

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

by Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com) 1st March 2008

In 2006, Dr. Wood had posted her first study of the destruction of the WTC complex and in an appendix linked some information regarding what has become known as the "Hutchison Effect" - as a possible energy phenomenon that might have some relevance to what happened on 9/11. In approximately mid November 2007, Dr. Wood had cause to revisit the idea of the Hutchison effect and she sent John some of the WTC photo evidence she had been studying, for him to comment on. It was a pleasant surprise to find that John was willing to discuss areas of correspondence between WTC photo evidence and the effects seen in his own experiments. Most other people with a science background that we had contacted had not expressed any interest in, for example, discussing the links between the Cold Fusion cover up and 9/11. (See CB Brooklyn's article about Prof Steve Jones and 9/11). John was very helpful to us and sent us ideas, pictures, information and photos of documents he has kept. He has a number of "Blogs" that he has created, where he has posted hundreds of images related to his work and interests. Some of the things he has posted are very candid and open. John sent us scans or photos of various documents and photos showing how his work has been investigated by Scientists, the Military and in various TV documentaries, almost since the time he started his experiments, back in 1979. On 25th December 2007, having discussed a number of points of evidence with me and with John Hutchison and got agreement that he could be listed as a co-author, Dr. Wood began posting a new series of web pages entitled Anomalies at the WTC and the Hutchison Effect. A few days later around 12th Jan 2008, Dr. Wood added a kind of "overview list" to the front page, to show a summary of the main evidence, which we found to be quite compelling, and the preliminary feedback that we got generally indicated the same feeling. Also on 12th Jan 2008, I travelled to Washington DC having been invited to go onto Ambrose Lane's show "We Ourselves" on Mon 14th Jan and Fri 18th Jan. At that point, I was not sure whether I would be appearing with Dr. Wood on the same programmes, but thankfully, she was able to make the trip. As anticipated, Dr. Wood and I appeared on Ambrose Lane's "We Ourselves" programme on 14th and 18th of January and we were honoured to be joined on the 18th of January by John Hutchison himself, who confirmed details of his work and some of the witnesses to it, and he also expressed an interest in some of the effects seen at the World Trade Centre. He also agreed that the ongoing effects at the Deutsche Bank (Banker's Trust) building were indicative of some type of infection. (Links to audios of these interviews are here [1] [2] - please download and share. Links to videos of these interviews are on this website and Dr. Wood's website.) About six hours after the radio show, also on Fri 18th Jan, Alexander ("Ace") Baker sent an e-mail regarding the Hutchison effect to Dr. Wood, myself and several others. Baker is a fellow 9/11 researcher, whom I admired for his notable "Chopper 5 Study". This study was a detailed video analysis showing that the live WNYW (Fox 5) helicopter video of UA Flight 175 striking the World Trade Centre is a fake. I had also been impressed with way that Ace had dealt with rebuttals to his analysis from Eric Salter, another researcher, who had been quite rude to Ace. Ace had also appeared several times on Jim Fetzer's "Dynamic Duo" radio programme, and Prof Fetzer often introduced him as an "expert in digital processing". In Ace Baker's e-mail, he said he was about to attempt to produce or reproduce the Hutchison Effect experiment. He said "As it turns out I have experience with Tesla Coils. As a young teenager, I helped build a Tesla coil device. It was a Boy Scout project." His e-mail included further details about how he had made the Tesla Coil - a device for generating a high voltage discharge, and that he was going to attempt to make two smaller coil assemblies that same weekend. This timing seemed quite interesting, though I have to confess that, at the time, I was a little puzzled at why, he had chosen to do this, but I did not think too much more about it. About two hours later on 18th Jan, Ace sent another e-mail, saying he had actually managed to obtain Tesla Coils on e-bay and that they would be delivered on Sunday by Special Delivery. (Which mail delivery services work on Sunday? Why did Ace want them so quickly?). Subsequently, on Monday 21st Jan, Ace sent another e-mail saying "Success! I have reproduced the Hutchison Effect!" In that message (which was also sent to John Hutchison) was a link to a YouTube video which Ace had made of his experiment. (The original video that Ace posted was moved to a different place on YouTube) I responded to Ace, asking if he could post a YouTube video (not realising he had already done so, due to only rapidly scanning the subject line of his message and not reading the body). The video showed a doll's house with a toy table moving jerkily around and then "flying up" into the air. A reflection of the toy table was shown in a small mirror. The video seemed to be of good quality. On watching the video, I was rather uneasy - my feeling was that what he had made was a fake video, though I didn't have enough information to be certain, so I made no further comments at the time. I could see he had gone to some trouble to make the video - which, to me, meant one of two things. (a) The video was genuine and Ace really had managed to reproduce the effect. (b) Ace had made a fake video for some other unknown reason. I could not really convince myself that (a) was the correct reason, because I was certain that John Hutchison had spent quite some time in getting his experiments to work successfully (in the early days, he was unable to produce effects reliably, but latterly he is able to produce effects very reliably). I was therefore suspicious that Ace's presentation was not. John responded to Ace's posting of the video saying that he thought it was "cute". However, I left this all "on one side" as I was about to return to the UK. On returning to the UK, I wrote a press release, which was reviewed and edited by Dr. Wood and Dr. Reynolds. The press release discussed the main points of correspondence between the WTC photo evidence and the various aspects of the Hutchison Effect. It also mentioned the discussion of 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect on Ambrose Lane's show. When we did the shows, we were pleased with the audience reaction - especially the initial reaction we got from one caller who said: "This is a revelation beyond revelations...this trumps everything...If this story ever gets out, it will change the course of the United States' and the whole world's history." On 30th Jan 2008, the press release was posted on several Websites, including PR Log and OpEdNews. The reaction was generally quite small, but mostly positive. On 7th Feb 2008, Dr. Judy Wood appeared on the Dynamic Duo, with guest host Dr. Morgan Reynolds, to discuss the Hutchison Effect and 9/11. It was intended that John Hutchison would also appear, but John had to take an important call, so he was unable to join the discussion. As had been posted elsewhere, Dr. Wood had filed a Qui Tam case against a number

