Purpose

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to present information to you for urgent review. My mailing to you has been motivated by the knowledge that the official stories of events on September 11, 2001 and the events of July 7, 2005 are bogus – in ways only a few people seem willing to examine in any detail. I would contend that this knowledge is important to our very survival, impinging as it does on political, technological and even environmental matters.

Since 2004, I have been involved in ongoing research and campaigning with regard to what happened on 9/11. I have even had ancillary involvement in US-based legal action relating to the 9/11 cover up. During the same period (2004-present), in the UK, we have seen an increasing number of laws relating to terrorism either created or amended and “hardened”. This has essentially resulted in the removal of habeas corpus and a general erosion of certain civil liberties. The consequences for our freedom are already far greater than any small illusory group of Muslim fundamentalists could ever have created. Thankfully, there are an increasing number of people who are beginning to wonder just what is going on in the world – and they are beginning to look at the “bigger picture”. Perhaps you even fall into that category yourself, in certain respects.

My background is in Software Engineering, although I did a joint degree in Physics and Computer Science and I currently work as an assessor and part-time tutor for the Open University. You would likely not believe me if I said to you that in studying the 9/11 evidence and cover up, Dr. Judy Wood – a US-based former Professor of Mechanical Engineering - and others have come to the conclusion that some type of Directed Energy Weapon was used to destroy the WTC complex. The evidence is so conclusive that much of it has been submitted in legal challenges to the National Institute of Standards in Technology (NIST) in the USA. By late 2004, I had already calculated the time of freefall for an object dropped from the top of the WTC towers and found that the towers came down in almost that same time – about 9 or 10 seconds. It still took me sometime to see what really happened to the towers – they underwent an almost complete powderisation of most of the steel of which they were made (a total of 283 columns – each approximately 1360 feet in length). In 2007, I

got to know Dr. Judy Wood, and became involved in her attempts to sue NIST's contractors for fraud. In January 2008 we visited New York together, where I filmed ongoing "hosing down" operations at the site of the WTC. NIST (The National Institute for Standards in Technology) were tasked with producing 1000's of pages of reports to explain the "collapse" of the WTC towers. They used external contractors. It turns out that at least 3 of these contractors are involved in the development of Directed Energy Weapons technology (SAIC, ARA and Boeing). Funnily enough, Dr. Wood, in preparing her case against the contractors, had already come to the conclusion that a Directed Energy Weapon of some unknown type had been used to destroy most of the WTC complex. All the evidence she had compiled, and copies of the legal documents she has submitted are posted online for anyone to review (see <http://www.drjudywood.com/>).

Later, Dr. Wood's research uncovered the presence of Hurricane Erin – a Category 5 storm - which was closest to NYC at about 8am on 9/11/01 – this is not a coincidence. All this information was sent to the BBC and all UK media outlets. Without exception, they have remained silent on the legal case and on the issue of Hurricane Erin. In January 2008, I advised Dr. Wood not to agree to an interview with BBC producer Mike Rudin who asked her to have a "quick chat" in relation to the documentary he produced called *The Third Tower*, which aired on the BBC earlier this year and was repeated more recently. I asked Mike Rudin to make sure Radio 2 News Bulletins included the news that NIST's contractors had been sued for fraud by Dr. Wood and Dr. Morgan Reynolds. He said he was not able to do this. When I said to him that the BBC was promoting a fake war on terror and asked him if he could produce any evidence that it was genuine, he was either unwilling or unable to do so – he did not even argue that the War on Terror was genuine. (Adam Curtis' important BAFTA award winning documentary series, the *Power of Nightmares* provides plenty of evidence that any threat from the mythical Al Qaida "sleeper cells" is either grossly exaggerated or entirely fabricated.) The correspondence with Rudin is posted on my website and therefore may help you to understand why you have not heard about this matter – and this page has received 1 or 2 interesting visitors.

Dr. Wood and I have concluded that the weapon used to "dustify" the twin towers and destroy WTC 7 uses some type "field effect" technology – similar to that discovered by Canadian inventor and researcher John Hutchison. For over 20 years, Hutchison has been performing experiments that have "jellified" and in some cases even "dustified" metal samples and he was even visited in 1983 by Colonel John Alexander and a team from Los Alamos National Labs (LANL – where much of the work

on the Atomic Bomb was done). Hutchison's work has also been discussed in the Pentagon.

It is our contention that the correspondence of evidence between "Hutchison Effects" and those seen at the WTC (<http://tinyurl.com/911hestudy>) lead strongly to a conclusion that shows that black technology was used on 9/11 – and this evidence and conclusion has been submitted in Dr. Wood's Qui Tam Case filings. These documents include an affidavit from John Hutchison. This technology makes that of nuclear weapons essentially obsolete – as it turned most of two 110-story buildings (and a vast proportion of their contents) to powder in about 20 seconds – with little or no production of heat. This also indicates a different type of physics at work – one which allows us to exploit "free energy" in a similar way to that discovered and demonstrated by Nikola Tesla in the early 20th Century (and, essentially, suppressed ever since). The straight-line path and timing of Hurricane Erin both strongly indicate the use of Weather Control technology on 9/11 too (<http://tinyurl.com/911erinstudy>). Clearly, this moves us into a new territory – which many or even most people would dismiss as fantasy. This is therefore the main reason that you should not take my statements at "face value" – you must research and investigate for yourself, and review the available evidence. This is precisely what I have done and it is why I have written this letter to you (and many others). The truth of 9/11 (and 7/7) – and the fact that this truth has been successfully covered up for 7 years - forms part of a larger picture.

