

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

Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com) 11 March 2008 It was approximately 1 year ago that I felt there was a need to document the circumstances surrounding the break up of the original Scholars for 9/11 Truth group, which became 9/11 Scholars and Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice. After the split, the 9/11 Scholars group was headed up by Prof. Jim Fetzer and Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice was headed up by Prof. Steve Jones, who had already been connected to the Cold Fusion cover up and Los Alamos National Laboratories and who had been caught using faked or massaged data in his presentations. At the time of the split, I was still puzzled by certain aspects of what happened, and others in the group that were corresponding with one another at that time still had misgivings about being involved in either camp. However, I felt that the evidence was clear about Prof Steve Jones - and that Jim Fetzer had been able to see problems with the way Steve Jones was acting and the way he was presenting data, therefore I had only minor reservations about being associated with Fetzer's 9/11 Scholars group. Jim Fetzer Commends Andrew Johnson On Mar 24 2007, following the split in the Scholars Group, Jim Fetzer sent an e-mail to several people, including me, inviting them to join the Scholars Group's "steering committee". In this e-mail he said: I have been impressed with your integrity and dedication and efforts to promote truth and exposed falsehoods about the events of 9/11. I need people like you to advise me in relation to the future of Scholars and to offer comments, criticism, and critique as appropriate. This seemed like a good development, and when someone makes a statement such as this, one is more likely to consider the request seriously. I agreed to be on this committee. However, there was very little activity and the only question Jim Fetzer asked us during the time that I "served" on this committee was whether he should take action against Alex Floum over intellectual property issues. At that time, I suggested Jim not do this, because it was not really specifically related to the study, research or exposure of 9/11 issues and so did not seem worth expending any effort on. The next discussion of any significance that I had with Jim Fetzer came in late September 2007, I had compiled a study of NYC "First Responder" witness accounts in an effort to find out how they described the impact of the second "plane" on WTC 2. Jim Fetzer invited me onto his radio show "The Dynamic Duo" to discuss this. On 02 Oct 2007, he sent me an e-mail saying: Your summary is excellent. We can go thorough it--you can lay it out--and we can go from there. Examples of witness reports are very effective. On 3rd October 2007, I spoke with Jim on his radio show. We had a good discussion about this study and some interesting questions were discussed and analysed. At the end of the broadcast, Jim Fetzer said: Andrew Johnson, I can't thank you enough for your excellent work – I'm really proud to have you as a member of Scholars, and I'm very grateful for all you're doing. Keep up the good work. So, from these messages and statements, it would seem that Jim Fetzer valued my opinion, my methods, study and conclusions. The Hutchison Effect on Jim Fetzer In late December and early January Dr. Judy Wood posted her study comparing the damage at the scene of the destruction of the WTC Complex with the effects observed in Hutchison's experiments. Dr. Wood and I had also appeared Ambrose Lane's show "We Ourselves" on Mon 14th Jan and Fri 18th Jan. (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.) Dr. Judy Wood explained to me that Jim Fetzer was advised directly about this new study on approximately 20 Jan 2008. On 30 Jan 2008, I posted a press release about this study on PR Log and OpEdNews. During this time, I received no communication at all from Jim Fetzer. Surprisingly, the first comment I heard from him came via Judy, in an e-mail, where he offered to "smooth" the Press Release I had written. Why did Fetzer not contact me directly, as author of the Press Release? Why had it taken him almost 2 weeks to contact Judy regarding the Hutchison Effect study? This situation was strange to me. Fetzer had previously complimented me, I was on the "steering committee". Why had Fetzer not contacted me first? One might have thought that if he was unhappy that I had written the press release (as a matter of urgency, as I saw things), he might have even "chastised" me for not involving him in the process. However, I did not attach the press release to the "Scholars" group – but it obviously mentioned Dr. Wood. Jim Fetzer and Ace Baker and Video Fakery On 27th Feb 2008, Ace Baker appeared with Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo. They discussed how Ace was sure that John Hutchison had faked his videos and how Ace was therefore greatly concerned that Dr. Judy Wood had associated herself with "a fraud". The problem with Ace's analysis then became the subject of an article I wrote, describing why his conclusions were ill-founded as they were based only on a limited set of evidence. Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison on Dynamic Duo On 28th February, Dr. Wood and John Hutchison appeared on the show with Jim Fetzer. Fetzer introduced John as follows: JF: John I want to welcome you to the Dynamic Duo. JH: Hello-o... JF: John – could you tell us a little bit about yourself – your background and your education – especially your training in science and technical subjects? Rather than, say, asking John how he started to perform his experiments, or perhaps what he thought of the intriguing data that Fetzer and Wood had just been discussing, Fetzer chooses to ask a question about John's training and/or education. Why did Fetzer seem more interested in this than in the bizarre data and effects that had also been touched on, both on Fetzer's previous show with Ace Baker and with Dr. Judy Wood only moments earlier? Regardless, John replied candidly, and cheerfully. Fetzer then asked about him going to High School and pointed out that John did not "matriculate to a university" or have a university degree. John agreed, without any reservation or hesitation. Fetzer, still not asking about the anomalous data or effects, then said "How have you made your living, John?" What was unclear to me was how this was relevant to the study of the WTC evidence - which was the subject of discussion at the time John came on. How exactly was Jim Fetzer's line of questioning relevant to the Hutchison Effect evidence itself? As I mentioned in the previous article, during the broadcast, Jim Fetzer seemed noticeably quiet and there were a number of longer silences as Judy waited for Jim Fetzer's reaction. He made no points of science and did not specifically query or re-interpret any of the points of evidence in relation to the WTC that Dr. Wood presented. When Jim Fetzer asked John Hutchison for an explanation of the Hutchison Effect, John Hutchison gave a summary describing how it may be caused by a poorly understood interaction between Radio Frequency (RF) fields, Electrostatic Fields. Did Fetzer not consider it significant that the Hutchison Effect was actually named after John? If Prof Stephen Hawking had been on the program, because someone in the 9/11 Truth