of contractors who contributed to the fraudulent NIST NCSTAR reports. (Dr. Wood's filing of a "Request for Correction" earlier in the year laid the foundations for the Qui Tam). As things turned out, more documents towards this case had to be filed by Friday 29th February 2008. A lot of work had to be done to meet this deadline, as Dr. Wood wanted to incorporate newer information into the submission. On Weds 27th February, Ace Baker sent another e-mail to a group of people (including John Hutchison). In this message he said that he would be appearing, again, on Jim Fetzer's Dynamic Duo radio show to discuss further aspects of 9/11 video fakery and also ... his work on the Hutchison Effect. Though Ace had advised us on the 26th Feb that he would be appearing on the 27th, in his latest message, Ace included links to 3 new video clips he had made which seemed to reproduce some of the effects that John Hutchison had seen in his experiments. It felt odd that Ace would be discussing the Hutchison Effect with Jim Fetzer before Dr. Wood – but it seemed to be clear where Ace was heading with his discussion. The 3 new video clips were of good quality, and in one of them, Ace appeared on the left, juggling balls, whilst the Hutchison effect demonstration occurred over in a framed area to the right. In another clip, the background showed a small Tesla coil, discharging, whilst the effect took place in a framed area in the foreground. Before the Show with Ace When Ace had said that he was going to be discussing the Hutchison Effect on the Dynamic Duo with Prof Jim Fetzer, Dr. Wood expressed surprise that Ace would be going on before her, discussing things that related to an area in which he had no special expertise. Fetzer initially responded saying he did not know what Dr. Wood meant, because he hadn't asked Ace to talk about the Hutchison Effect, only video fakery. Dr. Wood pointed out that Ace Baker had said he would be talking about the Hutchison Effect in the same e-mail that Fetzer then responded to! Fetzer then said he'd missed this in Ace's e-mail, but had not imposed any restrictions on Ace as to what he should talk about, but he did offer to switch the appearances over. Dr. Wood was not able to appear on the Wednesday night, so Ace Baker was still scheduled to appear. Ace Baker on Dynamic Duo Ace Baker appeared with Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo, as planned, on 27th Feb. In the first hour, Ace discussed other video fakery research he had been doing, but in the 2nd hour, he discussed the Hutchison Effect. His opening statement more or less set the tone of what was to follow: "There are a lot of disciplines that are relevant to 9/11 [research] and, while nuclear physics and quantum mechanics are not my areas of expertise, video fakery is." Ace had posted some videos on his relatively new Blog (started in Feb 2008). Ace Baker does have his own website, where he has some 9/11 research posted, but the Hutchison-related information, as well as a critique of other 9/11 video fakery research, has been posted on his Blog (perhaps for the purpose of obtaining more comments etc). He started by describing a video he had edited together showing some of the aspects of the Hutchison effect. The 1 minute 10 second compilation of clips showed only the levitation effects and even though he showed a clip with the cannonball, he did not show the cannonball levitating. (Neither did his clip show any metal effects such as snapping bending or "jellification", which can be seen in the videos I edited of Ambrose Lane interviews). Ace Baker then went on to discuss the video clips he had made and how he had faked the levitation effects by using a magnet to make objects stick to the wooden surface, whilst they were filmed upside down. Then he would move the magnet around for a few moments, before finally removing the magnet so that the object fell down (thus appearing to levitate). Ace went on to explain that he had seen videos of John Hutchison's demonstrations about 10 years ago (on a low quality tape) and assumed that he was seeing things being filmed upside down. I had also seen similar videos 10 years ago and, at that time, without much additional information or exploration probably would have then agreed that it was trickery of some kind. Later, I did gather more information and realised there was a lot more to this – such as the interest of people like Boyd Bushman at Lockheed Martin. Clearly Ace had spent some time setting up these demonstrations – putting magnetic or metal pins or pieces in the toys/samples in the correct place so that they would work well in the demonstrations. He also later explained how he had split the screen and done a video overlay, which allowed him to appear and a cat to appear at the same time as the "effects" were happening. Hutchison and Tesla Ace mentioned that John Hutchison was trying to mimic the experiments of Tesla and then Ace went on to describe Tesla's brilliance – for example for inventing a system of alternating current for use in electrical power transmission over cables, but Ace incorrectly attributed the invention of the Vacuum Tube to Tesla. (This is credited to John Ambrose Fleming, who invented the first practical electron tube called the 'Fleming Valve'. In 1904). Ace then went on to acknowledge the possibility that something very powerful and mysterious that had been kept secret, but he said he thought the John Hutchison videos were fake. (Indeed, his 28th Feb 2008 blog entry unambiguously declares "John Hutchison is a Fraud". Curiously, the filename that this entry was saved under is entitled "judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html"). In the programme, he said: "It's tough for me. There is no bigger supporter of Judy Wood's work than I, but [I feel have to] offer whatever input I can in my strongest area of expertise which is – while I don't really know that much about quantum mechanics – I do know a thing or two about video." Does Ace believe that using deception is a way of showing support? Ace and the Red Bull Ace had also set up a demonstration of a red bull can bobbing around and then crushing, comparing it to one of John's own experiments with a Red Bull can. He explained he had to put steel screws in it because the can was aluminium, and therefore not magnetic. He explained how he had reached in and crushed the can every so often, as he filmed it, then he edited out the portions of video where his hand appeared. He explained how he carefully arranged the lighting, and then did a video composite – showing the clocks on the right hand side, so that the viewer would think there were no edits in the video. It would therefore appear Ace had clearly gone to quite a bit of trouble to make this video. The motion of the can in John Hutchison's video is not the same as in Ace Baker's video – it is more fluid. Also, the can flexes and bends in the middle slightly as well as at the end. Also, at the end, it appears to go out of view, then come back into view a couple of times. Ace and Jim Fetzer then discussed briefly how the Wikipedia article on John Hutchison is "skeptical" of his experiments, claiming he cannot reproduce them. This is untrue. Wikipedia seemed to be an unusual source for Jim and Ace to quote, considering the pedigree of Wikipedia when it comes to the discussion of 9/11 research - see Jim Fetzer's passionate remarks on this topic. They did not quote any of the other significant articles about the Hutchison Effect, such as those listed on a site called RexResearch, though they did note Wikipedia Page had been edited around the time the show went on air. Ace then went on to discuss John Hutchison's "toy