Another part of this picture seems to have been exposed during a recent incident in Liverpool and it is primarily this that has renewed my wish to write to all UK Police Chiefs and as many senior military people as I can find addresses for.



A disturbing incident took place on Church Street in Liverpool on the 11th of October 2008. I have already written to the police Chief Constable of Merseyside police to express my dismay at learning of events where, as we can clearly see from the video record (google it), that it was a completely peaceful situation – basically people walking around, just talking, discussing "the state of the world" and officers casually walk in and seize property from legal and pre-authorised street stalls! This is yet another instance of peaceful protest being either disrupted or banned by inappropriate policing.



This type of “policing” seems to be part of a worrying trend both in the UK and the USA. (A few days ago, in the USA, a 54-year old woman was tasered for being in the wrong seat at a Madison football game - google for the video of this incident. A few days ago, a man was tasered by California Police (Mendocino) for getting agitated when the police did little or nothing to save his drowning father (google for the video). What is happening to our society?

It is my sincere hope that at some point, tremendously difficult though it can be, you will realise that all this nonsense about terrorism (which is likely what much of the police action mentioned above was somehow, some way – vaguely, probably, potentially related to) is soon going to be fully exposed. For example, we have a video clip of Sir Ian Blair saying "If London could survive the Blitz, it can survive four miserable bombers like this.... I'm not saying there are four bombers.... four miserable events like this." And there is much other incriminating evidence that shows the 7/7 bombings were not the work of mythical “home grown” Muslim fundamentalists. For example, the train that the suicide bombers were supposed to have caught was cancelled, Bruce Lait described how he saw no one with a rucksack – nor did he see a bag where the bomb was supposed to have been. Peter Power of Visor Consultants stated that he was running a simulation of bombs going off at the exact same stations where the actual events took place – at the exact same time. I could go on.

For the moment, I want to discuss the link to Common Purpose – Cressida Dick, the senior officer described as the "decision maker" on the day that Jean Charles de Menezes was killed, is a Common Purpose graduate. It is my understanding that a number of other senior police figures and some military people have undergone common purpose training. According to Wikipedia, “Common Purpose UK is an influential educational charity delivering a range of leadership training programmes to decision-makers drawn from all sectors of society.” Common purpose’s own website makes it less clear whether it is a charity, a trust or a company. One somewhat troubling statement found on their “about” page is:

“Common Purpose programmes produce people who lead beyond their authority and can produce change beyond their direct circle of control.”

Does this sound like they are encouraging people to trample over the authority of others? It sounds to me like something akin to megalomania. Indeed, Brian Gerrish has documented a number of examples of

Common Purpose Graduates behaving in a way which could be described as being like megalomania. A response to an enquiry about Cumbria County Council's use of Common Purpose training contained this:

The information is specific to the courses held by Common Purpose. It details the content and structure of the training provided by Common Purpose. If this information were disclosed to competitors, this could allow others to emulate their programme style, undermining its ability to provide unique leadership training. It would therefore be likely to, prejudice the commercial interests of Common Purpose.

(This was in response to an FOI request about how Common Purpose training was being used). Why does a charity have commercial interest? Are charities now in competition with one another? Surely CP's aims are purely altruistic if they are a charity? I trust that you will consider carefully the evidence presented by Brian Gerrish (and others) as to what the real agenda behind Common Purpose is (and some military leaders are also Common Purpose Graduates.)

I have enclosed a couple of leaflets, and I encourage you to study and research the topics that they cover (as well as Common Purpose – see www.cpexposed.com). You may then realise (as I have) that “you’ve been had” and someone is lying to you – and to the rest of us. Look at what is really going on in the world – if you want a future, that is. Feel free to copy the leaflets, which I have posted on the Web for easy download (<http://www.checktheevidence.com/pdf/>) I also encourage you to try and identify the aircraft that are regularly leaving persistent trails (“chemtrails”) in our skies. Officials tell me they are “regular aircraft” – but why do they leave grids, and why is the CAA unable to give me any flight information for these flights? There are many questions I have in relation to this issue too.

As a summary, I will say that there are quite a few people have become aware of the information laid out here before you. This number is not decreasing. At some point, you will need to deal with the very fundamental issues set out here – and you will either do it by serving the people above you or by serving the people below you. Therefore, in the final analysis, I hope you will ask yourself whom are you (and your colleagues) serving? I hope you can answer that question comfortably enough to sleep at night.

