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The New “9/11 Hijackers”?
Andrew Johnson, 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 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
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 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 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). 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?”)

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 – 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 Judy 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” 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.

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).
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 being 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 of Steve Jones links to the energy cover up, 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. 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 website. 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 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 the existing page (archived here) 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] and [2].

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. Judy 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. 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 and another of Judy Wood’s students had a fire in their apartment. Since that time, some people have tried to suggest that Judy 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. It basically seems like a smear campaign against Wood and Fetzer. Sometime after this, Judy received personal threats around the time she published the highly controversial “Beam Weapon” paper. (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.)

For online versions of these articles see: http://www.checktheevidence.com/ or google keywords
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 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. 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
Webcast, especially as she had been contacted by an attorney, Jerry Leaphart, who had seen Judy’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?”. Apparently 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 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.**

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 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 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
after, I received a message from Steve Jones asking me which questions he couldn’t answer, so **I pointed him at the list that Judy Wood had prepared**. 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 Judy’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.** 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 (linked 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 Judy 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 Lioy et al.** 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 Judy 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" 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 sulfdation 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.
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 Reynolds, 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:

| Judy Wood identified against her will | Steve Jones lauded and applauded for his “Why Indeed…” paper. |
| Judy Wood lost her job at Clemson | Steve Jones retired – and still salaried. |
| Judy Wood’s student Michael Zebuhr murdered | Steve Jones described in CBS News Piece as founder of ST911 (see also response from 911Scholars) |
| Judy Wood receives death threats | Steve Jones featured in “Improbable Collapse” |
| Judy Wood attacked for promoting “wild” | Steve Jones thermite_hypothesis_evidence |
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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Dr Greg Jenkins’ “Directed Debunking Energy” and Prof Judy Wood
Scholarly Questions and Inquiry, or Badgering, Misrepresentation and Harassment?
Andrew Johnson, 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 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.

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 Judy? 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 Judy out of going to the restroom, saying the "interview" would only take 2-3 minutes. But, Judy felt she couldn't wait. She saw the cameras for the first time after she came back from the restroom.

Judy insisted on switching seats with Greg Jenkins because there were other people in the room who were watching the interview and Judy 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 Judy 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 Judy would be there - who told him? Judy 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 Judy were the invited speaker at the National Press Club?

Judy 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 Judy, 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 Judy 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 Judy 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 Judy 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 Judy 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 Judy’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. Judy 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 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.
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 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 Judy’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 Judy's group with Judy'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” on Steve Jones’ Journal of 9/11 Studies. 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? How is it that the subway station has only a relatively small amount of debris and the train is not badly crushed and damaged? 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? 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 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.
Transcript of “Micronukes vs Thermite/Thermate at WTC”
Discussion 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.

Video: http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-1184826770885695772

Audio: http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Prof%20Steve%20Jones%20&%20Dr%20Bil l%20Deagle%20on%20WTC%20Destruction%20-%20Vancouver%20-%2024%20Jun%202007.mp3

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 Oaklahoma 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 Securirty don’t seem to have expressed an interest in this.

Listen to the audio or read the transcript.
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: 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: Well, I mean you're looking to [inaudible].

D: …the next thing.

J: …even Brazinsky before a Senate committee in the Congress just this

---

1 How will the citizens react to this? Will people simply accept it?
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 on2.

D: Oh absolutely.

3:33

J: ... I thought that was a good place to start. We agree first of all that the discussion should be evidence-based.3

D: Oh absolutely it can't be based on opinion4... 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 evidence5 --

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...

---

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?

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…?
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 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 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.  
8
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  
9
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.  
10
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.  
11
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 whatsoever... because they teach this course... in architecture around the world that these buildings were built to withstand up to a 9.5 earthquake 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

---

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...
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?
13 New York is not in an Earthquake zone.
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 -- Paramagnetic 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...

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

Person [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 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 -

---

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 thermit splash on them in the basement?
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 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. |

\(^{18}\) 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.

\(^{19}\) 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.
**Person** What would satisfy both of you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>What would satisfy both of you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>That's what I'm going to get at – it's what's called a crucial test. 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>Okay. Here we go now – Iron - you agree that... 59... iron 59?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>Well you're going to get iron 59 and 58. 58 is stable... a stable isotope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>So what we want is to look for short-lived isotopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>... and and longer ones too. You will see some long stable isotopes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>Okay but what we want is the ones that would represent neutron activation - cobalt 60 might be... iodine 110...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:59</td>
<td>Yeah exactly yeah. So if you show these heavier isotopes then that's going to help, yeah. Something I'm not sure about half-lifes, but cobalt 60 has a half life, I think, of 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>yeah but that's enough... because were only at five-and a half years now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Isn't it true, though that the super thermate if it is a fine dust near the outside of the building exploded?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>That's correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:10</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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?
building literally turn and then tilt and then, all of a sudden, that building just went poof22 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 because we expect that and - I’m certain – that you’re right and there was thermate or super thermate23 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 marshaled - 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 ?