UFO" video, which used a wire attached the toy UFO. Ace describes how the UFO is levitating, but there is a "problem" because of the string. The truth behind this experiment is that it was not a levitation experiment in the same way as the others were. This was for a high voltage experiment – with the voltage being delivered through a wire (not a string). Ace and the Boat Experiment Jim Fetzer and Ace then discuss the Boat Experiment video, where John has placed a boat in a shallow tank of water. The water "shimmers" and the boat wobbles slightly. Additionally, fires periodically light and extinguish around the sides of the boat. http://drjudywood.com/videos/video_comments.html#boat Ace suggests that, because we can't see the right hand end of the boat, someone is likely to be holding it and moving the boat. Ace then discusses the strange fires which skip around the boat and then says they disappear within one frame and the water goes calm. This description is inaccurate, as the water is moving and flames are seen approximately 10 seconds into the video. Later in the video, however, flames are seen when the water is calm – this is repeated at 1 minute 10 seconds. At 1 minute 25 seconds, flames are seen when the water is calm again. Ace suggests the fire is real and that John may have "flash powder" or something like that, but this does not seem plausible as the same points on the boat ignite more than once in the sequence (and I can see no evidence of editing). Also, is it possible to get such fire effects without smoke? Is it possible to get such fire effects of that colour, lasting for several seconds, rather than just a single flash? I really don't think this is flash powder. The fire/flashes in the YouTube videos don't resemble those shown in the boat video - there is much more smoke, the flashes are short-lived and they are more explosive. Ace suggests the tub is vibrated by a sander. Why would the tank need to be vibrated? How does it help the supposed fakery? Surely the vibration is not really very interesting in itself – but the fire is – so why bother faking the vibration? Ace then offers to make a reproduction of the boat video (which again, would take quite some trouble and perhaps at least \$100 for the materials?). Why do this? At the end of the show, Fetzer thanked Ace for coming on and said he would "have to have [him] back".

Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison on Dynamic Duo (Commentary) On 28th February, Dr. Wood and John Hutchison appeared on the show with Jim Fetzer. Fetzer had had stomach flu for some time and seemed fairly quiet. Nevertheless, he did ask John Hutchison about his educational and career background, and his source of income for more than the last 30 years – this is far more than he has done with his other guests. John replied candidly, with no trace of reticence or concern. Later, John described how Scientists such as Rene Louis Vallee and Andrei Sakharov had studied the Hutchison Effect and had suggested many of the effects were caused by an interaction between the electrostatic and RF fields, but that this interaction was not immediate – the effects only happened some time after the fields had interacted. As Judy and John discussed some of the effects on the steel and the glass at the World Trade Centre, Jim Fetzer seemed noticeably quiet and there were a number of longer silences as Judy waited for Fetzer's reaction. After an interesting discussion about the residual effects at Ground Zero, Fetzer switched to asking where John Hutchison was on 9/11 and then he asked John thought about Ace Baker's attempts at copying Hutchison's effects. John said he thought Ace was "having fun" with his video project, and Fetzer then said that because John's effects were "so peculiar and so odd" that the possibility of video fakery should not be ruled out. Before John had a chance to answer this point, Fetzer started talking to Judy again, and moved on to the next section of the webpage. Judy then said "what happened on 9/11 was pretty unbelievable – does that mean it didn't happen?" In the remaining minutes of the programme, there were a number of rather long silences as Judy pointed out the unusual aspects of the data. Judy asked if the perpetrators of 9/11 would want people to look at the data. Jim Fetzer, without responding, then asked John if his phenomena had anything to do with 9/11. John responded saying he thought there was a "high probability" when considering how much research had been going on into other directed energy weapons and how powerful they were. Fetzer then thanked Judy and John for coming on, but asked no further questions and made no further comments. He did not seem to express the same enthusiasm for his guests as he usually does, although perhaps this was due to his illness.

Ace Baker Sends More e-mails around Weds 27th A sequence of e-mails were sent by Ace Baker, around the time of the Weds 27th Dynamic Duo. In the first of these, Ace stated: Hutchison is a video faker, pure and simple. There is no Hutchison Effect. I'm sorry. Hutchison makes silly upside-down videos. He then went onto explain how the thought some of the videos had been made and he said: He's been caught red-handed using strings on the toy UFO thing. Ace repeated some of the points he had made in the program, but he seemed far more certain of what he was saying and also he seemed quite angry: As long as he was just pushing UFO's, I didn't care. But when he stepped into 9/11, and video fakery, he stepped onto MY TURF. Under NO circumstances will I allow John Hutchison to pollute 9/11 research with his trickery. This seemed to be a very odd statement. The only context in which UFO's had been mentioned was in relation to the video of the high voltage experiment, which Ace took to be something else (levitation using a string). Why did Ace react so vigorously to John? In any case, all that John had done was comment on some of the evidence that Judy had collected regarding the World Trade Centre. It was Judy who contacted John and John had sent information and comments – John was not "polluting 9/11 research". Ace had stated that he is Judy's greatest supporter, but it was apparent that Ace was not supporting Judy's research expertise. Ace had accused John of trickery because he could make videos which mimicked some aspects of John's experiments. Ace had not reproduced: a) the levitation of the cannonball b) the metal effects c) the fire effects d) the bending and flexing motions in the can In fact, Ace had not properly reproduced any of John's videos. For Ace to call John a fraud seemed a very bold and reckless, because we had substantial evidence that John's experiments had been validated many times. We had documents from Scientists, we had TV documentaries and letters from Canadian and Government groups showing how they had been actively researching the phenomena John had discovered. In addition, it was Ace himself who admitted he had been dishonest and deceptive about the videos he presented. Is this a good way to find the truth about something? Ace claimed to have explained some of the other effects that John had generated: The bent rod is . . . a bent rod. He heated it up, bent it, and let it cool. Notice how it's charred in the middle, like where the bend is? This, again, seemed like a rush-to-judgement. I had observed a number of metal samples from John, such as these: Ace had not bothered to check the diameter of the rods which John had bent – up to 3 inches in diameter. I had seen no evidence of "burn marks". Was John a blacksmith as well as a video faker? (That is, he would need a hot kiln and metal shaping tools