Yours Most Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

31. References

Outside of these references, readers may find it useful to look at “Secrets of Antigravity” by Dr. Paul La Violette and the works of Dr. Joseph P Farrell, such as “The Cosmic War” and “SS Brotherhood of the Bell”.

-
- ⁱ <http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=84>
- ⁱⁱ <http://www.nineeleven.co.uk/board/viewtopic.php?t=6735>
- ⁱⁱⁱ <http://www.ermysteds.n-yorks.sch.uk/>
- ^{iv} <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/aboutLU/index.htm>
- ^v <http://www.westnotts.ac.uk/>
- ^{vi} http://www.tbsmobility.com/about_tbs.php
- ^{vii} <http://www.double--click.co.uk/>
- ^{viii} http://www.open.ac.uk/cater/p2_1.shtml
- ^{ix} <http://www.open.ac.uk/>
- ^x <http://www3.open.ac.uk/courses/bin/p12.dll?C02T224>
- ^{xi} <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-8355784822242137698>
- ^{xii} <http://forum.physorg.com/index.php?showtopic=3108>
- ^{xiii} <http://www.nineeleven.co.uk/board/viewtopic.php?t=1003>
- ^{xiv} <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-2991254740145858863>
- ^{xv} <http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/911/Thermite2.htm>
- ^{xvi} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buildings_Completely_Collapse?
- ^{xvii} <http://drjudywood.com/articles/BBE/BilliardBalls.html>
- ^{xviii} http://www.nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=we_have_holes
- ^{xix} <http://www.nineeleven.co.uk/board/viewtopic.php?p=35852>
- ^{xx} http://www.nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=trouble_with_jones
- ^{xxi} <http://drjudywood.com/articles/scientific/JonesScientificMethod.html>
- ^{xxii} <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/WhyIndeedDidtheWorldTradeCenterBuildingsCompletelyCollapse.pdf>
- ^{xxiii} <http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/911/flight93.pdf>
- ^{xxiv} <http://newsmine.org/archive/9-11/flight93-ua/cell-phones-dont-work-above-10k-feet.txt>
- ^{xxv} <http://physics911.net/projectachilles>
- ^{xxvi} <http://911research.wtc7.net/materials/flight93/flight93.html>
- ^{xxvii} <http://911research.wtc7.net/essays/st911/index.html>
- ^{xxviii} <http://www.911eyewitness.com/>

- xxix <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-4563604978641682920>
- xxx <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=222951174833360205>
- xxxi <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LQz7JUJ4hOU>
- xxxi http://www.onlinejournal.com/artman/publish/article_83.shtml
- xxxi <http://www.wanttoknow.info/fredburksresigns>
- xxxi [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/911/misc/Scholars For 9-11 Truth-Split.htm](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/911/misc/Scholars%20For%209-11%20Truth-Split.htm)
- xxxi <http://911scholars.org/SiteThreatened.html>
- xxxi <http://www.911scholars.org/SorrowAnger.html>
- xxxi http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/aluminum/Aluminum_Glows.html
- xxxi <http://covertoperations.blogspot.com/2006/03/extremely-sad-news.html>
- xxxi <http://michaelzebuhr.blogspot.com/2006/09/case-of-michael-zebuhrs-murder-intro.html>
- xl <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/DEW/StarWarsBeam1.html>
- xli http://www.nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=reynolds_booted_spine
- xlii http://www.newstatesman.com/nssubfilter.php?newTemplate=NSArticle_NS&newDisplayURN=200609110028
- xliii [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/911/Derby Evening Telegraph 09-Dec-2005.pdf](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/911/Derby%20Evening%20Telegraph%2009-Dec-2005.pdf)
- xliii [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/audio/911/NCST Advisory Committee Webcast Dec14 - 2006 0900-1100 EST.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/audio/911/NCST%20Advisory%20Committee%20Webcast%20Dec14-2006%200900-1100%20EST.mp3)
- xliii <http://911blogger.com/node/5437?page=5>
- xliii <http://www.nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=hustler>
- xliii <http://www.911researchers.com/node/114>
- xliii [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/audio/911/Jim Fetzer - Steve Jones - Dynamic Duo - 17 Jan 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/audio/911/Jim%20Fetzer%20-%20Steve%20Jones%20-%20Dynamic%20Duo%20-%2017%20Jan%202007.mp3)
- xliii <http://www.ehponline.org/members/2002/110p703-714lioy/lioy-full.html>
- l <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/DEW/StarWarsBeam3.html>
- li <http://www.911researchers.com/node/160>
- lii http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=46&Itemid=60
- liii <http://www.nineeleven.co.uk/board/viewtopic.php?p=50492>
- liii <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/01/29/national/main2411081.shtml>
- liii http://911scholars.org/CBS_Pulls.html
- liii <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6708190071483512003>
- liii [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/audio/911/Jeff Strahl with Jim Fetzer on Dynamic Duo 04 Jan 07.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/audio/911/Jeff%20Strahl%20with%20Jim%20Fetzer%20on%20Dynamic%20Duo%2004%20Jan%2007.mp3)
- liii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/911/TheNew9-11Hijackers.htm>
- liii <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-558096240694803017>

