

The New “9/11 Hijackers”?

Andrew Johnson, Feb 2007/9/11 – It Controls Our Lives

After 5 years, many many aspects of domestic and foreign policy in both the USA and UK are based on a false premise – that the 9/11 attacks were committed by Islamic fundamentalist hijackers in a plot to “attack the freedom” enjoyed by people living in Western Democratic Societies. 9/11 Truth Campaigners, like me, now know that this story is false and that we must, as quickly as possible, make as many people as possible aware of the depth of this falsehood, and its implications. We know that WTC Towers 1, 2 and 7 were not destroyed by jet fuel and jet impacts. More and more people are beginning to realise the official story is a gigantic lie. We are now battling to get the truth out to people who need to understand that they are being spoon-fed a diet of fear and misinformation. Mainstream media will not treat the issue seriously, and the language they use to describe our efforts to expose the truth is usually tainted with ridicule and/or disbelief, though recently, in the USA, things have begun to take a slightly different direction. For those of us engaged in this battle, it is sometimes easy to think that we now know enough about the realities of what happened on 9/11 to campaign and we should focus on that and keep our momentum going. However, perhaps we should remember, too, that the 9/11 perpetrators (“perps”) are still at work – they didn’t just “disappear” or “go underground” when the 9/11 Truth Campaign began to get some traction (more so in the USA than the UK). We should realise that the perps’ tactics are to infiltrate, decoy, distract, trash and ridicule and those tactics will be applied to 9/11 Truth Campaign groups in exactly the same way as they are applied to other protest groups such as Amnesty International and Stop The War. (These groups, for example have not, to my knowledge, yet made any public statements about the proof that 9/11 was an Inside Job.) When we join a campaign such as the one for 9/11 Truth, perhaps there is an expectation that all fellow campaigners – especially those who become prominent – are involved for the same reasons we are. Also, because of the particularly fundamental nature of 9/11 truth, we possibly assume fellow campaigners will be open-minded enough to dispassionately evaluate pertinent evidence regarding the events of 9/11 in an effort to determine what really happened. This expectation is perhaps brought about by our change in attitude from “believing what the media spoon-feeds us” to an attitude of looking more critically at evidence, from different sources, and deciding why and how this evidence is being brought to our attention, and what its meaning is. One of the key phrases that we come across is “Cui Bono?” – “Who Benefits?”. Additionally, we learn to “follow the money” - i.e. an unfolding agenda can often be seen to be orchestrated by bodies with a large amount of cash.