Movement had referenced Hawking Radiation for example, would Fetzer have asked about Hawking's background in the same detail as he did of John Hutchison? Dr Wood first learned of Hutchison's work in October 2006 and she has said that she felt she could not endorse it or deny it without additional information and/or studying. It took well over a year for her to feel confident enough about the science of John Hutchison's work, and to fully appreciate the striking parallels with what happened on 9/11. She reached that point, very carefully and methodically, by conducting research in that area of science. Jim Fetzer, though has written a number of books and has studied and taught courses in the Philosophy of Science, is not an engineer, and not a scientist per se, and hasn't studied the science. However, he seems to have few reservations about the methods employed by Ace Baker to mimic and by inference discredit John Hutchison's work. Is this a credible position for Jim Fetzer to adopt? After the Dynamic Duo Show it seemed to be that Jim Fetzer had drawn the same conclusion as Ace Baker – that John Hutchison was a fraud, and he seemed to think that Ace had essentially demonstrated this beyond reasonable doubt. To make sure I had read the situation correctly, I sent an e-mail to Jim Fetzer asking him 6 specific questions about what had been discussed in the broadcast with Ace Baker. His initial response did not answer my questions. In it, Fetzer said: You have taken for granted that Hutchison's research is well-founded or at least sincere. This was incorrect. I had known of John Hutchison's work since around 1998 or 1999, having come across it in a book by UK Author Albert Budden and also having heard it discussed by Lockheed Martin Scientist Boyd Bushman and UK Defence Journalist Nick Cook on a programme called Billion Dollar Secret. I had audio recordings of John Hutchison on my own Website – from 2004 and 2005. So I had certainly not taken Hutchison's research for granted! Fetzer stated this, even though I had previously advised him that I had researched into areas related to black projects, as well as free energy technology. If Jim Fetzer had looked at my Website in a little more detail, he would have found the research and presentations I had already posted there. I had included a segment about John Hutchison's experiments and experience in a presentation I had originally put together in March 2004. Fetzer's message was overall, rather negative, leaving only a little leeway for his own error. For example he said: I don't know enough to resolve it, but I'm very troubled. Hutchison's work does not look right to me. It appears to me to be fake, phony, and staged, something we might expect from some high school student who is contemptuous of authority--especially academic!--and is out to make fools of them. Fetzer didn't discuss any specific points of evidence, he merely offered feelings and opinions and seemed to suggest that because John had no academic background, his experiments and work were bogus. Fetzer completely ignored the evidence that the Hutchison Effect was real. This evidence included documents, metal samples and witness testimony. Neither Ace Baker or Jim Fetzer directly addressed any of this evidence. Why? Fetzer's focus was primarily on the idea that videos of the Hutchison Effect could be faked easily (but even that point is debateable, as Ace had clearly gone to some trouble). I sent an e-mail back to Jim Fetzer pointing out that he had not answered any of my 6 questions and I said: For you to support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis now forces me to resign from the 911scholars group, regardless of what anyone else on this list chooses to do. So I decided that because his emphasis was on the idea that it was likely a fake, because the fake video produced by Ace Baker looked too similar to the videos made of John's experiments (which, in most cases, were not filmed by John anyway), I could no longer see how Fetzer was interested in looking at the evidence that this view was inadequate and incomplete. Fetzer responded with a message saying: I hope you understand that, in rejecting Hutchison (in the tentative and provisional fashion characteristic of science, where new evidence and new hypotheses might revive an old theory or impugn a new one), I am not rejecting Judy. This was not what I had stated to him. I had stated to him that I could not support his conclusion, as he had not criticised Ace for putting out a fake story about buying coils on e-bay and then making a fake video to explain away the Hutchison Effect. Fetzer had ignored evidence. Fetzer continued: If there is something to Hutchison's "effects", it would mean that he has discovered laws of nature (anti-gravity, unusual forces, etc.) the existence of which has heretofore been unrecognized (unsuspected, unconfirmed). This is correct – but the conclusion that Hutchison has, indeed, discovered anti-gravity can only be drawn once the evidence is evaluated. Fetzer ignored this evidence – as already mentioned above. Fetzer continued: I most certainly do not "support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis" and I cannot imagine what has given you that impression. I was given the impression in Fetzer's earlier e-mail, in which he said: I think Ace's point was that it is easy to simulate "Hutchison-like effects" and claim they are valid when they are not. That seems to me to be perfectly appropriate and I do not fault him for that. Ace had produced a fake video and sent round a fake story about it. Fetzer "did not fault him" – if Fetzer didn't support Ace's approach to 9/11 research, then why did he say the opposite of this? This same e-mail also contained a message Fetzer had sent to another person in our small group who had questioned Fetzer in a similar manner. To this other person, Fetzer wrote: Andrew Johnson posed questions to me, which implied that, unless I disavowed Ace, he might have to consider withdrawing from Scholars. Technically, this interpretation was not accurate. I had not suggested Fetzer "disavow Ace" for me to continue my association with the Scholars group – rather, I had said I could not support the group's founder if he supported the methods that Ace had used. This was a subtle, but important difference – I said that I could not continue to be a member of the 911 Scholars group if its founder wasn't significantly more critical of Ace's approach – based as it was on a lack of evidence. Jim Fetzer Answers Key Questions! I further clarified my feelings and position that I wished to resign from the Scholars group in follow-up e-mails to Fetzer. Fetzer's support of Ace's approach was confirmed in the next e-mail I received from him, in which he had chosen to answer the questions I posed, thus: 1) Do you think it is a good way to assess the validity of a study by making a fake video, after initially giving out a false story about that video? i.e. Ace Baker said he had obtained Tesla Coils from e-bay to attempt experiments related to the Hutchison Effect, then he posted a video saying he'd reproduced it. In reality, he put out a false story and sent a later e-mail suggesting we should have detected this and commented. What are your views on this, coming as it did from a respected researcher? Come on! He's pointing out how easy it is to fake this stuff. There was nothing wrong in his doing what he did. You should be more open-minded. Fetzer says there was nothing wrong with what Ace had done – he had made a fake video, but initially lied saying he had used Tesla coils to produce the effect. Fetzer saw nothing wrong with this. 2)