ix

http://i18.photobucket.com/albums/b108/janedoe444/ARG/aha/COLLAPSE10_2D.jpg?t=1173082808

lxi <http://i18.photobucket.com/albums/b108/janedoe444/ARG/Image122.jpg?t=1173082676>

lxii <http://i18.photobucket.com/albums/b108/janedoe444/ARG/Image254.jpg?t=1173082142>

lxiii <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200702/Implausibility-Directed-Energy-Beam-Demolish-WTC-by-Gregory-Jenkins.pdf>

lxiv <http://www.journalof911studies.com/>

lxv <http://i18.photobucket.com/albums/b108/janedoe444/ARG/Image108a.jpg>

lxvi <http://s18.photobucket.com/albums/b108/janedoe444/ARG/Image87.jpg>

lxvii <http://i18.photobucket.com/albums/b108/janedoe444/ARG/Image311.jpg>

lxviii <http://www.drjudywood.com/>

lxix <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters.html>

lxx <http://forums.therandirhodesshow.com/index.php?showtopic=106193&st=0>

lxxi <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-1184826770885695772>

lxxii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Prof.SteveJones&Dr.BillDeagleonWTC Destruction-Vancouver-24Jun2007.mp3>

lxxiii <http://www.xmradio.com/onxm/channelpage.xmc?ch=169>

lxxiv <http://www.newsday.com/news/printedition/nation/chi-070710chertoff,0,6464324,print.story>

lxxv http://infowars.com/articles/terror/dhs_general_attack_could_happen_any_day.htm

lxxvi http://rawstory.com/news/2007/Oldline_Republican_warns_somethings_in_works_0719.html

lxxvii <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/09/AR2007050902719.html>

lxxviii <http://www.deps.org/DEPSPages/sponsors.html>

lxxix <http://911research.wtc7.net/disinfo/alibis/chenev.html>

lxxx <http://www.whitehouse.gov/government/mineta-bio.html>

lxxxi http://www.boeing.com/news/releases/2000/news_release_000408a.html

lxxxii

http://graphics8.nytimes.com/packages/html/nyregion/20050812_WTC_GRAPHIC/met_WTC_hi_stories_full_01.html

lxxxiii http://www.nomoregames.net/911/exploding_the_airliner_crash_myth/tire1.jpg

lxxxiv <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8045542387672451515>

lxxxv <http://wtcmodel.wikidot.com/structural-data-wtc-1-2>

lxxxvi <http://www.photolibrary.fema.gov/photodata/original/3946.jpg>

lxxxvii <http://www.photolibrary.fema.gov/photodata/original/5345.jpg>

lxxxviii http://www.weourselves.org/mp3/wpfw_011808_judy-andrew2.mp3

lxxxix <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/>

xc http://drjudywood.com/media/071212_JohnHutchison-TruthH.mp3

xci

http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=95&Itemid=60

- ^{xcii} <http://www.blogger.com/profile/04641021361644318889>
- ^{xciii} <http://drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>
- ^{xciv} <http://www.weourselves.org/>
- ^{xcv} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/We Ourselves Dr. Judy Wood and Andrew Johnson 14 Jan 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/We_Ourselves_Dr._Judy_Wood_and_Andrew_Johnson_14_Jan_2007.mp3)
- ^{xcvi} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/We Ourselves Dr. J Wood J Hutchison and A Johnson 18 Jan 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/We_Ourselves_Dr._J_Wood_J_Hutchison_and_A_Johnson_18_Jan_2007.mp3)
- ^{xcvii}
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=158&Itemid=60
- ^{xcviii} <http://www.acebaker.com/9-11/ABPlaneStudy/Chopper5Velocity2.html>
- ^{xcix} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace Baker - 9-11 Video Fakery - Dynamic Duo - 27 Sep 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace_Baker_-_9-11_Video_Fakery_-_Dynamic_Duo_-_27_Sep_2007.mp3)
- ^c [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace Bake-9-11 Video Fakery\(Harzakani\)-Dynamic Duo- 07 Nov 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace_Bake-9-11_Video_Fakery(Harzakani)-Dynamic_Duo_-_07_Nov_2007.mp3)
- ^{ci} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace Baker - 911 Video Fakery and Fakery of Hutchison Effect - Dynamic Duo - 27 Feb 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace_Baker_-_911_Video_Fakery_and_Fakery_of_Hutchison_Effect_-_Dynamic_Duo_-_27_Feb_2008.mp3)
- ^{cii} <http://www.richieburnett.co.uk/tesla.shtml>
- ^{ciii} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JKgHGOb4ClU>
- ^{civ} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKZo4SoPjjw>
- ^{cv} <http://www.prlog.org/10048184-scientists-see-wtc-hutchison-effect-parallel.html>
- ^{cvi} http://www.opednews.com/articles/genera_andrew_j_080129_scientists_see_wtc_.htm
- ^{cvii} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood - 9-11 and The Hutchison Effect - Morgan Reynolds - Dynamic Duo - 07 Feb 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr._Judy_Wood_-_9-11_and_The_Hutchison_Effect_-_Morgan_Reynolds_-_Dynamic_Duo_-_07_Feb_2008.mp3)
- ^{cviii} http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.html
- ^{cix} <http://www.prlap.com/pr/92756/>
- ^{cx} <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/>
- ^{cxii} <http://www.acebaker.com/>
- ^{cxiii} http://inventors.about.com/od/uvstartinventions/a/Vacuum_tube.htm
- ^{cxiiii} <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2008/03/judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html>
- ^{cxv} http://drjudywood.com/videos/video_comments.html
- ^{cxvi} <http://www.rexresearch.com/hutchisn/hutchisn.htm>
- ^{cxvii} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1qnEuk-n-0Q>
- ^{cxviii} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o18fjUMRoWU>
- ^{cxix} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison 9-11 and Hutchison Effect - Jim Fetzer Dynamic Duo 28 Feb 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr._Judy_Wood_and_John_Hutchison_9-11_and_Hutchison_Effect_-_Jim_Fetzer_Dynamic_Duo_28_Feb_2008.mp3)
- ^{cxix} <http://archives.cnn.com/2001/COMMUNITY/10/03/alexander.cnn/>
- ^{cxix} http://www.parapsych.org/members/h_puthoff.html
- ^{cxix} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=92sw2S7pn4U>
- ^{cxix} http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uO9Iv_4ZfNI