A Personal Perspective

Recently, I seem to have found myself to be involved in what I think are pivotal matters in the 9/11 Truth Arena. I am not entirely sure how this happened - I did not actively seek to be involved, nor do I have any desire to gain any recognition for this involvement, other than as someone who is honest, tries to be balanced and who dislikes conflict. To be frank, I would rather get on with my own life and I wish that there wasn’t a need to campaign vigorously for these matters to be exposed. As Korey Rowe has been heard to say “I had a nice life before this.” A number of laughable allegations have been made against me on the UK 9/11 Forum, which only upset me to the extent that those making them could have spent their time more productively (for example, in completing activities which they accuse me of “distracting” others from doing – by writing articles like this!). In order that the risibility of the allegations can be appreciated, let me describe my background - I am now 42 and was born in Skipton, North Yorkshire, UK - in (essentially) a working-class family and I am the youngest of 9 children. My Dad had no formal education and was an orphan at 12 years old. My Mum also had little formal education but has always had an interest in science, the arts, and literature and has a very active and open mind. I was educated at Ermysted's Grammar School (Skipton) and left in 1983 with ‘A’ Levels in Maths, Physics, Chemistry and General Studies. I went on to Lancaster University do a degree in Computer Science (with a minor module of Physics) and graduated in 1986. I then worked in Software Engineering (real-time software – process control and telecommunications) for about 6 years. I developed an interest in teaching and education and ended up spending 2 years as a lecturer on BTEC National and Higher National Diploma Courses at West Notts College. Dissatisfied with working conditions, I then moved back into industry (1995-1997) working in the field of Mobile Data. Following an attractive offer of work from a friend, I started to work at home, just before my daughter was born. I now do a range of part time jobs, earning most of my income from assessing disabled students for access to assistive technology for higher education. I got into this work through the Open University - I tutor part time on a course called T224 (Computers and Processors). I began actively campaigning about 9/11 (writing letters, speaking to people in the street etc) in about September 2004. In approximately December 2005, I received a surprise invitation from Steven E Jones to join a loose association called “Scholars for 9/11 Truth”, which had several types of membership – “Full”, “Associate” and “Student”. As I wasn’t a full-time academic, I requested to join as an associate, but surprisingly Steve suggested I join as a full member (I thought at the time this may have been because I had previously posted a “challenge” on a popular Physics forum for people there to explain the freefall collapse times of WTC 1 & 2.) As I had been privately campaigning for about 1 year, I was greatly encouraged, at the time, that the academic community might finally be waking up to the serious flaws in the Official 9/11 Story – what with the likes of Prof David Ray Griffin, Prof Jim Fetzer, Prof Kevin Barrett and others beginning to speak out. The fact that Jim Fetzer and Steve Jones seemed to be bringing these people together seemed to be a super development – giving real hope. I was prompted to write to my own University to ask for permission to give a presentation at the Main Campus in Milton Keynes (the request was denied). At around the same time, Prof Jones had discovered (or been advised of) some unusual footage from the Camera Planet Archive (posted on Google Video) which apparently showed Molten Metal flowing from the South Tower prior to its collapse. He had asked for help in extracting this from Google Video format to one that could be used on a Web Page or PowerPoint presentation (so it could be shown side-by-side with a staged thermite experiment as a comparison). I had the software to make this a relatively simple task, so I was happy to help out. I was pleased to see that Steve Jones originally referenced this in his paper (“Why Indeed did the World Trade Center Towers Collapse?”) And so, at the time, it seemed that thermite played a role in the destruction of the WTC towers – we seemed to have an answer to part of the mystery – the use of thermite was enough to prove it was an Inside Job. Even at that time, though, it seemed