Ace, on his blog, has declared John as a fraud and that his videos are 100% fake. How much do you agree with his conclusions? What do you think of the considerable amounts of other documentary evidence that John has been visited by Los Alamos National Labs (which Steve Jones has been connected with)? For reasons I have explained already, I also think Hutchison is a fraud. But I stand behind Judy's research, which I extoll as extremely important. Again, Fetzer was agreeing with Ace – and ignoring the documentary and physical evidence that Hutchison was not a fraud. Fetzer seemed to be saying “everything else apart from this Hutchison stuff that Judy had posted was good.” So Fetzer was disregarding my view – someone he invited onto the committee. More importantly, he was disregarding the significantly more qualified view of Dr. Wood. Instead, he decided that Ace was “on the money” – simply because Ace was an “expert in Digital Processing” (but with unknown qualifications) and Ace had produced a video which mimicked some (not all) of the characteristics of Hutchison's experiments. Why was Fetzer saying this? 3) I have been checking Ace's blog and one of the file names he used was “judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html” (see <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2008/03/judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html>) Do you have any thoughts on the fact that he has used this particular filename? Why do you think he has done this? You are making a mountain out of a molehill. He thinks Judy has made a blunder. You think she and Hutchison are “right on”. I agree with Ace. Fetzer doesn't specifically answer my question here – but he still agrees with Ace – who says Judy has made “a blunder”. In any case, I thought this debate was primarily about the Hutchison Effect, not Judy Wood – why didn't Fetzer make this distinction himself? 4) One would think that Ace might have made a single video to point out the possibility of video fakery, but I think he has now made 4 or 5 different ones, and seemingly he's gone to quite a bit of trouble to do this. Do you have any thoughts on the reasons behind this? This stuff is very easy to fake. Why don't you at least admit as much. What in the world justifies you in thinking Hutchison is on the up and up? This answer from Fetzer is very surprising and again he completely ignores the other documentary and physical evidence, as well as witness testimony and many videos shot by different film companies. I had already pointed this all out to Fetzer. Dr. Wood and I had already discussed this 6 weeks previously on Ambrose Lane's radio program. Why did Fetzer ignore all of this, and what I'd previously said? Also, making a fake video proves nothing in of itself – this is precisely why other evidence must be evaluated before drawing conclusions! 5) Do you think that Ace has managed to reproduce any or all of the effects that John Hutchison has? (I noted on your show that Ace discussed the Red Bull Can experiment and described the can flexing and bending throughout the length of it, yet his faked video did not duplicate this phenomenon - therefore Ace had noted these anomalies, but had not reproduced them.) They are close enough to raise serious doubts in most minds--indeed, in every serious scientific mind, in my opinion. I know we disagree. OK? Again, Fetzer just thinks “close enough” is “good enough”. He suggests “every serious scientific mind would have serious doubts, in his opinion”. I myself have been described as having a “scientific mind”, but because I have evaluated the evidence I have little or no doubt that the Hutchison Effect is real. 6) Ace says he is sure the Hutchison Effect is not real, but he can't explain the evidence that Judy has collected. Why would he attack Judy for giving an explanation that involves a well-documented, almost 30-year old phenomenon? Appealing to the Hutchison effect to explain Judy's work is to appeal to a mystery to explain an enigma. There is no explanatory benefit here. This statement by Fetzer is almost meaningless and is based on no evidence – only his own opinion. The comparison of the WTC evidence and Hutchison Effect evidence is obvious to those who see the photographs side by side. Fetzer, at this point, ignores this evidence too. Jim, some chips seem to have fallen here and I, as a fellow member of 911 Scholars am keen to get your views on “where they now lay”. I need to work out if I can continue to be aligned with the 911 Scholars group, or whether it's founder would support the idea that guests on his show can, without criticism, use “debunking tactics” to attempt to discredit perhaps the most diligent research that the group might be associated with. The answer to this question is especially important to me now that that researcher has definitely used deception as part of his approach. There was nothing wrong with what Ace has done. I applaud him for showing how easy it is to fake this stuff. You haven't shown it is genuine, but, for reasons I do not understand, are swallowing it hook, line, and sinker! Again, Fetzer re-asserts his support for Ace promulgating a bogus story and making fake videos. He says he “does not understand why” I am “swallowing” the Hutchison Effect “hook line and sinker”. Again, Fetzer completely overlooks or disregards all the evidence presented here. Is Fetzer trying to make me feel stupid? This seemed to be the approach he would now adopt, but in the next e-mail, Fetzer expressed concern that I would “offer a very unflattering portrait” of him, as I had mentioned I was going to compose this article. The reader must decide whether Fetzer's view on this is fair or accurate – all I can do is present all of the evidence for review. My intent is simple: to analyse the evidence, draw conclusions and find the truth. I am not at all comfortable with how this matter has unfolded. A “War of Credentials” and The Logic Quiz Following this exchange, Fetzer then decided he would start to debate my methods of reasoning, based on his own “35 years teaching students how to think responsibly”. He also stated that this appeared “to be a lesson that you [Andrew] need to learn”. I had sent several messages to Fetzer where I stated I claimed no credibility for myself, only that I collected evidence, analysed it and posted conclusions. Fetzer suggested I “seem to believe that all opinions are equally good!” I never said this. Those reading this article and my website will quickly gain an impression of how credible the information and analysis is, so you might like to consider this as you read on below – and you might also like to consider carefully Fetzer's earlier messages to me, documented near the beginning of this article. Here, he seemed to be comfortable that my analyses were credible. In Fetzer's next e-mail, he decided to test me on aspects of methods of reasoning and logic, based on his knowledge of the Philosophy of Science. I decided I would accept his challenge even though I questioned (for myself) his motives - for 2 reasons. Firstly, why didn't he set me such a “quiz” in order to gain entry to the Scholars group? Surely it would've been better to ensure that members thought “logically” and “responsibly” before disputes over evidence arose? Secondly, what did these questions – such as “What is the difference between deductive and inductive reasoning?” have to do with WTC or Hutchison Effect evidence specifically? I have to confess, that at this point, I no longer took the debate seriously. In such instances, I defer to my sense of humour to carry the matter forward – as I have found this method is far more useful and it can occasionally precipitate useful information, which is harder to obtain using the anger/accusation/ridicule approach. Fetzer, however, had started to use