to do this.) Though not video fakery per se, the metal sample with the knife in it is equally silly. The knife is stainless steel. The metal looks like a very soft aluminum. He poured some liquid aluminum around a knife. When it cooled off, he took a grinder to it. Voila! Fused knife! Please. How did John get liquid aluminium to work this way? We can see on the right hand side the knife is quite well embedded into the metal block, though over to the left it does not seem fully fused. The marks of the surface of the block go in different directions, and certainly do not look like the results from using a grinder. In the picture on the right, why would molten aluminium would have left the wood unburned? A Lack of Scientific Curiosity? On 29th February, a deadline for filing documents in Judy's Qui Tam case, Ace Baker sent another e-mail, noting how he had advised Judy, Morgan Reynolds and myself of his claim to have bought Tesla coils on e-bay in mid-January. He then said: Dr.. Wood said nothing. Dr.. Reynolds said nothing. ... Mr. Leaphart said nothing. I had produced evidence of anti-gravity levitation, one of the most important and amazing aspects of the Hutchison Effect, and the silence was deafening. This, to me, seemed to make Ace's motive clear. He seemed to be saying "I made a fake video. You didn't detect it was fake, therefore how can your judgement be trusted?" Unlike Ace, I did not want to accuse him outright of fakery, because I did not feel I had enough evidence to be certain that he had made a fake video. I did not want to get into a debate about this peculiar behaviour. He asked why we had not asked him questions about his experiment and how peculiar he found it. John had sent Ace (and others) a follow-up email, noting that Ace's video was a joke. John pointed out that Ace would need a lot more equipment to produce the Hutchison Effect. (Note, John does not use Tesla coils for levitation.) My response at this time was to send Ace an e-mail message with some of the most interesting questions regarding the Hutchison Effect. 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?3) How would you explain the ongoing effects on the Banker's trust building? Regarding John Hutchison, I asked Ace these questions: 1) How do you explain the samples of metal that he has shown us?2) How do you explain the multiple witnesses to his experiments?3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security? (see attached - as posted on his blog)4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him? (see attached- as posted on his blog)5) What do you think of Col John Alexander's statements that John Hutchison is seeing the effects of "PK" (Psychokinesis)?6) Why would LANL express an interest in basic video fakery and spend 4 months working with John? Ace responded a short time later saying: > 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?Good question. Certainly very powerful weapons of some type were used to disintegrate the towers.> 2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?Good question. Ordinarily bending steel like that requires foundry conditions. So Ace did not have an alternative explanation for what happened at the WTC, but he still thought it was a powerful weapon. Ace rejected the idea that a letter from the Canadian Government to John said that his work was a matter of National Security: > 3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security? (see attached - as posted on his blog)I read the letter. It does not classify "his experiments as a matter of National Security". It is rejecting Hutchison's request for information on the grounds of National Security. Please. Ace's response was, to me, a very unusual response – the letter clearly linked John's experiments with National Security issues, even if the exact meaning is somewhat ambiguous. Ace's next response was also very surprising to me:> 4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him? (see attached- as posted on his blog)Have Mr. Puthoff and/or Col. Alexander contact me, and I'll explain to them how Huthison's videos are made. This demonstrated an unusual lack of humility. Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander are well known in "alternative knowledge" circles. Alexander is best known for his involvement in the Non Lethal Weapons programme. Puthoff is an experimental Physicist and he has published many papers and a textbook on "Quantum Electronics". He has ties to the NSA, so like Alexander, seems to be connected to the Military Industrial Complex. So, Ace was suggesting that he'd be able to convince two well known figures, both who have ties to the Military Industrial Complex and have expressed interest, over several years, in John Hutchison's work, that John was a fraud? This claim of Ace's was quite extraordinary to me. Ace went on to suggest that the researchers from Los Alamos never actually visited John – he seemed to be suggesting John had made the whole thing up. Ace further stated: I'm 100% certain that Hutchison's videos were made exactly as I describe. So Ace was saying the Hutchison videos were fake, but still didn't explicitly disagree the Hutchison Effect evidence was similar to effects seen at the WTC. Ace didn't really fully address the fact that many videos of John's experiments were taken by other production companies, such as www.gryphonproductions.com and www.bluebookfilms.com. I wanted to confirm some of the answers Ace had given so I sent him another message, asking him to confirm that his views on these points: 1) Everything JH says regarding his experiments is fake.2) Los Alamos have helped him promote fakery of one kind or another.3) All the metal samples he has are fake or not what he says they are.4) You have no idea what caused the documented effects at the World Trade Centre. Ace responded, saying he thought all of John's videos were fake (but I asked about the actual experiments, not just the videos). Regarding the Los Alamos National Labs (LANL) connection, Ace said: Or, it could be that the government is seizing an opportunity to promote false beliefs. They do that ALL THE TIME. If there is any documentation about LANL and Hutchison, I'll review it. Currently, I don't have copies of substantial documentation, but I have seen at least 2 documents showing the connection, and Col John Alexander certainly doesn't deny his connection to John Hutchison. Ace also confirmed he does not know how the WTC was destroyed. Questions The key questions in all of this seem to be: 1) Why has Ace Baker taken it upon himself to try to disprove the Hutchison Effect? Why is this so important?2) Why has he gone to such trouble to make several different videos? (A new one appeared whilst this article was being written.)3) Was the timing of his attack on the Hutchison Effect coincidental?4) Why did he accuse Drs. Wood, Reynolds and Jerry Leaphart of a lack of Scientific Curiosity?5) Why does he regard 9/11 Research as "his turf"?6) Why does he seem reluctant to talk about the links between the Hutchison Effect evidence and WTC Evidence?7) Why is his reaction so vehemently against the Hutchison Effect (e.g. "John Hutchison is a fraud") with no leeway for his own error. I.e. why doesn't he say "I am pretty sure it isn't related to the Hutchison Effect, but there could be something here."8) Why is his research into the Hutchison Effect so different in character to his other research such as the Chopper 5