- ^{cxxiii} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Andrew Johnson - 9-11 NYC 1st Responder Accounts - Dynamic Duo 03 Oct 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Andrew%20Johnson%20-%209-11%20NYC%201st%20Responder%20Accounts%20-%20Dynamic%20Duo%2003%20Oct%202007.mp3)
- ^{cxxiv} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=161&Itemid=60
- ^{cxxv} <http://math.ucr.edu/home/baez/physics/Relativity/BlackHoles/hawking.html>
- ^{cxxvi} <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-286184459501486399>
- ^{cxxvii} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/pdf/Hutch Letters.pdf](http://www.checktheevidence.com/pdf/Hutch%20Letters.pdf)
- ^{cxxviii} [http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2008/03/Dr. Wood-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html](http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2008/03/Dr.%20Wood-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html)
- ^{cxxix} http://www.checktheevidence.com/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=134&Itemid=60
- ^{cxxx} <http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=mYe6je7N0aQC&pg=PA8&dq=%22total+evidence%22+%22arbitrary+subset%22&sig=DrIGXCcT4Uj579G2TqOpBtDIQF5>
- ^{cxxxi} http://atheism.about.com/library/glossary/general/bldef_specialpleading.htm
- ^{cxxxii} <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJ8.html>
- ^{cxxxiii} <http://www.free-energy-info.co.uk/>
- ^{cxxxiv} <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>
- ^{cxxxv} http://www.checktheevidence.com/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=164&Itemid=60
- ^{cxxxvi} http://www.checktheevidence.com/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=161&Itemid=60
- ^{cxxxvii} <http://www.assassinationscience.com/FuturisticWeaponry.pdf>
- ^{cxxxviii} <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJAppendix1.html>
- ^{cxxxix} <http://cerncourier.com/cws/article/cern/28497>
- ^{cxl} <http://sis-forum.web.cern.ch/SIS-Forum/Public-v1/3Programme/Projects/Flyers/Leaflet36.pdf>
- ^{cxli} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=category§ionid=1&id=1&Itemid=60
- ^{cxlii} http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/short/Fetzer_Hutchison.html
- ^{cxliii} <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/>
- ^{cxliiv} <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erin5.html>
- ^{cxlv} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood - 911 and Hurricane Erin - Dynamic Duo - Andrew Johnson 30 Jul 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr.%20Judy%20Wood%20-%20911%20and%20Hurricane%20Erin%20-%20Dynamic%20Duo%20-%20Andrew%20Johnson%2030%20Jul%202008.mp3)
- ^{cxlvi} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood - 911 and Hurricane Erin - Dynamic Duo - Andrew Johnson 31 Jul 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr.%20Judy%20Wood%20-%20911%20and%20Hurricane%20Erin%20-%20Dynamic%20Duo%20-%20Andrew%20Johnson%2031%20Jul%202008.mp3)
- ^{cxlvii} <http://www.acebaker.com/9-11/PinocchioStudy/Chopper5Velocity.html>
- ^{cxlviii} http://www.drjudywood.com/pdf/080229_AffdAJ_60.pdf
- ^{cxlix} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZqvNrlWwoUc>
-