clear that the thermite could only have been used to cut the steel beams and that something else must have been used as an explosive (as seen in the squibs, for example). Indeed, Prof Jones does mention the use of "other explosives" in the destruction of WTC 1 & 2. He also mentions the Controlled Demolition of WTC 7 – again enough to show that 9/11 was an Inside Job. However, more than a year after the publication of Steve Jones paper, we are still (apparently) no further forward in engaging other members of the academic community with the evidence. During the discussion of Steve Jones' paper, I learned of Prof Judy Wood's "Billiard Ball" example paper – much shorter and simpler than Steve Jones paper, which focused on the freefall aspect of the collapse of the towers (the same evidence I had focused on in my "physics forum challenge", but using a more basic and less complete analysis). Later I learned from Judy that Steve Jones had disclosed her name in a lecture he gave when she had requested that he did not do this. This seemed an unfortunate oversight – perhaps a simple slip of the tongue? Sometime later, I read the article by Morgan Reynolds and Rick Rajter "We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories" which, in an evidence-based manner, raises serious questions about what really hit the WTC buildings. I had already read the heated debates on our UK forum about the so-called "No-planes" issue and I hadn't really studied the evidence before reading the Reynolds/Rajter article, therefore hadn't come to any conclusions other than "well, I find it really hard to believe that big jets didn't hit the WTC!!" I couldn't ignore Morgan Reynolds highly significant credentials, nor those of Rick Rajter – a Materials Science graduate. Also, there were many posts on various forums that were characteristically dismissive, rude and included remarks about the poster's intelligence when the ideas that there were indeed some serious problems with the video evidence for the WTC plane impacts. (The "delayed fireball" of the 2nd impact being, to me, the most obvious, which has nothing to do with interpolated frames, frames rates or video compression artefacts.) Once I had seen this evidence for myself, like understanding that the WTC had undergone explosive demolition, it was so obvious that I was surprised I could have missed it for 3 or more years. However, some people think "the delayed fireball" is perfectly normal and does not break any laws of physics. The Reynolds/Rajter article later led me to another – by Profs Reynolds and Wood - originally entitled "The Trouble With Steve Jones" (now re-titled "Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Disintegrate?") Whilst I found some of the language a little abrasive, and perhaps desultory in places, I could not ignore the facts and evidence presented. Indeed, a realisation that the main thrust of what is stated in the article must be correct made me understand why such language had been used. (I would not have chosen to use such language myself, but unlike the authors, I was not directly involved in the events that had "played out".) The article raised serious questions about the thermite evidence that Jones had presented, and some of the other conclusions he had drawn. It also made me question how far Steve Jones was prepared to go in studying evidence of what really happened that day. He was, in my view, unduly dismissive of evidence presented in the We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories article, and there were certain other questions he seemed unduly unwilling to attempt to answer. So, as I began to understand the evidence presented, I gradually became less and less supportive of what Steve Jones was saying. I added a link on my "thermite" comparison page to Morgan Reynolds' and Judy Wood's critique of the Jones' paper because I felt it was important that people be given the opportunity to study all the evidence for themselves. (I notice that the latest version of Steve Jones' paper no longer includes a link to my page.) Previously, Steve Jones, in his discussion of how he got involved in 9/11 Truth research, mentioned Jim Hoffman several times. Though I had referenced Jim Hoffman's comprehensive website quite a few times prior to my involvement with ST911 - for example, in preparing a leaflet targeted at audiences of the Paul Greengrass fantasy film United 93 - I found it surprising when Hoffman seemed to be suggesting that cellphone calls could have been made successfully from Flight 93, in the light of my own knowledge about the "hand-off" problem, and the study completed by Kee Dewdney (Project Achilles). Also, I found Hoffman's mention of a "hoax theory" that Flight 93 landed at Cleveland Airport to be equally puzzling, when there was some news coverage of this at the time. Also, Hoffman's essay about Scholars for 9/11 Truth's website (st911.org) cannot be ignored and seems to be designed to distract and decoy people looking for authoritative information. In this essay, even though Jones was a co-chair of ST-911, Hoffman says: "Despite the evidence, ScholarsFor911Truth.org has thus far failed to acknowledge that the promotion of nonsensical claims is part of a deliberate strategy to undermine the Truth Movement." He also inaccurately describes Loose Change 2 as promoting "the idea that the Twin Towers were not hit by jetliners" when it does no such thing! Additionally, he seems to imply that Rick Siegel's video 9/11 Eyewitness has been produced only to make money (even when it is freely available on Google Video). As I was learning more about "little things" Jones had said, I became involved in an ongoing e-mail exchange between Morgan Reynolds, Judy Wood, Gerard Holmgren, Nico Haupt, Jim Fetzer, Thomas Mattingly and several others. Quite a few unpleasant and heated remarks were exchanged between some of these people, but I tried to filter out the important information and viewpoints presented. This was all around the time that the schism in ST911 was developing, and criticisms seemed to be targeted at both Fetzer and Jones. I became more suspicious when Jones refused Fetzer's invitations to discuss aspects of the thermite hypothesis in public forums. His actions seemed to be characteristic of someone who had something to hide – and was afraid his evidence and arguments may be deconstructed with close scrutiny. However, I tried to remain "neutral" in case there was information I wasn't aware of. We later then learned, from a year 2000 documentary of Steve Jones links to the energy cover up, which involved him publishing a paper around the time Pons and Fleischman published their pivotal Cold Fusion research. We learned that Steve Jones had connections to Los Alamos National Laboratories (where some of the development for the Atomic Bomb took place) and the Department of Energy. This wasn't looking good at all – we seemed to be seeing some kind of infiltration of the campaign by a person or people who were adopting a "limited hangout" position regarding what happened on 9/11. They were happy to say 9/11 was an Inside Job, but stopped short of analysing all the evidence available to them, to then try and determine the answers to the "who" and "how" questions. Alex Floum Then, another person, Alex Floum, came into the picture – seemingly in defence of Steve Jones. I had previously corresponded with Alex when I was posting more regularly on the ST911 forum. He had written an article summarising the Law Suits which had been started in relation to 9/11 evidence. I found this to be a good summary and, I had presumed, a useful basis on which to initiate further legal cases. I was later to realise there was a