video? Conclusion I would suggest the reason is that Ace Baker knows that the Hutchison Effect is very relevant to what happened on 9/11 and he wants to discourage people from thinking this. I would suggest he did this to try to break up a small group of researchers. and to try to set them against one another. (I suggested this idea to Ace in a follow up e-mail and he did not respond to this point). I would suggest Ace Baker knows more than he is letting on. Who else knows? Emails E-Mail 1-----Original Message-----From: Ace Baker [mailto:ace@acebaker.com]Sent: 18 January 2008 21:35To: johnhutchison; Judy WoodCc:Subject: Re: Attempt to produce Hutchison effect Group, Such exciting new developments! As it turns out, I have experience with Tesla Coils. As a young teenager, I helped build a Tesla coil device. It was a Boy Scout project. We made a primary coil out of #6 gauge wire wrapped around a cylindrical arrangement of styrene plastic ribs. The secondary coil began as an 8 foot cardboard tube from the inside of a roll of carpet. We used a bicycle pedal to turn the tube as we wrapped the length of it with a fine, 24 gauge uninsulated copper wire. We built a model city out of wood and cardboard. It had fluorescent bulbs, hooked up to nothing! When we turned the coil on, sure enough, the fluorescent bulbs lit up like Times Square. It was displayed at the "Scout-A-Rama". Some official deemed it "unsafe" and we weren't allowed to turn it on. We were all quite angry about that, we had been quite sure we'd win a ribbon. My daughter and I are going to build two smaller coil assemblies this weekend, with variable voltage power supplies. Wish us luck! E-Mail 2----- Original Message -----From: "Ace Baker" ace@acebaker.com>To: xxxxSent: Friday, January 18, 2008 11:20 PMSubject: Bought Tesla Coils on Ebay > Got two different ones, they should both be here by Sunday, special> delivery. Can't wait. Don't have to build them. Love Ebay.===== E-Mail 3----- Original Message -----From: ace bakerTo:Cc:Sent: Monday, January 21, 2008 7:41 AMSubject: Success! I have reproduced the Hutchison Effect! Group, This is very exciting. I have reproduced the Hutchison Anti-Gravity Effect. Please see this video. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JKgHGOB4CIU> Please give me your comments. Sincerely, Ace Baker E-Mail 4----- Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 21 January 2008 10:09To: ace baker; Judy WoodCc: Subject: Re: Success! I have reproduced the Hutchison Effect! Ace, This sounds very interesting indeed! Would you be able to post a video to YouTube or somewhere? We might be able to use it! Andrew E-mail 5----- Original Message-----From: Ace Baker [mailto:ace@acebaker.com]Sent: 27 February 2008 03:30To:Cc:Subject: Re: You Tube H-Effect Group, Here's some of my original work that I'll be discussing with professor Fetzer. Enjoy, and comments welcome of course.Tesla's Dancing Screw <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-fHjnhS-T8U> Anti-gravity goop <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KywkBdLqaDU> Red Bull can experiment <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hiNPYQv8yNQ> E-mail 6-----Original Message-----From: Ace Baker [mailto:ace@acebaker.com]Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2008 9:01 PMTo:Cc:Subject: Re: Status on Video Group, Well, we have a little issue with regard to the Hutchison Effect. Hutchison is a video faker, pure and simple. There is no Hutchison Effect. I'm sorry. Hutchison makes silly upside-down videos. If he video tapes one more thing falling up, I'll scream. He has a rotating miniature room like the old Fred Astaire movie. It's pretty cool, but it doesn't fool me. He wiggles things with a magnet on the back side, other times he has strings. He edits video, making things appear to change instantly. He's been caught red-handed using strings on the toy UFO thing. The boat is being moved by a person out of the picture, notice you can't see the back end of it. The vibrating water is - a vibrator touching the tub. The spontaneous fires are probably real fires, ignited flash powder. Notice that the fires appear and disappear instantly, and on the same frame the water instantly changes from vibrating to calm. They are edits. He reached in, lit the fires, got his hand out quickly. Then he edited out where his hands came in. OK? Same deal with his pieces of metal that bend instantly. It's a freaking edit. Go watch "I Dream of Genie" reruns. Look, Genie pops in instantly! If Hutchison's metal really moved that fast, there would be motion blur. There isn't. At least he could learn some new software, and do some compositing like I have. He could add references to up and down, and to continuous time, as I have done. And a touch of motion blur as needed. Though not video fakery per se, the metal sample with the knife in it is equally silly. The knife is stainless steel. The metal looks like a very soft aluminum. He poured some liquid aluminum around a knife. When it cooled off, he took a grinder to it. Voila! Fused knife! Please. The bent rod is . . . a bent rod. He heated it up, bent it, and let it cool. Notice how it's charred in the middle, like where the bend is? The little chips of metal are . . . little chips of metal. He attacked it with a grinder or whatever. The Red Bull can I explained. The one with the two levitating dishes is cute. They appear to float upwards a little bit, and rotate in the air, then fall down. Actually they are upside down, hanging from the ceiling by a string through the center. He lets the string down a little, then pulls it up quickly, slamming the dishes together against the ceiling. The whole thing is in slow motion. Did I miss any? Don't think so. Here is John Hutchison himself, to me, in an email from just last night, regarding my H-Effect videos. And I quote: "cool stuff makes it easy dont forget my ex had her own motion picture company in los angeles and showed me cool stuff on a grand scale look for fred astaire revolving room also the movei cleopatra was done images bolted onto the camera giving the top section to the movei sets she blw up a mountain it looked like that but it was styrofoam with strings in a studio plus she showed me how cars ride on 2 sets of wheels and also the never ending story realy neet stuff are you working in the industry now ??? love to meet we are going ahead with the network tv show and you would be great to have around robert drake my producer will be on with" I was quite civil today on Dynamic Duo. The truth is John Hutchison is an unabashed fraud and charlatan. He is a disgrace. As long as he was just pushing UFO's, I didn't care. But when he stepped into 9/11, and video fakery, he stepped onto MY TURF. Under NO circumstances will I allow John Hutchison to pollute 9/11 research with his trickery. It would be really, really a good idea to pull the plug on "Hutchison Effect", admit some errors, and get back to business. Sincerely, E-mail 7-----Original Message-----From: johnhutchison [mailto:heffect@infinet.net]Sent: 28 February 2008 09:37To:Cc: Subject: Re: Re: in the old days such asinine statements where dealt with pistols in traditionl dueling ace buddy your challenged to this;;; with witnesses as traditional ways with men not faggets or little men with little you know what ;;;real men with hearts who respect woman and children who have honor and dont wine and whimper to lawyers or cops like cowards,, its my way and was done before with fists and weapons iam not jokeing lucky no body got killed but a bloody mess i dont hide also in virtual worlds like a lot of

psychological damaged folks do hideing and playing cyber games i normaly dont like confrontation but when its on me watch out i have had a number of human rights violations in this country;;; not the usa and fought back and won also ill be happy to leave this country ace you a bitch not only to me but to the grup you either stand on your principals as you got folks counting on you !whatever they beleive is true in there realm of realities as each of us is differant iam myself open to sometimes the wildest things but i learn yet hold my opinions on this situation iam an observer the team has tp prove there ideas in the courts that should be easy in some cases as directed energy systems have been around a long time i so far have learned a lot i did not realize the buildings where bolted together one loose bolt on bad damaged bolt could have helped in this failure i dont see any beams where bolted together damaged on the holes hard for me to belive yet understand they where bolted together i lend support without crapping all over folks like you do ace the lace as well at the last minute you crap over everthing like a bloody idiot in a desperation to get out of this entire situation BITCH cheers john ps iam tibetian in thinking but realy folks there sometimes i love to give off a salvo its my other life as a sea captain ??????? now i sound nut but ;;; it comes out in me its very strong but true E-mail 8-----Original Message-----