-
- ^{cl} [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace Baker - Video Fakery and the \\$100000 Hutchison Effect Challenge - 26 Aug 2008 - Dynamic Duo.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace Baker - Video Fakery and the $100000 Hutchison Effect Challenge - 26 Aug 2008 - Dynamic Duo.mp3)
- ^{cli} <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Ace Baker - John Hutchison Challenge - 26 Aug 2008 - Dunamic Duo.mp3>
- ^{clii} http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/conspiracy_files/6160775.stm
- ^{cliii} [http://www.911podcasts.com/files/video/The Conspiracy Files \(BBC2\) -9-11 Xvid.avi](http://www.911podcasts.com/files/video/The Conspiracy Files (BBC2) -9-11 Xvid.avi)
- ^{cliv} <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6398254539895168463&hl=de>
- ^{clv} http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.html
- ^{clvi} http://www.nomoregames.net/index.php?page=911&subpage1=federal_case
- ^{clvii} <http://www.911truth.org/>
- ^{clviii} <http://www.weekoftruth.org/>
- ^{clix} http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2006-04-14-iran-nukes_x.htm
- ^{clx} http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=47738
- ^{clxi} http://www.fromthewilderness.com/free/ww3/112603_kennedy.html
- ^{clxii} <http://www.livevideo.com/socialservice>
- ^{clxiii} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=91&Itemid=60
- ^{clxiv} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=edm9pcKGkgU>
- ^{clxv} <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJ3.html>
- ^{clxvi} <http://atlanticfreepress.com/content/view/3858/81/>
- ^{clxvii} <http://www.nineeleven.co.uk/board/viewtopic.php?t=13721&highlight=investigation+wake>
- ^{clxviii} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=168&Itemid=60
- ^{clxix} http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/conspiracy_files/6160775.stm
- ^{clxx} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=177&Itemid=60
- ^{clxxi} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=157&Itemid=60
- ^{clxxii} <http://www.checktheevidence.com/pdf/Hutchison Effect FOIA from Brian Allan.pdf>
- ^{clxxiii} <http://www.nucleonicenergy.com/>
- ^{clxxiv} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=175&Itemid=60
- ^{clxxv} http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/april2008/042208_assault_videos.htm
- ^{clxxvi} http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=176&Itemid=60
- ^{clxxvii} <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qyzSSnNUWnE>
-

- clxxviii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/>
- clxxix <http://www.911scholars.org/>
- clxxx
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=170&Itemid=60
- clxxxi <http://www.checktheevidence.com/cms/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=170>
- clxxxii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/CB Brooklyn - 911 Research Group - Ace Baker - Jim Fetzer - 16 Oct 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/CB_Brooklyn_-_911_Research_Group_-_Ace_Baker_-_Jim_Fetzer_-_16_Oct_2008.mp3)
- clxxxiii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Fetzer/Weds-Thurs Wood Baker etc - Jim Fetzer - 16 Oct 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Fetzer/Weds-Thurs_Wood_Baker_etc_-_Jim_Fetzer_-_16_Oct_2008.mp3)
- clxxxiv [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Fetzer/Fetzer blames wood etc - Jim Fetzer - 16 Oct 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Fetzer/Fetzer_blames_wood_etc_-_Jim_Fetzer_-_16_Oct_2008.mp3)
- clxxxv [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Fetzer/Ace Baker Hates Judy Wood - Ace Baker - Jim Fetzer - 16 Oct 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Fetzer/Ace_Baker_Hates_Judy_Wood_-_Ace_Baker_-_Jim_Fetzer_-_16_Oct_2008.mp3)
- clxxxvi [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Jim Fetzer and Sofia - Dynamic Duo - 05 Aug 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Jim_Fetzer_and_Sofia_-_Dynamic_Duo_-_05_Aug_2008.mp3)
- clxxxvii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Jim Fetzer - 911 Research - Richard Syrett CFRB - 11 Sep 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Jim_Fetzer_-_911_Research_-_Richard_Syrett_CFRB_-_11_Sep_2008.mp3)
- clxxxviii <http://www.richardsyrett.com/february07.htm>
- clxxxix
clxxxix [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Caller Discusses Sept Clues and on Kevin Barretts WTPRN Show - Alex Jones calls in and comment - 20 Sep 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Caller_Discusses_Sept_Clues_and_on_Kevin_Barretts_WTPRN_Show_-_Alex_Jones_calls_in_and_comment_-_20_Sep_2008.mp3)
- cxc [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Def - Richard Curtis - Alex Jones - Kevin Barrett - Truth Jihad radio - WTPRN - 20 Sep 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Def_-_Richard_Curtis_-_Alex_Jones_-_Kevin_Barrett_-_Truth_Jihad_radio_-_WTPRN_-_20_Sep_2008.mp3)
- cxci
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=176&Itemid=60
- cxcii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/SEJones/Alex%20Jones%20Steve%20Jones%20-%20Marvin%20Marian.mp3>
- cxci <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7glUiRbCDP0>
- cxci <http://uk.youtube.com/watch?v=MqJEvqrxNYM>
- cxci <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/a/CG/otm.html>
- cxci <http://www.lenr-canr.org/>
- cxci http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.shtml
- cxci [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood - WTC Destruction - Rollye James - 09 Dec 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr._Judy_Wood_-_WTC_Destruction_-_Rollye_James_-_09_Dec_2008.mp3)
- cxci [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood - Richard Syrett - CFRB 1010 - WTC Destruction and Field Effects - 19 Sep 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr._Judy_Wood_-_Richard_Syrett_-_CFRB_1010_-_WTC_Destruction_and_Field_Effects_-_19_Sep_2008.mp3)
- cc http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred_Webre
- cci http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leuren_Moret
- ccii <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=5326824137117584395&ei=VehbSdqJII62iAL-i6naBw&q=beyond+treason>
- ccii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Leuren Moret - 9-11 Issues - Dynamic Duo - 14 June 2007.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Leuren_Moret_-_9-11_Issues_-_Dynamic_Duo_-_14_June_2007.mp3)
-