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

22 This is a term Dr Wood has used…
23 No evidence has been provided that Super Thermate was or has been used or is in use anywhere.
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

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 have25 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 effects26 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 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

---

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_confinement_fusion )

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

J: What they found was that they found sediment layers that clearly identified the World Trade Centre dust on top and it’s identifiable, 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

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?

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?
tiny spheres and then kind of...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J:</th>
<th>... 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...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>but you know the half life of 110...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>It’s short... but..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>very short - in fact you can count it in days which is why after Chernoby...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>But there's enough time for it to still be there... and that doesn't...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>Just a month later there may not be detectable levels...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>I have to... there would be detectable levels after a month... we agree that will 110...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20:30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J:</th>
<th>Iodine 131, sorry.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>It could just be background...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>...it was made by these scientists that - there is then …and they had other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>Where is the dust that they gathered – was it on a roof somewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>No…It’s already lower than the sediment...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>It doesn’t matter...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>Why does the sediment below not...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{31}\) Melted – but what about the dust? Was “melted stuff” in the river?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J:</th>
<th>… what’s the half life?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>The half life is something like 72 hours – it’s very very short. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>I don’t know…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>If anybody has internet we can look it up. But the point is these serious scientists33 analysed…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>They never went…. and looked for the other ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>I have looked at some of those things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>Did you read my paper in the Journal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>I think I remember having a look at that yeah…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>Because this was one of the main points –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>Did they test for beryllium 9?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>They tested for iodine 131 specifically…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>And they did they do that by induction and coupled [plasma microscopy?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>I didn’t go back to …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>It’s actually a calculation based on ionization, so you have to…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>They measured the sediment layer…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>But what technologies did they use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>It’s in their paper I’m sure…but I don’t have that recollection – I quoted the result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>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…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>This is the sediment in the Hudson…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>No, this is now in the dust as I recall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>The dust at the bottom of the Hudson – yeah…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D:</td>
<td>Yeah – it was closer – if there was neutron activation produce those things – it would disappear pretty quickly though…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:</td>
<td>It varies a lot. I mean cobalt 60 – lasts a long time…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| D: | Oh yes – Cobalt 60 – but….

---

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”?
For online versions of these articles see: [http://www.checktheevidence.com/](http://www.checktheevidence.com/) or google keywords

| 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 | 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… |
| 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 |

[^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?

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…

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.

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 samples39 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 physicist40 – 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 minus41 – 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…

---

37 Beryllium 10 has a half life of $1.51 \times 10^6$ years - [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beryllium](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](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niobium) why is Deagle looking for this?

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?
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…

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…

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 operations – 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.

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 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

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

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 custody45 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, 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

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”?  
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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 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 Trace 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 this by the 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...

35:13 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

---

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?

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

50 What evidence is there that they use “layers” of explosives to destroy buildings? How was this done in Oklahoma – can Deagle supply more details?
me explaining because of my background as a chemist before I went into medicine I was a biochemist \textsuperscript{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 \textsuperscript{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 \textsuperscript{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 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 \textsuperscript{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? \textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{37:17} Person: Well I guess my biggest point here – questions to both of you – looks like

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

\textsuperscript{52} In how many floors? All of them – half? ¾ etc?

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

\textsuperscript{54} Will the trigger be fusion or fission? How is fission achieved without critical mass?

\textsuperscript{55} Why does Jones suddenly change the subject here, when it was getting so interesting…
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\(^{56}\) – that needs to happen now – but if we get additional evidence that there were nukes. Thermate can be acquired yeah, through e­­bay 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 excavating\(^{57}\) 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\(^{58}\) actually blowing up nukes in multiple cities and it also changes the level of…

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 whether the hypothesis is supported or not and if it is positive –

\(^{56}\) Chain of custody of evidence being…?

\(^{57}\) 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?
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…

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 lifes…

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 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 –

\(^{59}\) 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.

\(^{64}\) 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!
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 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 Thermit, but of course as a citizen you say well this is really getting very obvious.

D Yeah well, I gotta thankyou. I really think that the end-statement…

\(^{65}\) 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?

\(^{67}\) Can’t it be analysed with a mass-spectrometer?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Thank you – good talking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>Alright. Good. We're in quite good agreement – yes thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Yeah – you're welcome – take care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>You too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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" 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 (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 “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 e.g. 
http://www.newsday.com/news/printedition/nation/chi-070710chertoff,0,6464324,print.story in which he is quoted as saying:

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

Also, Air Force Gen. Victor "Gene" Renuart has said: 
(http://infowars.com/articles/terror/dhs_general_attack_could_happen_any_day.htm)

…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: 

"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 Qaeda 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” (http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/09/AR2007050902719.html)
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):

(http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/transcript/Jones_Deagle_transcript.html)

“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…

(the page above links to the Google-video of the discussion. 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.

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) - see http://www.deps.org/DEPSpages/sponsors.html

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 – see http://911research.wtc7.net/disinfo/alibis/cheney.html) 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 (see http://www.whitehouse.gov/government/mineta-bio.html) – 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” (see http://www.boeing.com/news/releases/2000/news_release_000408a.html )

**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.

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