From: Ace Baker [mailto:ace@cebaker.com]Sent: 29 February 2008 14:46To:Cc:Subject: The Lack of Scientific Curiosity was Telling Group, In mid-January, I claimed to have bought two tesla coils on Ebay. A few days later, I sent around a video that showed a toy table moving around, then falling upwards. A cat strolled by in the background. My subject header was "Success! I have reproduced the Hutchison Effect". I got a short note from John Hutchison accusing me of using "invisible wires" whatever those might be. Evidently he doesn't believe in his own effect. I got a short note from Andrew. Dr.. Wood said nothing. Dr.. Reynolds said nothing. Mr. Gerst said nothing. Mr. Leaphart said nothing. I had produced evidence of anti-gravity levitation, one of the most important and amazing aspects of the Hutchison Effect, and the silence was deafening. Had the situation been reversed, and I believed in the Hutchison Effect, and I had written a paper claiming it was used to blow up the WTC, and I had received a brand new video from a known associate showing anti-gravity, I would have been overjoyed, and overcome with curiosity: Wow! You made something fly upwards! What's the table made of? How did you do it? Where were the tesla coils positioned? How many windings on the coils? What gauge wire? What voltages? What frequencies? How far apart? Was there any sound? Could you repeat it? Could you feel it yourself? Were you harmed? Are you planning more experiments? Have you called the newspapers or the Nobel Prize Committee? But no, there was none of that. Given the alleged belief, inexplicable. Sincerely, E-Mail 9-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 28 February 2008 15:04To: Ace BakerSubject: Hutch Effect Program etcAce, I listened with interest to your broadcast re video fakery and the Hutchison effect. Russ kindly forward the message you sent regarding your view that John is basically a video faker. I want to give people a balanced view, therefore I would like to post your comments and analysis on my mailing list and possibly on my website. However, at this time, I have some additional questions of evidence that address some of the most compelling aspects of Judy's study. These are as follows: 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?3) How would you explain the ongoing effects on the Banker's trust building? Regarding John Hutchison: 1) How do you explain the samples of metal that he has shown us?2) How do you explain the multiple witnesses to his experiments?3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security? (see attached - as posted on his blog)4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him? (see attached- as posted on his blog)5) What do you think of Col John Alexander's statements that John Hutchison is seeing the effects of "PK" (Psychokinesis)?6) Why would LANL express an interest in basic video fakery and spend 4 months working with John? Answers to these questions would make a great addition to my proposed posting. As a final, but least important question, was there any reason you didn't send your message to me but the others? (I don't regard myself as significant except because I shared the Ambrose Lane interviews with her to reveal this evidence to the world - essentially for the 1st time.) I hope you are comfortable with the amount of evidence that you have to back up what you have said in e-mail. Andrew E-Mail 10 -----Original Message-----

From: Ace Baker [mailto:ace@cebaker.com]Sent: 28 February 2008 18:41To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.comSubject: Re: Hutch Effect Program etc Andrew, Answers interspersed. > 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC? Good question. Certainly very powerful weapons of some type were used to disintegrate the towers. > 2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC? Good question. Ordinarily bending steel like that requires foundry conditions. > 3) How would you explain the ongoing effects on the Banker's trust> building? Good question. And the fuming at ground zero generally. What was that about? It's certainly not fire, and it's not thermite, I'll promise you that. I think it's quite clear that some type of exotic weapon of mass destruction was used. It is capable of turning steel into white powder. It releases a lot of energy in the process. It can be detonated at precise times. It continues to react for a long time afterwards. Whether it's a chemical reaction, or nuclear, or something entirely new, I honestly can't say. Dr.. Wood has done a masterful job at making observations, presenting evidence, and asking the right kinds of questions. Unfortunately, she has teamed up with John Hutchison. I have no doubt that the evil geniuses at Los Alamos have cooked up all sorts of exotic secret weapons. But John Hutchison had nothing to do with it. There is no Hutchison Effect, I'm sorry.>> Regarding John Hutchison:>> 1) How do you explain the samples of metal that he has shown us? Though not video fakery per se, the metal sample with the knife in it is equally silly. The knife is stainless steel. The metal looks like a very soft aluminum. He poured some liquid aluminum around a knife. When it cooled off, he took a grinder to it. Voila! Fused knife! Please. The bent rod is . . . a bent rod. He heated it up, bent it, and let it cool. Notice how it's charred in the middle, like where the bend is? The little chips of metal are . . . little chips of metal. He attacked it with a grinder or whatever. If there are other samples I've missed, let me know.> 2) How do you explain the multiple witnesses to his experiments? I explain Hutchison's witnesses the same way I explain multiple witnesses to planes at the WTC: They are lying or they are mistaken. It's my understanding that Hutchison has never been able to produce his effects under scrutiny. I'd be more than happy to witness one of his experiments. > 3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security? (see attached - as posted on his blog) I read the letter. It does not classify "his experiments as a