the “ridicule” approach. In the message referenced above, he wrote: Creating a fabricated video to demonstrate that a video can be fabricated is not deceitful but appropriate. It is actually a form of replication. Ace did that to show how easily it can be done. You are holding that against him? Really, Andrew, you can't be that dumb! Again, Fetzer ignores the aspect of Ace putting out a fake story and then he suggests I am “dumb” for not agreeing with him. Is this evidence, or an attempt at debunking and ridicule? Other elements of this message contained a similar comment. In my response to Fetzer, I pointed out his earlier praise for my NYC Witness Study. Why was he now suggesting I was “dumb” for disagreeing with him? “Total Evidence” and “Special Pleading” I found some of the questions in the “Logic Quiz” that Fetzer had set for me were quite tricky – I had never studied the theory of logic. In researching answers to the questions Fetzer had set for me, I came up with some interesting terms, and I sent him my “answers” in another e-mail. For fun, I set Fetzer some questions related to software and programming (but he declined to answer them). Fetzer asked: What is the requirement of total evidence? It seems that this consideration applies to this very case of the Hutchison Effect (HE), Ace Baker's “evidence” and the WTC Evidence. In researching the definition of “total evidence”, I found this link: “One crucial respect in which inductive arguments differ from deductive arguments is in their vulnerability to new evidence”. I would suggest this applies precisely in this case. I also found this link, where it is suggested that “the confirmation function must use all the available evidence and not an arbitrary subset” So, I responded to Fetzer's question about “total evidence” thus: It is that ALL the evidence is evaluated! Perfect! Yes! HE and WTC do have a total evidence requirement and Dr. Wood in her study is MUCH closer to it than Ace Baker, so even by your own knowledge and teachings, you are not adhering to the standards of logic you teach. What Ace Baker has done (and you have supported him) is use an *arbitrary subset of evidence*! A perfect expression! Thanks! Another question Fetzer posed was: What is special pleading? I found a definition at this link: “The informal fallacy of special pleading is committed whenever an argument includes some double standard. For example, if someone criticizes science for not producing all of the answers to life but excuses their religion for not having all of the answers about life, they are engaged in form of special pleading.” I therefore responded to Fetzer thus: Ah - this is also a good one. It's when an argument includes double standards. This applies very well here. Ace Baker produced a fake video, in his search for the truth. He is engaging in "special pleading" - by claiming he has mimicked a real process, therefore the real process must be fake - he has ignored "total evidence" and adopted a double standard. In the same e-mail, I made several other points which, based on the research I did to try and answer the questions he posed, were significant in debating the way Fetzer and Baker had treated this whole business. Fetzer Responds In trying to answer the Logic Quiz, I felt I had least got some things right, even though it was, for me, a 2-hour “crash course” in Philosophy and Logic Theory (subjects I have never formally studied at any level). I eagerly awaited his response... I am sorry, Andrew, but your standards of credibility and mine simply do not coincide. I suppose that having a Ph.D. in the history and the philosophy of science and having devoted my professional life to logic, critical thinking, and scientific reasoning have given me a different perspective than your own. Again Fetzer does not debate specific points of evidence and he also ignores my answers to the “quiz”, which, I contend, expose how weakly he has applied his own standards of thinking to this case. Fetzer then went on to make another bold statement: I find it fascinating that you infer that, because Ace Baker and John P. Costella and I disagree with you, we must be suppressing, distorting, or otherwise fabricating evidence! Whilst I had suggested Fetzer was trying to cover up the Hutchison Effect's relation to the destruction of the WTC, I never accused him of fabricating evidence. Neither had I accused Ace Baker of fabricating evidence. Ace himself admitted faking a video – so I wasn't accusing him of anything other than what he had already admitted doing! Fetzer also said: Make sure that you observe in this article or yours that I stand behind Judy's research but not Hutchison's. And be sure to explain our reasons for thinking as we do. That called playing fair by laying our cards on the table as well as your own. So, here is all the evidence – all the cards, and all the chips for the reader to consider. Fetzer sent a short follow up e-mail, where he responded to my note that I thought the quiz he'd set had been “fun, fun, fun”. Since I mentioned there were three differences between inductive and deductive reasoning and you (wrongly) mention a common misconception, I presume you already know you are wrong on that one. I'd love to offer you a tutorial, but you are not a very promising student. In any case, thanks for your good work of the past. All my best! So again, Fetzer makes disparaging remarks, rather than replying to the specific points I'd made about the evidence and the way he had analysed and criticised it – or rather, the way that he and Ace Baker seemed to have agreed that ignoring evidence completely was the best policy in this case. By this point, of course, I knew what Fetzer was doing – and so again, I deferred to my sense of humour and responded thus (in reference to my earlier “fun, fun, fun” comment): Can't you at least “mark” my attempts at “special pleadings” and “total evidence” [answers] - go on, please!?! Or “has the Daddy Taken the T-bird away, then?” Fetzer didn't seem to see the humorous side here, and responded thus: I had no idea I was dealing with a child! Thanks for clarifying that! I had perhaps “taunted” Fetzer somewhat, during the exchange of e-mails, but I had not insulted his intelligence nor had I made disparaging remarks – I tried hard to stick to points of evidence, both regarding the Hutchison Effect and the WTC and his own analysis of these things. He responded without addressing the evidence and he suggested I was either “dumb” or “childish”. Is this an effective way to debate the truth of an issue? Summary and Conclusions Here are some observations. Prof Jim Fetzer, is an author or editor of multiple books, and he repeats this fact at regular intervals. Fetzer said he was impressed with my “sticking to the truth” but completely ignored my analysis of the Hutchison Effect evidence and he never sent any comments up until Ace Baker had been on his show. Fetzer claims he is more credible, due to his PhD and experience, yet he gives more credibility to Ace Baker's analysis regarding the Hutchison effect rather than that of Dr. Wood. He never disclosed Ace's qualifications – yet he takes Ace's view as more credible than Dr. Wood's and my own – even though he asked Dr. Wood and myself, but not Ace Baker, to be on the Steering Committee. Fetzer does not take exception to the fact that Ace Baker put out a false story about his video. Fetzer takes no account of the other evidence regarding John Hutchison – and has not commented on the other documents, metal samples etc. Fetzer takes no account of the fact that John Hutchison has submitted a sworn affidavit for the court, which in effect means that if he is lying, he could

potentially go to prison. In the broadcast with Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison, there were a number of long silences where Fetzer had an opportunity to question points of evidence, analysis or science. At no time did he do this in any meaningful way. Fetzer does not consider it significant that the Hutchison Effect was actually named after John. Some people will, even though all this evidence has been presented, think Fetzer either just has a "big ego" or that he is just being stubborn or stupid. The key question is, why has he been so consistent in this behaviour with regard to the Hutchison Effect and the WTC destruction? I think that the answer is because he knows that the Hutchison Effect is extremely important in this area of research and he has been "given the job" of distracting people from the evidence and turning attention away from it. He cannot, however, simply do this by "trashing Dr. Judy Wood" overtly, as this would be too obvious. He can, however, attempt to "trash" others who are involved in this affair when they are unimportant in the overall scheme. I think this all goes to show, again, that we now stand at a juncture in human history and it seems to be revolving around revealing secrets and exposing falsehoods. Some people, however, are helping to keep the truth covered up – and by continually challenging them, questioning them and reviewing the evidence, we can work out who those people are. I hope that this work has served to document the truth about Jim Fetzer and the Hutchison Effect and that the reader will draw their own conclusions as to what has really been happening here. E-mails E-mail 1----- Original Message ----- From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com, "Judy Wood" , "Morgan Reynolds" , Subject: Reconstituting the Steering Committee Date: Sat, 24 Mar 2007 11:53:06 -0600 Andrew, Judy, Morgan, CB, Jeff, and Jerry, I am inviting you to be the members of a new steering committee for Scholars. Let me know if this works for you. I have been impressed with your integrity and dedication and efforts to promote truth and exposed falsehoods about the events of 9/11. I need people like you to advise me in relation to the future of Scholars and to offer comments, criticism, and critique as appropriate. Let me know if this works for you. I am especially desirous of having those I trust in positions to advise me about future efforts, including the possible reorganization of the society. I hope that you will join me! Jim E-mail 2----- Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 02 October 2007 19:03To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.comCc: jfetzer@d.umn.eduSubject: Interview: Revisiting 1st Responders' Accounts Andrew, Your summary is excellent. We can go thorough it--you can lay it out--and we can go from there. Examples of witness reports are very effective. If you can create a simpler link to your web site, that would be good. Thanks. Jim Quoting Andrew Johnson