- cciv http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=197&Itemid=51
- ccv <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Leuren Moret - DU and 9-11 - Madison Conference - 05 Aug 2007.mp3>
- ccvi <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Alfred Webre and Comments - Madison 9-11 Science Conference - 05 Aug 2007.mp3>
- ccvii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison - Co-Op Radio - 14 Feb 2008-32kpbs.mp3>
- ccviii http://exopolitics.blogs.com/exopolitics_radio/2008/04/coopradiorg--1.html
- ccix http://exopolitics.blogs.com/exopolitics_radio/2008/03/coopradiorg--3.html
- ccx
- http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=209&Itemid=60
- ccxi http://www.ae911truth.net/omnitv_interview.htm
- ccxii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Leuren Moret - Alfred Webre - 9-11 - Whodunnit - Expansions \(Sofia\) - 14 Nov 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Leuren Moret - Alfred Webre - 9-11 - Whodunnit - Expansions (Sofia) - 14 Nov 2008.mp3)
- ccxiii <http://www.republicbroadcasting.org/index.php?cmd=archives.month&ProgramID=39&year=8&month=10&backURL=index.php%253Fcmd%253Darchives.getyear%2526ProgramID%253D39%26year%3D8%26backURL%3Dindex.php%253Fcmd%253Darchives>
- ccxiv <http://www.gi.alaska.edu/ScienceForum/ASF13/1340.html>
- ccxv <http://peaceinspace.blogs.com/peaceinspaceorg/2008/12/my-entry.html>
- ccxvi <mailto:leurenmoret@yahoo.com>
- ccxvii <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=-7892004186194307613>
- ccxviii <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=6714196008143117547>
- ccxix <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/dirt/dirt1.html>
- ccxx <http://www.drjudywood.com//articles/erin/erin6.html>
- ccxxi <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Sofia-and-Judy-Wood-WTC Destruction - 10 Mar 2007.mp3>
- ccxxii <http://peaceinspace.blogs.com/911/2008/11/911-energy-budget-and-molecular-dissociation-of-the-world-trade-center-wtc-by-independent-scientist-leuren-moretcanada.html>
- ccxxiii <http://www.google.co.uk/search?hl=en&q=leuren+moret+HAARP&meta=>
- ccxxiv
- http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=167&Itemid=60
- ccxxv <http://www.wtpn.com/programs.html>
- ccxxvi <http://www.amazon.com/Fluoride-Deception-Christopher-Bryson/dp/1583227008>
- ccxxvii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Sofia Smallstorm 'Fluoride' and the WTC Destruction - Mike Herzog \(Hour 1\) 16 Mar 2009.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Sofia Smallstorm 'Fluoride' and the WTC Destruction - Mike Herzog (Hour 1) 16 Mar 2009.mp3)
- ccxxviii http://www.nctimes.com/articles/2007/08/01/news/sandiego/10_34_077_31_07.txt
- ccxxix <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/MHMI/mmg11.html>
- ccxxx http://www.idph.state.il.us/Bioterrorism/factsheets/hydro_fluoride.htm
-

- ccxxxi http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=217&Itemid=60
- ccxxxii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Sofia Smallstrom - Truth Quest - Eric Karlstrom - 29 Jan 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Sofia_Smallstrom_-_Truth_Quest_-_Eric_Karlstrom_-_29_Jan_2008.mp3)
- ccxxxiii <http://911newworldorderfiles.googlepages.com/home2>
- ccxxxiv <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/dirt/dirt3.html>
- ccxxxv http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=208&Itemid=60
- ccxxxvi <http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=content&task=view&id=45>
- ccxxxvii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/SEJones/S Jones Silvery Aluminium Molten All temps in daylight 07 Jun 2006 Alex Jones.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/SEJones/S_Jones_Silvery_Aluminium_Molten_All_temps_in_daylight_07_Jun_2006_Alex_Jones.mp3)
- ccxxxviii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/Chemtrails/>
- ccxxxix [http://www.avatarproducts.com/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Screen=CTGY&Category_Code=DVD S](http://www.avatarproducts.com/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Screen=CTGY&Category_Code=DVD_S)
- ccxl <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I02cdiX9rMs>
- ccxli <http://www.bentham.org/open/tocpj/MSandI.htm>
- ccxlii <http://www.bentham.org/open/tocpj/EBM.htm>
- ccxliii http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=145&Itemid=60
- ccxliv <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJ1.html>
- ccxlv http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/pics/erin2001_e.gif
- ccxlvi http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=222&Itemid=60
- ccxlvii <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/RFCtoNISTbyMcIlvaineDoyleJonesRyanGagacSTJ.pdf>
- ccxlviii <http://www.journalof911studies.com/volume/2007/AppealLetterToNISTGourleyEtAl.pdf>
- ccxlix [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/SEJones/Paint on Thermate - 9-11 Debate-Air America - R Greene - S Jones 08 May 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/SEJones/Paint_on_Thermate_-_9-11_Debate-Air_America_-_R_Greene_-_S_Jones_08_May_2008.mp3)
- cccl <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tou71StrOb0>
- cccli <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Was-it-Nanotech-Thermite--by-John-R-Moffett-090415-784.html>
- ccclii <http://www.opednews.com/populum/diarypage.php?did=11424>
- cccliii http://drjudywood.com/articles/a/CG/spot_a_spook.html
- cccliv <http://drjudywood.com/articles/a/CG/otm.html>
- ccclv http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=206&Itemid=76
-