matter of National Security". It is rejecting Hutchison's request for information on the grounds of National Security. Please. > 4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to> contact him? (see attached- as posted on his blog) Have Mr. Puthoff and/or Col. Alexander contact me, and I'll explain to them how Huthison's videos are made. > 5) What do you think of Col John Alexander's statements that John> Hutchison is seeing the effects of "PK" (Psychokinesis)? Either Col. Alexander is lying, or he was fooled by Hutchison's fake videos. > 6) Why would LANL express an interest in basic video fakery and> spend 4 months working with John? Los Alamos have a strong interest in promoting false beliefs. In case you haven't noticed, the government promotes all sorts of false things. The idea is to create so many versions of reality that people don't know what to believe. Or, it never even happened. Is there a paper I can read from LANL describing their findings with Hutchison? Or at least some confirmation that this 4 month experiment took place? Not that I would believe Los Alamos if they denied it, but I'm certainly not going to believe John Hutchison, given his fake videos. >> Answers to these questions would make a great addition to my> proposed posting. As a final, but least important question, was> there any reason you didn't send your message to me but the others?> (I don't regard myself as significant except because I shared the> Ambrose Lane interviews with her to reveal this evidence to the> world - essentially for the 1st time.) You weren't included in that particular email message because I was replying to a message originally sent to me.>> I hope you are comfortable with the amount of evidence that you> have to back up what you have said in e-mail. I'm 100% certain that Hutchison's videos were made exactly as I describe. I've repeated his results, and published. If Hutchison wants to invite me to his place to witness an experiment, I will pay my own way to get there. I've offered him a \$5000 reward if he can reproduce the H-Effect for my camera. Hutchison is threatening me with violence. -Ace Baker>E-mail 11 -----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 28 February 2008 19:30To: Ace BakerSubject: RE: Hutch Effect Program etc Ace, Thanks for your answers - I think you have given me the information I needed. Your answers do not address all of the evidence. As John pointed out to you, many of the videos weren't even made by him. I never mentioned a knife in what I wrote - maybe I should've made it clear I was referring to Aluminium bars and steel etc - the bigger stuff. What you are basically saying that, correct me if I am wrong: 1) Everything JH says regarding his experiments is fake.2) Los Alamos have helped him promote fakery of one kind or another.3) All the metal samples he has are fake or not what he says they are.4) You have no idea what caused the documented effects at the World Trade Centre.5) Even though I have been helping Judy with the Hutch stuff and candidly spoken about it in public and on air etc, this didn't warrant including me in the discussion. As a kind of related extra point: 6) Wikipedia is unreliable for 9/11 stuff, but reliable when it comes to John Hutchison and his experiments. Is this a fair summary of what you are saying? can you give me "yes" or "no" or short refinements to the above summary, so I can get this straight as to what you are actually saying? If you are I'm "100% certain that Hutchison's videos were made exactly as I describe" would you be willing to contact the TV companies that have filmed his experiments and verify that ALL their videos are fakes too? As for the other information you asked for, it's easy enough to find, so I'll leave you to investigate for yourself. We haven't claimed there are peer reviewed papers about Hutch - basically because there aren't any in the public domain that I know of, but there are people George Hathaway, Boyd Bushman and others who have written reports about the experiments - which was mentioned in our press release. I've known of John Hutchison since either 1997 or 1999 and it's been a real pleasure to speak with him. I look forward to getting clarification and, if possible, answers or a response to the other comments I made to the group message. Andrew E-mail 12 -----Original Message-----From: Ace Baker [mailto:ace@acebaker.com]Sent: 28 February 2008 21:20To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.comSubject: Re: Hutch Effect Program etc Andrew, I'm correcting you. 1. All of John Hutchison's videos are video trickery, yes. Correct. If there are any specific shots that I have not explained, link me to them and I will be glad to explain them. 2. I don't have any idea what Los Alamos National Lab relationship is with Hutchison, if any. It could be that there was never any relationship at all. Or, it could be that the government is seizing an opportunity to promote false beliefs. They do that ALL THE TIME. If there is any documentation about LANL and Hutchison, I'll review it. 3. The metal samples are not "fake", they're real. I haven't seen anything that looked particularly unusual. If there are particular things that you think require explanation, please link me, and describe what you think is unusual about them. 4. Correct. I don't know how they blew up the WTC. 5. Andrew, I'm not excluding you from any conversation. I told you. The original email to which you refer was a REPLY. Someone sent me a mail, and I answered it. I hit "REPLY TO ALL". You were not on that original email. E-mail 13-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 28 February 2008 22:50To: Ace BakerSubject: RE: Hutch Effect Program etc Thanks for those corrections and clarifications. I appreciate you taking the time to send me the information. I wasn't all that bothered about 5 - just curious because when I wrote the press release re Hutch Effect etc, and I was the named author, Jim contacted Judy about it without contacting me at the same time when he offered to "smooth out wrinkles" in it. It's just an apparent pattern I have observed - probably nothing... Andrew E-mail 14 -----Original Message-----From: Judy Wood [mailto:lisajudy@nctv.com]Sent: 27 February 2008 00:35To: johnhutchison; jfetzer@d.umn.edu; jamesfetzerfetzer@yahoo.comCc: Morgan Reynolds; Ace Baker; Jerry Leaphart; Andrew Johnson; Russ Gerst; Steve GoodaleSubject: Re: Will be on Dynamic Duo Tomorrow It's Thursday. This is the first I've learned that Fetzer is having Ace on to talk about the Hutchison Effect. That's pretty weird. I don't know what Fetzer is doing. Why would he have Ace introducesomeone else's work? Why? E-mail 15-----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 27 February 2008 03:59To: Judy Wood; jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: johnhutchison; jamesfetzerfetzer@yahoo.com; Morgan Reynolds; AceBaker; Jerry Leaphart; Andrew Johnson; Russ Gerst; Steve GoodaleSubject: Re: Will be on Dynamic Duo Tomorrow Judy, I don't know where this is coming from. Ace will be discussing the latest on video fakery/planes/no planes, not the Hutchison Effect. I am having you and John on Thursday for that purpose. Many thanks! JimE-mail 16-----Original Message-----From: Judy Wood [mailto:lisajudy@nctv.com]Sent: 27 February 2008 05:57To: jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: jamesfetzerfetzer@yahoo.comSubject: Re: Will be on Dynamic Duo Tomorrow Jim, Ace sent out an email to the rest of the folks on the list I added you to. "Hi All, I'll be on Dynamic Duo with

Jim Fetzer tomorrow 5-7 EST. I'll be discussing latest research including H Effect. Should be memorable." It just seemed a bit weird to have Ace on, talking about this same topic, while his area of expertise is video fakery. I've heard a lot of good things about his presentations on this topic. He gets folks interested in thinking about things and that's really cool! As a listener, I like to learn new things from those who know about things I don't know about. Also, as a listener, I prefer to learn new and interesting things that motivate me to think about new things or old things in a new way. "Debates" don't seem very useful; they consume a lot of energy and don't inspire the listener to learn and think. Tomorrow will not work for me. Let's keep it for Thursday, as planned. Thanks!