<ad.johnson@ntlworld.com>: http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=134&Itemid=60 Going in Search of Planes in NYC Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com) Oct 2007 E-mail 3 At 06:20 AM -0600 2/1/08, jfetzer@d.umn.edu wrote:Content-Type: text/plain;DelSp="Yes";format="flowed"Content-Disposition: inline Judy, Morgan, and Jerry, This appears to be getting around. I think it would be an appropriate subject for a Scholars press release. Judy, would you want to draft a version for me to smooth? Or should I draft one and run it by you? Thanks. Jim E-mail 4-----Original Message-----
From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]
Sent: 03 March 2008 22:23
To: Jim Fetzer

Subject: The Hutchison Effect and Ace BakerJim, I have been watching with interest developments regarding Judy's research in comparing characteristics of Hutchison Effect and elements of the WTC evidence. I listened closely to the Weds and Thurs broadcasts. As you are probably aware, though Judy has done the great bulk of the work, I have made some small contributions to some smaller parts of it and, of course, we both spoke in some detail about it on Ambrose Lane's Washington DC show (where the audience reaction seemed to be very positive overall). I must admit to being deeply troubled over the latest developments with Ace Baker (I have, like you, been an admirer of his research - especially the Chopper 5 study he did). I am writing an article about the latest developments. I wanted to ask you about your thoughts on this, as follows: 1) Do you think it is a good way to assess the validity of a study by making a fake video, after initially giving out a false story about that video? i.e. Ace Baker said he had obtained Tesla Coils from e-bay to attempt experiments related to the Hutchison Effect, then he posted a video saying he'd reproduced it. In reality, he put out a false story and sent a later e-mail suggesting we should have detected this and commented. What are your views on this, coming as it did from a respected researcher? 2) Ace, on his blog, has declared John as a fraud and that his videos are 100% fake. How much do you agree with his conclusions? What do you think of the considerable amounts of other documentary evidence that John has been visited by Los Alamos National Labs (which Steve Jones has been connected with)? 3) I have been checking Ace's blog and one of the file names he used was "judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html" (see <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2008/03/judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html>) Do you have any thoughts on the fact that he has used this particular filename? Why do you think he has done this? 4) One would think that Ace might have made a single video to point out the possibility of video fakery, but I think he has now made 4 or 5 different ones, and seemingly he's gone to quite a bit of trouble to do this. Do you have any thoughts on the reasons behind this? 5) Do you think that Ace has managed to reproduce any or all of the effects that John Hutchison has? (I noted on your show that Ace discussed the Red Bull Can experiment and described the can flexing and bending throughout the length of it, yet his faked video did not duplicate this phenomenon - therefore Ace had noted these anomalies, but had not reproduced them.) 6) Ace says he is sure the Hutchison Effect is not real, but he can't explain the evidence that Judy has collected. Why would he attack Judy for giving an explanation that involves a well-documented, almost 30-year old phenomenon? As Judy has said, we really don't know what was used to destroy the WTC towers, but it is difficult to ignore the close links between the 2 sets of evidence. Jim, some chips seem to have fallen here and I, as a fellow member of 911 Scholars am keen to get your views on "where they now lay". I need to work out if I can continue to be aligned with the 911 Scholars group, or whether it's founder would support the idea that guests on his show can, without criticism, use "debunking tactics" to attempt to discredit perhaps the most diligent research that the group might be associated with. The answer to this question is especially important to me now that that researcher has definitely used

deception as part of his approach. Thanks very much in anticipation for your answers. Andrew E-mail 5-----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 04 March 2008 00:48To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; ace@acebaker.com; jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc:Subject: Re: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker Well, I think we have a problem. You have taken for granted that Hutchison's research is well-founded or at least sincere. I think Ace's point was that it is easy to simulate "Hutchison-like effects" and claim they are valid when they are not. That seems to me to be perfectly appropriate and I do not fault him for that. Frankly, what Hutchison has produced looks very suspicious to me. I have a friend with a Ph.D. in electromagnetism whom I want to invite to take a good look at this stuff. My mind is not made up, but I find it troubling that our most important scientist would align herself with this man and his work in a situation where he has been enormously controversial in the past. By his own admission, he has no scientific background but "taught himself" and discovered all of these "effects". I am not sufficiently expert to judge, but what he had to say by way of explanation sounded phony to me. I am therefore in a dilemma. This requires expert evaluation that exceeds mine and, I dare say, that of the other members of this research group, including Judy. When I have more data in the form of additional opinions from experts I trust, I will add more. But I must say that for anyone to "beg the question" as to who is right and who is wrong in a case of this degree of seriousness is not an appropriate response. If you chose to dissociate yourself from Schoars because we have a conflict, well, it is the not the first time. I have stuck with Judy through thick and thin. I have no illusions about the origin of your questions. But that is my current opinion about this matter. I don't know enough to resolve it, but I'm very troubled. Hutchison's work does not look right to me. It appears to me to be fake, phony, and staged, something we might expect from some high school student who is contemptuous of authority--especially academic!--and is out to make fools of them. That is only my current opinion, however, and when I have additional expert opinions at hand, I will say more. I have no idea how all of this is going to play out, but I find this development profoundly disturbing. E-mail 6-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 04 March 2008 10:11To: jfetzer@d.umn.edu; ace@acebaker.comCc: lisajudy@nctv.com; econrn@suddenlink.net; Jsleaphart@cs.comSubject: RE: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker Jim Thanks for your candid response. It is most helpful. Whilst I can accept a difference of opinion, I don't think you answered any of my questions. This is the most telling of all to me. Whether the Hutchison Effect is real or not (and we can tell by your reaction that it is), it is disrespectful, in the same way as the Greg Jenkins video was disrespectful, to produce a fake video and claim it is an explanation for a real effect which breaks the laws of physics. We can all see that the laws of physics were broken - by a new physics - on 9/11. That new physics is known about by the Military Industrial Complex - and I am not the first to say this. For the record, Judy did NOT put me up to anything. I listened with my own ears and watched with my own eyes. I drew my own conclusions. For you to support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis now forces me to resign from the 911scholars group, regardless of what anyone else on this list chooses to do. All I do is evaluate evidence and draw conclusions and tell other people what I think. I don't consider I have a reputation to protect - it makes things a bit easier most of the time. Thanks for giving me some more evidence of what's really going on here. Regards Andrew E-mail 7 -----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 04 March 2008 15:35To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; jpcostella@hotmail.com; jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: ace@acebaker.com; lisajudy@nctv.com; econrn@suddenlink.net;Jsleaphart@cs.comSubject: RE: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker Andrew, I'm glad you found my "candid response" to be "most helpful". Did you read my response to Russ Gerst, which for some reason was not coming back to me in cc but only as a blank space? Here it is. I hope you understand that, in rejecting Hutchison (in the tentative and provisional fashion characteristic of science, where new evidence and new hypotheses might revive an old theory or impugn a new one), I am not rejecting Judy. Her work remains the most important in the history of the study of 9/11, with no doubt. Please do not confound the two. I worry a bit here since you have confounded the difference between laws of nature (which cannot be violated and cannot be changed) with theories (beliefs, opinions) about laws of nature, which of course can be. Violations of laws of nature would be miracles. If there is something to Hutchison's "effects", it would mean that he has discovered laws of nature (anti-gravity, unusual forces, etc.) the existence of which has heretofore been unrecognized (unsuspected, unconfirmed). I think you are making a mistake in resigning because your reasons are not well-founded, but I also suppose that, in the greater scheme of things, if this were the gravest mistake you were to make in life, you would be doing pretty well! I most certainly do not "support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis" and I cannot imagine what has given you that impression. I do hope to arrange communication between Judy, John Costella, Ace Baker, and Hutchison, if it can be arranged. In any case, Judy's work has nothing to do with Hutchison's claims, where Ace has done a good job exposing how easy it can be to create seemingly plausible effects using commonplace methods. Why you should think that is underhanded or improper is beyond me. Exposing frauds, fakes, and charlatans has proven a challenge during the history of science. If Hutchison is among them, as I suspect, he is hardly the first. When you tell others why you now condemn me, please share with them what I've written here and below. Then they can better judge for themselves. Thanks!Jim My reply to Russ (which for some reason has not been going through): Egad! I asked someone who knows vastly more about this matter to offer his considered opinion. It did. And it confirms my suspicions that something is wrong with Hutchison--not with Judy! Please notice the distinction. In my view, her work on the WTC is unparalleled, but I think that she has been taken in by Hutchison. I trust John's views on Hutchison; in fact, I lend them far greater weight than my own. I know him very well, and he has no stake (financial or otherwise) in any of this. I fail to understand your remarks about ethics. OF COURSE it is POSSIBLE that someone like Hutchison could stumble on something big, but it is NOT LIKELY. My first impression of his videos was that they were "junk science". And when he poses both as untutored but offers what come across to me as pseudo-scientific explanations that would (presumably) only make sense to him if he were tutored, I become very suspicious. Andrew Johnson posed questions to me, which implied that, unless I disavowed Ace, he might have to consider withdrawing from Scholars. That's what he said. I replied to him and explained that I think we have a problem. We still do. I have stuck with Judy through thick and

