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.

Please forward this article to everyone who may take it seriously – as soon as possible.

---

For online versions of these articles see: http://www.checktheevidence.com/ or google keywords
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

An audio-only copy can be heard here http://tinyurl.com/29xtwz . These really are extraordinary statements to come from two supposedly well-qualified scientists.

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 Forum, 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 School (Skipton) and left in 1983 with ‘A’ Levels in Maths, Physics, Chemistry and General Studies. I went on to Lancaster University 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. Dissatisfied with working conditions, I then moved back into industry (1995-1997) working in the field of Mobile Data. Following an attractive offer of work from a friend, I started to work at home, 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. I got into this work through the Open University - I tutor part time on a course called T224 (Computers and Processors). I began actively campaigning about 9/11 (writing letters, speaking to people in the street 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 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
A Touch of “The Hidden Hand”?
Is the Next False Flag Attack on US Soil Near?

Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com), 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” (http://www.xmradio.com/onxm/channelpage.xmc?ch=169). 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 - The Power” that 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’s shows the same treatment.

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 (http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/DEW/StarWarsBeam1.html). 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 “distufied”, 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 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.

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?”) 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 article, and there were certain other questions he seemed unduly unwilling to attempt to answer.

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 to Morgan Reynolds’ and Judy 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.)

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 - I found it surprising when Hoffman seemed to be suggesting that cellphone calls could have been made successfully from Flight 93, in the light of my own knowledge about the “hand-off” problem, and the study completed by Kee Dewdney (Project Achilles). Also, I found Hoffman’s mention of a “hoax theory” 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 (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 has been produced only to make money (even when it is freely available on Google Video).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>You mean under a scanning electron microscope?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>No – this is optically and looking at the material under a microscope – oh about 100x (power) yes -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>So they’re pretty big chunks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>They’re a fairly good size – 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…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>You mean the thermate – before the thermate might have been exploded or broken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>That’s right – before the reaction – this material in this shell form – so we’re pursuing that. That would be a great discovery to find it after and before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>So in other words there may have been some thermate areas that weren’t exploded…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>…that did not explode – that were blown up and you have these little pieces now…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Oh really?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yes – and so we’re very excited…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>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 – 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Yeah well, I gotta thank you. I really think that the end-statement…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**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. 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 hominem 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
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 justice55 – 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 accept 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 excavating56 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 them actually blowing up nukes in multiple cities and it also changes the level of… |
| J: | [inaudible] a little more [inaudible] |
| 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 whether the hypothesis is supported or not and if it is positive – |

55 Chain of custody of evidence being…?
56 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?

---

Ostracism

From an observer’s stand point, it seemed to me that people like Rosalee Grable, Nico Haupt, Gerard Holmgren, Morgan and Judy 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.

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 perpetrators 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. 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).

Jerry Leaphart and NIST/NCST Review Meeting

On Dec 14th 2006, I received a message from Judy 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. Judy asked me to record the
already had 22 cities pre-wired with nukes and they told me the names of the cities that are targets*.  

J: I heard of some of these names – one’s not too far from here actually [yes – Seattle]?

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** 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 by this special agent – that told me this – there was 2 unexploded micronukes a C4 pineapple, RDX and there was thermate in the building that was not exploded in the Oklahoma city Murrah building. OK?** 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…

35:17 J: Oh absolutely – C4 or RDX

D: Yeah – there could have been others ones– they had a whole bunch of layers*** – like this guy literally told 5 or 6 things and he spent hours with

---

* 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?

** 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?

*** 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?

**** Readers might also compare the damage in the Murrah building with that in WTC 6 (link)

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

---

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

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 Judy Wood).

Black Projects and Alex Floum

When I had read Judy Wood’s Beam Weapon (now often termed Direct Energy Weapon - DEW) paper, 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.

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. Why should he 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 Judy’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 Judy Wood had raised. Soon
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.

25:10

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. 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…

29:40

J: 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…

D: 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. 

30:05

J: 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 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, 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 of some event – in the United States blamed on Iran…

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" 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 Judy’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 interview 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.

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 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 “Walmart” 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…
Of course, but I mean Iron – you’ve got tons of iron

Yeah, I saw 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

I showed it to a machinist – it’s hard to tell – it’s clearly an iron bar - it’s clearly opened [7]

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…

It does have some residue [yeah] on it …

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.

…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…

Yeah - most of the isotopes though will be stable not radioactive…

I guess you know the answer… it’s in my paper. There was no radioactivity [yeah] in this iron[36] – this steel from the World Trade Centre 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…

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]

So the point is, I summarized in my paper [yeah] various studies that had

Iron 58 I think lasts quite a while too.

Yeah – but then indeed but depending on the basis - cobalt 59

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

Iron 58 is a STABLE isotope – not radioactive.

For online versions of these articles see: http://www.checktheevidence.com/ or google keywords

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”. 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.
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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,
35 Repeated references to IRON – was it iron or steel they tested?
36 Iron 58 is a STABLE isotope – not radioactive.
31 Melted – but what about the dust? Was “melted stuff” in the river?

J: … melted. Melted\(^3\) 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 Chernobyil...

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...

20:30

J: 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

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…

\(^3\) Melted – but what about the dust? Was “melted stuff” in the river?
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... ?

15:33

D: It was a special op agent that told me this...

J: ... without fission. But... okay. But still you get....

D: But they might have26 a fission / fusion bomb.

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 effects27 in order to create a fusion reaction and also these super high-powered lasers27. 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 internally28 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 try 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

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...

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_confine... )

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

Readers who think Judy might be wrong about the nature of the debris should consider these pictures [1] [2] [3]. 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 Judy Wood was shown

It must also be noted that Judy was not shown an identical image to the one that Greg Jenkins inserted into the video he posted. Judy 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 Judy 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, Judy 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 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 Judy for her time in answering the questions. 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 Judy 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 Judy’s actual paper. However, a statement that Judy 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.
Of the 26 floors from the top you saw... a portion of the... 28... in the video... a portion of the... 21

For online versions of these articles see: http://www.checktheevidence.com/; or google keywords

Additionally (as of Mar 02 2007), though there is a link in this paper to Judy’s homepage (http://janedoe0911.tripod.com) 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 (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 Judy Wood’s discussion of molten aluminium as “disinformation”. If the hard evidence Judy is presenting is nonsense, why is so much time and energy being spent in attacking it?

Conclusion

It seems that Judy's only mistake was to agree to answer a few questions. It was a “failure” based on Judy'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. Judy 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 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. 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.

---

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?
normal combustible materials couldn’t have done to the buildings - it had
to have been controlled demolition.

J: So we agree with that...

D: 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 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?

D: We have photos...

Person: We have photos from them ... and apparently [inaudible] and all documented with the location...?

D: I heard they're still stored down there 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 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. 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...

[Deagle]

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

8:05 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 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 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: ...the next thing.

D: ...even Brazinsky before a Senate committee in the Congress just this

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