E-mail 17 Envelope-to: lisajudy@nctv.com Date: Wed, 27 Feb 2008 05:46:43 -0600 From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu To: Judy Wood <lisajudy@nctv.com> Cc: jfetzer@d.umn.edu Subject: Re: Will be on Dynamic Duo Tomorrow Yes, but I hadn't noticed the "H-effect" remark when I scanned it. I had not imposed any limits on his scope of discussion in having him back. You and John were on with Morgan recently, as I recall, so this isn't really the first introduction of his work in relation to yours. I will have Ace on on Wednesday and you and John on Thursday, but I am interested in what Ace may have come up with. I am fascinated to learn more about all this!

Quoting Judy Wood <lisajudy@nctv.com>: E-Mail 18==Envelope-to: lisajudy@nctv.com Date: Tue, 26 Feb 2008 22:37:01 -0600 From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu To: lisajudy@nctv.com, jfetzer@d.umn.edu Cc: Subject: Re: Will be on Dynamic Duo Tomorrow X-Virus-Scanned: ClamAV 0.92.1/6006/Tue Feb 26 19:03:40 2008 on mxv2.d.umn.edu X-Virus-Status: Clean Judy, I certainly had not imposed any restrictions on what Ace would cover, but if there is a conflict, we could switch your appearances and have him on Thursday while you and John are on Wednesday. I am asking him if that would work for him, since I infer it would work for you. I'll email you after I speak with him, but it won't be till tomorrow morning. Jim

Ace Baker's Answers to Questions Posed Above

Once I had posted this article, Ace Baker sent me his answers to the questions I posed above, I have commented on them:

1) Why has Ace Baker taken it upon himself to try to disprove the Hutchison Effect? Why is this so important? I'm debunking the Hutchison Effect because it's wrong. It's video fakery. It's disinformation. I care about 9/11 truth, and my fear is that sincere people will dismiss all of 9/11 research because of an association between Dr. Wood and a charlatan. Again here Ace ignores the voluminous evidence outside videos that Hutchison has – documents, metal samples and witnesses 2) Why has he gone to such trouble to make several different videos? (A new one appeared whilst this article was being written.) I go to the trouble to make these videos for the same reason I went to the trouble to write a scientific study of Chopper 5. Making claims is one thing, having the goods to back it up is another. I make the claims, I have the goods. Here again Ace ignores the voluminous evidence outside videos that Hutchison has – documents, metal samples and witnesses. 3) Was the timing of his attack on the Hutchison Effect coincidental? I discovered the Wood/Hutchison paper about the first or second week in January, 2008. I was shocked, sad, angry, frustrated and concerned. I immediately decided that I should make a study of Hutchison's videos, and debunk them for the sake of 9/11 truth. Here Ace admits to debunking rather than analysis as in the style he did with the Chopper 5. He did no quantified video comparison, therefore it is not of the same calibre or value as his previous research. Yet again, he ignores documents, metal samples and witnesses. Also, the videos were shot by different TV companies – are they all frauds too? 4) Why did he accuse Drs. Wood, Reynolds and Jerry Leaphart of a lack of Scientific Curiosity? Wood writes a paper claiming the Hutchison Effect is responsible for disintegrating the twin towers. Hutchison has a long history of not being able to reproduce his alleged effect. I claim to have obtained equipment, then produce a video demonstrating "anti-gravity". I am a close associate of Wood and Reynolds. Neither Wood, nor Reynolds, nor Leaphart even replied. These issues are dealt with above and the answer is incorrect. Dr Wood has posted a study – it isn't a formal scientific paper and doesn't claim to be. Hutchison has reproduced his effect. Ace is still denying evidence, in just the same way as those who accept the official story of 9/11 deny evidence. 5) Why does he regard 9/11 Research as "his turf"? I regard video fakery as it relates to 9/11 research as my turf, yes. Video fakery and no-planes is the solution to 9/11. No-planes proves demolition. No-planes proves media complicity. Nobody else seems to even want the facts about video fakery to be known, including many so-called 9/11 truth movement members. If other sincere people want to join me on my turf, that would be welcome. Fraud charlatans like John Hutchison are not welcome. John Hutchison is not a charlatan – however many times repeats this accusation, based on no evidence. He has now submitted a Court Affidavit, therefore if he is lying, he could go to prison. So where oh where is Ace Baker's Court Case, prosecuting for video fakery. Where are his Affidavits? Or is this more empty words from Ace Baker? 6) Why does he seem reluctant to talk about the links between the Hutchison Effect evidence and WTC Evidence? I'm talking plenty. There are no links between the Hutchison Effect and the WTC because the Hutchison Effect doesn't exist. It is video fakery. The link to 9/11 is with Chopper 5 and Ghostplane - video fakery. Ace completely denies the similarity of the evidence, which is abundantly clear to anyone who looks at the data. Look at it this way how could anyone fake a set of evidence which matches many of the effects seen at the WTC? Ace's answer is "I don't know what happened at the WTC" and he offers no alternatives apart from "cold fusion nukes". How interesting... 7) Why is his reaction so vehemently against the Hutchison Effect (e.g. "John Hutchison is a fraud") with no leeway for his own error. I.e. why doesn't he say "I am pretty sure it isn't related to the Hutchison Effect, but there could be something here." I'm not pretty sure, I'm certain. There is no Hutchison Effect. John Hutchison is a scientific fraud. He made fake videos. That's all. Same as above. 8) Why is his research into the Hutchison Effect so different in character to his other research such as the Chopper 5 video? It isn't different. In both cases, I am applying my skills to study and debunk video fakers. In both cases I have produced video employing the same techniques as the frauds. I'm only accusing John Hutchison of scientific fraud. I accuse WNYW of treason and conspiracy to commit mass murder. This statement is false. The video analysis is not the same you have no frame-by-frame analysis, no measurements, no quantification. You haven't even reproduced the cannonball levitation or fire effects! Why is Ace wasting time repeating

himself when he could be suing WYNW for fraud and submitting his own affidavit?