thin. I'm still inclined to believe in her--but not Hutchison, at least, not until we have something more convincing from him by way of explanation of his effects. So I don't follow why I am supposed to be so deserving of this approbrium. I am explaining to Andrew what I take to be the case. And we have a problem! Maybe Hutchison is good as gold and I'm just not seeing it, but he acts like a juvenile. Have you read some of his comments? This is not serious stuff. E-mail 8-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 04 March 2008 22:24To: jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: Judy Wood; Morgan Reynolds; Jerry LeaphartSubject: RE: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker Jim, To make things clear, I am now resigning from the Scholars group, so please delete my name off the list on 911scholars.org the next time you update it. Sorry, I don't understand your previous response. In any case, I have laid out my thoughts, evidence and analysis in a new article posted

here: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/articles/TheHutchisonEffect2.htm> This has already been sent out. What you don't seem to realise is that there are other laws of physics which are not "in the text books". They have, for example, been shown in cold fusion experiments. We have discussed how they tie in with the Hutchison Effect. Steve Jones tried to cover cold fusion up. Do you remember this? There are many, many documented examples of experiments which break the known laws of physics (not difficult to find - for example www.lenr-canr.org . Free energy is the biggest cover up - and is likely the main reason the UFO/ET issue is covered up, as you are likely aware. I've been saying this for almost 5 years. You may or may not be aware of me announcing to an audience of 150,000 on Ambrose Lane's show in January the following:=====And I say I think the key in all of this question is the energy. And I've been saying to a few people that I've had the chance to speak to while I'm here that we really now do stand at a juncture, and looking at what has happened at the World Trade Center is one of the huge keys to everything that's going on in the world right now. And certainly this has been so much of a revelation to me over the last year and particularly in the last few weeks, you know, I'm thinking that a lot of other of the global issues fade in to insignificance because of the energy issue. We've essentially now - I'd like to steal a phrase from somebody who's across the room from me at the moment - We think that the destruction of the World Trade Center was the disclosure was that energy that is almost infinite almost free exists, and because of that we've seen that that technology has been taken up by some group of people somewhere. I don't know who they are. And they have taken that technology -- People like John Hutchison are still doing parlor tricks with it and will continue to do so, thankfully - and they've taken it and turned it in to a weapon. So rather than using it to mitigate the effects of global warming, or you know any issue - pick an issue basically - they have turned it in to weapon. They used to create fake war on terror. Those are the facts now as I see them, and I really challenge anybody to come up with some data which will refute these conclusions.===== So the cat's out of the bag now, I think - and many of the audience seemed to "get it" or some part of it. Some of my friends have already "got it" too. And then, of course, there's the very interesting connection to SAIC, which is now documented. Your response to Russ Gerst does not address the evidence - which is what I work on, so I have disregarded it, thanks. I have known about free energy technologies for at least 10 years. My research in the last 5 years has been way outside the 9/11 scene and I have collected all kinds of evidence, so I don't just listen to one professor of mechanical engineering, or one professor of economics or one professor of philosophy. I would be foolish to do so. You have said Judy Wood is associated with "a fraud". This "fraud" has metal samples - tested by the Max Planck institute. This "fraud" knows scientists such as George Hathaway, Ken Shoulders, Andrei Sakorov, Dr. Lorn A Kuenhe and others - they have researched his experiments and developed some understanding of their underlying mechanism. Some of this is mentioned page 2, page 7, page 8 of Judy's study, if you'd taken the time to study it. There is no escaping your support for someone who put out a false story, put out a fake video and doesn't explain the metal samples of John Hutchison. This is not research. This is debunking. It's that clear - and I can't understand how anyone who looks at the evidence can see it otherwise. You do what you like Jim, but I will have no part of it - and your disrespectful attitude to people who find knowledge in a different way is not something I find endearing. Andrew E-mail 9-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 06 March 2008 17:25To: jfetzer@d.umn.eduSubject: RE: A suggestion . . . Sorry Jim, but Ace has started telling lies about John Hutchison, so I can't really deal with this sort of behaviour any more. You already know my thoughts and they haven't changed and are unlikely to do so. I still await answers to the previous questions I posed for you, which are more to do with philosophy than the trying to pretend the Hutchison Effect doesn't exist because John P Costella says it doesn't (another person who suffers from "selective evidence blindness", apparently. A shame when his Zapruder study was so concise). You probably need to check out the other material I have posted about things like weather modification and antigravity. They have proved quite popular on google video. I am also very interested NASA's faking of Mars data and was even alerted to a comment that the Pope made about Mars last December! (The was in a public speech!) Like I said, it's a much bigger picture than 9/11 - you just have to study the evidence. Clearly, you have now lost the ability to do this rationally and have switched to supporting debunking now that the truth has been reached. Both Judy and me work off evidence - which is why we get on so well. Other things, in relation to 9/11 are all secondary to the study of evidence. That's how I chose the name of my website (I was quite pleased when that name came to me actually). So anyway, at least we both know what the general agenda is now. Take me off that list please. Andrew E-mail 10-----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 06 March 2008 19:20To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; lisajudy@nctv.com; econrn@suddenlink.net; Jsleaphart@cs.comCc: jfetzer@d.umn.eduSubject: Re: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker A few comments just for the record Quoting Andrew Johnson