- ecldvi http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/administrator/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=226&Itemid=60
- ecldvii http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/administrator/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=195&Itemid=60
- ecldviii <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=02ocTtPYz5E>
- ecldlix <http://www.drjudywood.com/wtc/>
- ecldcx http://www.defenselink.mil/transcripts/1997/t042897_t0428coh.html
- ecldcxi <http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/020804.htm>
- ecldcxii http://www.exopolitics.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=130&Itemid=1
- ecldcxiii http://standeyo.com/NEWS/08_Earth_Changes/08_Earth_Changes_pics/080502_Reno_Quakes/snap00.jpg
- ecldcxiv <http://www.volcanolive.com/news59.html>
- ecldcxv http://www.indiana.edu/~pepp/earthquakes/sumatra12_26_04.htm
- ecldcxvi <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0VX0JvpW5q0>
- ecldcxvii <http://tokyofreepress.com/>
- ecldcxviii <http://rapidfire.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/realtime/single.php?A081350535>
- ecldcxix <http://www.haarp.alaska.edu/>
- ecldcxx <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/>
- ecldcxxi <http://video.google.co.uk/videoplay?docid=3258559205473754938>
- ecldcxxii http://www.willthomas.net/chemtrails/Articles/Weather_Warfare.htm
- ecldcxxiii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/Chemtrails>
- ecldcxxiv http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=efCelx7qe_M
- ecldcxxv <http://www.theforbiddenknowledge.com/hardtruth/silentweaponsforquietwars.htm>
- ecldcxxvi http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=182&Itemid=60
- ecldcxxvii [http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio2/ET_and_UFO/Marshall_Vian_Summers - ET Influences - Coast To Coast AM - Jun 09 2008.mp3](http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio2/ET_and_UFO/Marshall_Vian_Summers_-_ET_Influences_-_Coast_To_Coast_AM_-_Jun_09_2008.mp3)
- ecldcxxviii http://www.bbsradio.com/bbc/fred_bell/Dr._fred_bell_news_flashess2.shtml
- ecldcxxix <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2DdvaVQjuHg>
- ecldcxxx <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qSQZYypijxc>
- ecldcxxxi <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sSpjMWiABVQ>
- ecldcxxxii <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3OEMbZEacaw>
- ecldcxxxiii http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/NIST_RFC.html
- ecldcxxxiv http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/pics/Erin_2001_track.png
- ecldcxxxv http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=187&Itemid=60

- ccxxxvi http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9N5_LqbNtVY
- ccxxxvii
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=173&Itemid=50
- ccxxxviii <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-7365305906535911834>
- ccxxxix <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=7065205277695921912>
- ccxc <http://www.whale.to/cancer/koch.html>
- ccxci <http://www.whale.to/cancer/ivy.html>
- ccxcii <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=4312930190281243507>
- ccxciii <http://cancertutor.com/Cancer/Essiac.html>
- ccxciv <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=5528328984547372206>
- ccxcv <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-2782671863823995360>
- ccxcvi
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=61&Itemid=53
- ccxcvii
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=33&Itemid=59
- ccxcviii <http://www.starchildproject.com/>
- ccxcix <http://www.near-death.com/evidence.html>
- ccc http://www.amazon.co.uk/Raymond-Moody-Foreword-Elizabeth-Kubler-Ross/dp/0712602739/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1224454078&sr=1-1
- ccci <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Art-Dying-Peter-Fenwick/dp/0826499236>
- cccii http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/Richard_Hoagland_on_9-11_Coast_to_Coast_-_Apr_16_2008.mp3
- ccciii http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/Nick_Begich_-_on_Afghanistan_-_Coast_to_Coast_-_Dec_10_2006.mp3
- ccciv http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/David_Wilcock_Interview_-_March_2008_-_911_and_Looking_Glass.mp3
- cccv
http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=202&Itemid=60
- cccvii <http://www.travis-walton.com/>
- cccviii <http://www.checktheevidence.com/WBSmith>
- cccix <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vX1CvW38cHA>