<ad.johnson@ntlworld.com>: Jim, I have been watching with interest developments regarding Judy's research in comparing characteristics of Hutchison Effect and elements of the WTC evidence. I listened closely to the Weds and Thurs broadcasts. As you are probably aware, though Judy has done the great bulk of the work, I have made some small contributions to some smaller parts of it and, of course, we both spoke in some detail about it on Ambrose Lane's Washington DC show (where the audience reaction seemed to be very positive overall). I must admit to being deeply troubled over the latest developments with Ace Baker (I have, like you, been an admirer of his research - especially the

Chopper 5 study he did). I am writing an article about the latest developments. I wanted to ask you about your thoughts on this, as follows: 1) Do you think it is a good way to assess the validity of a study by making a fake video, after initially giving out a false story about that video? i.e. Ace Baker said he had obtained Tesla Coils from e-bay to attempt experiments related to the Hutchison Effect, then he posted a video saying he'd reproduced it. In reality, he put out a false story and sent a later e-mail suggesting we should have detected this and commented. What are your views on this, coming as it did from a respected researcher? Come on! He's pointing out how easy it is to fake this stuff. There was nothing wrong in his doing what he did. You should be more open-minded. 2) Ace, on his blog, has declared John as a fraud and that his videos are 100% fake. How much do you agree with his conclusions? What do you think of the considerable amounts of other documentary evidence that John has been visited by Los Alamos National Labs (which Steve Jones has been connected with)? For reasons I have explained already, I also think Hutchison is a fraud. But I stand behind Judy's research, which I extoll as extremely important. 3) I have been checking Ace's blog and one of the file names he used was "judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html" (see <http://acebaker.blogspot.com/2008/03/judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html>) Do you have any thoughts on the fact that he has used this particular filename? Why do you think he has done this? You are making a mountain out of a molehill. He thinks Judy has made a blunder. You think she and Hutchison are "right on". I agree with Ace. 4) One would think that Ace might have made a single video to point out the possibility of video fakery, but I think he has now made 4 or 5 different ones, and seemingly he's gone to quite a bit of trouble to do this. Do you have any thoughts on the reasons behind this? This stuff is very easy to fake. Why don't you at least admit as much. What in the world justifies you in thinking Hutchison is on the up and up? 5) Do you think that Ace has managed to reproduce any or all of the effects that John Hutchison has? (I noted on your show that Ace discussed the Red Bull Can experiment and described the can flexing and bending throughout the length of it, yet his faked video did not duplicate this phenomenon - therefore Ace had noted these anomalies, but had not reproduced them.) They are close enough to raise serious doubts in most minds--indeed, in every serious scientific mind, in my opinion. I know we disagree. OK? 6) Ace says he is sure the Hutchison Effect is not real, but he can't explain the evidence that Judy has collected. Why would he attack Judy for giving an explanation that involves a well-documented, almost 30-year old phenomenon? Appealing to the Hutchison effect to explain Judy's work is to appeal to a mystery to explain an enigma. There is no explanatory benefit here. As Judy has said, we really don't know what was used to destroy the WTC towers, but it is difficult to ignore the close links between the 2 sets of evidence. Jim, some chips seem to have fallen here and I, as a fellow member of 911 Scholars am keen to get your views on "where they now lay". I need to work out if I can continue to be aligned with the 911 Scholars group, or whether it's founder would support the idea that guests on his show can, without criticism, use "debunking tactics" to attempt to discredit perhaps the most diligent research that the group might be associated with. The answer to this question is especially important to me now that that researcher has definitely used deception as part of his approach. There was nothing wrong with what Ace has done. I applaud him for showing how easy it is to fake this stuff. You haven't shown it is genuine, but, for reasons I do not understand, are swallowing it hook, line, and sinker! Thanks very much in anticipation for your answers. Andrew E-mail 11 -----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 06 March 2008 20:52To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: jpscostella@hotmail.com; ace@acebaker.com; lisajudy@nctv.com; econrn@suddenlink.net; Jsleaphart@cs.comSubject: RE: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker You said you were writing an article and implied you were going to offer a very unflattering portrait of me (Ace and John, too, no doubt). All I have asked is that you represent my position fairly--namely, recapitulate all the reasons that I (Ace and John) have given in support of our inference that this is an example of fraud, fakery and fabrication in the recent history of science. Don't bother to write back. We all know where we all stand. Thanks very much. E-mail 12 -----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 06 March 2008 22:32To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: John Costella; ace@acebaker.comSubject: RE: FW: A personal inquiry . . . What's wrong with that is there are objective standards for reasoning that may or may not be satisfied in a particular case. You seem to believe that all opinions are equally good! Sorry to disillusion you but that is far from the case. I spent 35 years teaching students how to think responsibly, which appears to be a lesson that you need to learn. You admit that you only have your opinion, but that and that alone brings with it no credibility at all! E-mail 13-----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 06 March 2008 21:50To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.comCc: jpscostella@hotmail.com; ace@acebaker.com; jfetzer@d.umn.eduSubject: RE: RE: A personal inquiry . . . OK, Andrew. What is the difference between deductive and inductive reasoning? (Clue: There are three differences.) When are analogies faulty? When is a generalization hasty? What is the requirement of total evidence? What is special pleading? What is the popular sentiments fallacy? What are the conditions that must be satisfied for an explanation to be scientific? What are the limitations of formal proofs of program correctness? Tell me. Creating a fabricated video to demonstrate that a video can be fabricated is not deceitful but appropriate. It is actually a form of replication. Ace did that to show how easily it can be done. You are holding that against him? Really, Andrew, you can't be that dumb! He made an important contribution you appear to be incapable of appreciating. He did more to raise doubts about the authenticity of the Hutchison effect than any previous student has ever done! E-mail 14-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 06 March 2008 22:48To: jfetzer@d.umn.eduSubject: RE: FW: A personal inquiry . . . Jim, You are putting words in my mouth - I never said all opinions are equal. The best opinions are based on the widest set of evidence which can be verified and cross referenced the most corroboration and the least amount of phenomena or factors which remain unexplained. Take my NYC witness study as an example of my approach and how I come to a conclusion. You seemed to like that. That's how I work - I try to maintain that standard, though my work has no guarantees, makes no claims for veracity has never been published in any peer-reviewed journal and I never received any money for anything I have published - and I have never claimed to. But this was all made clear to you 2 years ago - so what's changed? Anyway, what's your point? I will be filing

the "logic quiz" answers with you soon!! Fun, fun fun! Thanks! Andrew E-mail 15-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 06 March 2008 23:17To: jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: Morgan Reynolds; Russ Gerst; Judy Wood; Jerry LeaphartSubject: RE: Logic Quiz Jim, Here are some answers for you - but they have little or no relevance - I do not claim any credibility, only that I gather evidence, analyse and post my conclusions. When I build a coherent and self-consistent picture, which corroborates with other data, and then people expend considerable effort to debunk it (like JREFers do), I get a "warm glow". OK, Andrew. What is the difference between deductive and inductive reasoning? (Clue: There are three differences. Deductive reasoning - this is where one goes from a general to a particular case. Inductive reasoning is where you go from a particular to a general case. Sorry - I didn't get the 3 - just give me a B or a C for this one - it's a bit of a crash course for me. What has this to do with bent beams at the WTC and in HE experiments? Now your turn - In Pascal or BASIC programming, what is the difference between a procedure and a function? (easy) When are analogies faulty? It depends on the circumstances and the particular evidence under study. When one is evaluating black technology, analogies can be more valuable in discovering the truth than when you are working with "white world" science - because you are working with less information (by definition). The strength of analogies is increased when there are a greater number points of evidence which correspond - as with the HE/WTC evidence. Your turn: What is the difference between a procedural language and a functional language? When is a generalization hasty? Generalisation is hasty when there is a lack of evidence. For example, in smaller studies, it is less safe to generalise, because there is less evidence on which to base conclusions. ?What is the requirement of total evidence? It is that ALL the evidence is evaluated! Perfect! Yes! HE and WTC do have a total evidence requirement and Dr. Wood in her study is MUCH closer to it than Ace Baker, so even by your own knowledge and teachings, you are not adhering to the standards of logic you teach. What Ace Baker has done (and you have supported him) is use an *arbitrary subset of evidence*! A perfect expression! Thanks! Here's one for you: What is the difference between a compiler and an interpreter? What is special pleading? Ah - this is also a good one. It's when an argument includes double standards. This applies very well here. Ace Baker produced a fake video, in his search for the truth. He is engaging in "special pleading" - by claiming he has mimicked a real process, therefore the real process must be fake - he has ignored "total evidence" and adopted a double standard. Here's one: In C++ What is meant by name-mangling? (easy one) What is the popular sentiments fallacy? It is an appeal to emotions or feelings rather than relying on logic. An example would be saying "you should believe me because I have more credentials", rather than saying "you should look at the evidence and evaluate it on its own terms." Here's one: How is a stack used to pass parameters? What are the conditions that must be satisfied for an explanation to be scientific? First, "the explanandum must be a logical consequence of the explanans" and "the sentences constituting the explanans must be true". Second, the explanans must contain at least one "law of nature" and this must be an essential premise in the derivation in the sense that the derivation of the explanandum would not be valid if this premise were removed. The Hutchison Effect cannot currently be fully explained scientifically, but this does not mean it is not real. The "Pioneer Anomaly" cannot currently be explained Scientifically - that does not mean it is not real. http://www.planetary.org/programs/projects/pioneer_anomaly/ The fact that there is a persistent hexagon pattern in the atmosphere of Saturn, as observed by both Voyager and Cassini probes cannot currently be explained scientifically, that does not mean it is not real. <http://www.jpl.nasa.gov/news/news.cfm?release=2007-034> The fact that lapetus has an 8 mile-high 800 mile-long linear wall which runs along the equator of the moon and BISECTS the darker region cannot be explained scientifically, that does not mean it is not real. <http://saturn.jpl.nasa.gov/multimedia/images/image-details.cfm?imageID=1270> Want any more examples Jim? Here's one for you: What is the difference between passing parameters by value and by reference? What are the limitations of formal proofs of program correctness? Ooo - this is tricky - I am assuming you mean a computer program here? Now, if my memory serves me correctly, it's to do with how well you can establish the pre-conditions and post conditions of every statement and how well you can match assertions to those. Here's another: What is meant by re-entrant code? Tell me... How did I do, remember I am just a lowly graduate student who has taken a 2-hour crash course in these topics!! And I have learned a lot!! Fun, fun fun!! E-mail 16-----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu

[mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 06 March 2008 20:02To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; jfetzer@d.umn.edu; jpscostella@hotmail.com; ace@acebaker.comCc: lisajudy@nctv.com; econrn@suddenlink.net; Jsleaphart@cs.comSubject: RE: The Hutchison Effect and Ace Baker

I am sorry, Andrew, but your standards of credibility and mine simply do not coincide. I suppose that having a Ph.D. in the history and the philosophy of science and having devoted my professional life to logic, critical thinking, and scientific reasoning have given me a different perspective than your own. So be it! I find it fascinating that you infer that, because Ace Baker and John P. Costella and I disagree with you, we must be suppressing, distorting, or otherwise fabricating evidence! That is quite a reach. You may feel comfortable with that stance, but I would not be. Make sure that you observe in this article or yours that I stand behind Judy's research but not Hitchison's. And be sure to explain our reasons for thinking as we do. That called playing fair by laying our cards on the table as well as your own. Thanks for that! E-mail 17-----Original Message-----From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu

[mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 07 March 2008 00:01To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com; jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: Morgan Reynolds; Russ Gerst; Judy Wood; Jerry LeaphartSubject: RE: Logic Quiz Thanks, Andrew. Yes, it's been "fun, fun, fun".

I studied AI and computer science for a year at Wright State in 1986-87. Since I mentioned there were three differences between inductive and deductive reasoning and you (wrongly) mention a common misconception, I presume you already know you are wrong on that one. I'd love to offer you a tutorial, but you are not a very promising student. In any case, thanks for your good work of the past. All my best! E-mail 18-----Original Message-----From: Andrew Johnson

[mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]Sent: 07 March 2008 00:19To: jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: Morgan Reynolds; Russ Gerst; Judy Wood; Jerry LeaphartSubject: RE: Logic Quiz Thanks for this valuable feedback! I can post all this in my article! You didn't mark my other answers though :(. The 1st one deductive about reasoning came from here, and I paraphrased it: <http://www.wisegEEK.com/what-is-deductive-reasoning.htm> Can't you at least "mark" my attempts at "special pleadings"

and "total evidence" - go on, please!!?! Or "has the Daddy Taken the T-bird away, then?" E-mail 19 -----Original Message-----
--From: jfetzer@d.umn.edu [mailto:jfetzer@d.umn.edu]Sent: 07 March 2008 00:26To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com;
jfetzer@d.umn.eduCc: Morgan Reynolds; Russ Gerst; Judy Wood; Jerry LeaphartSubject: RE: Logic Quiz I had no idea I
was dealing with a child! Thanks for clarifying that!