low likelihood of Alex Floum being involved in any such initiations. A long debate then ensued which was based around the assumption that Jim Fetzer, by supporting the research of Prof Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds and others, was damaging the reputation of Scholars for 9/11 Truth. It was implied that it was clear to everyone else that Steve Jones' paper "was the most widely accepted" and any discussions considering the anomalous evidence of what happened to the planes at the WTC was divisive and probably "disinformation". I had already studied enough of the evidence (mentioned above) to know that this was a sweeping generalisation and it seemed like a tactic being used to discourage or prevent analysis of this evidence. Fred Burks Around this time (late December 2006), another character entered the debate of whom I had never heard – Fred Burks. (He was not, at the time I checked, listed as a member of ST911, however, he had joined the society early on and had assisted Jim briefly with the web site. Now, however, he was claiming to be some kind "trustee"). Jim has explained to me that he later removed Fred from the Membership List. Burks had formerly worked as an interpreter for the Bush Administration. He sent out a number of messages to the Scholars' e-mail list expressing the concerns described above. In at least one message he closed with "Deeply committed to what's best for all of us and to personal & global transformation through love & empowerment." He instigated a vote among the scholars as to whether the ST911.org web site should be run by its members. The ST911.org domain name had been acquired by Alex Floum at Jim's direction and on behalf of the society. This meant that, even though Jim had managed the site from its inception, Alex was in the position to control it. When Jim insisted that Alex turn the domain names over to him on behalf of the society, Alex instead gave them to Fred Burks, who now suggested that the way in which the society had been run should be changed or hits redirected to a new site (essentially to "save" Scholars for 9/11 Truth). The list which Fred Burks used was originally compiled by the ST911 membership secretary on behalf of Steve Jones and Jim Fetzer. While the Society has members, it is not run by its members, and there are no procedures for voting. Jim Fetzer had not given permission for the list to be used and I had seen no messages from Steve Jones to support what Burks was doing or asking Jim's agreement for such a vote. Burks conveyed the impression that Jim had entered into some kind of agreement with him about voting, which Jim has told me was not the case (I saw many of the e-mails in which this story unfolded). Some of the other Scholars such as Nick Newton seemed to express support for what Burks was doing (which essentially amounted to changing the Website content against the wishes of its rightful owner – or, to put it another way – theft and/or defacement). Jim Fetzer did not agree with what Fred Burks was doing, but suggested that, if anything like that were to be done, the right person to entrust with the domain names was Kevin Barrett. (Some of the messages which were sent were very critical of Jim Fetzer for even discussing any of this. Jim has advised me that he acted the way he did because he wanted to accommodate as wide a range of views as possible. Not all of the members of ST911 supported the research of Judy Wood and Morgan Reynolds – some of them were openly critical of the supposed ad hominem against Steve Jones (but not those against Wood and Reynolds) and were not apparently willing to dispassionately analyse the other evidence which Wood and Reynolds were highlighting. Alex Floum also supported Burks and Jones, and complained that Fetzer had threatened to report Floum for abuse of Intellectual Property laws (in seizing control of the www.st911.org). Floum seemed to think this was unfair, but Jim had consulted an attorney and learned that converting a property acquired for another party to personal use violates legal ethics. Some also criticised Floum for stating he "helped to found Scholars for 9/11 Truth" and pointed out that all he did was register the domain name on Jim Fetzer's behalf. But Jim Fetzer has advised me that he, Carl Weis, and Steve Jones were members of the original "steering committee" advising him in the conduct of the society from early on. An agreement about what to do with the www.st911.org web page was never reached, in spite of discussion that it might include an agreed statement explaining the schism. Fred Burks, however, had now frozen the site for the second time and, after conducting a second "vote", put up the the existing page (archived here) which neatly embodies the (apparently engineered) schism in www.st911.org. (Jim, who was forced by the freeze to move the scholars' web site to 911scholars.org, has now submitted the issue for a formal resolution and expects that the domain names will be turned over to him as the outcome.) One sensed "mission accomplished", as all the e-mail exchanges dropped off and, soon after, <http://stj911.org/> ("Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice" belonging to Steve Jones' et al.) received an expensive-looking website make over. Further background on these issues can be found in the statements on the www.911scholars.org website [1] and [2]. Of Molten Metals One of the key issues of evidence that Steve Jones was being criticised for were statements he made about molten aluminium. He essentially stated that, in the pictures and videos of the South Tower which showed a flowing orange metal, that metal could only be molten iron, because aluminium is silvery when molten. This statement is only partly true. Judy Wood and her student Michael Zebuhr had set up a demonstration showing that aluminium can glow orange if heated to approximately the same temperature as molten iron. This therefore negated one of the basic assertions Steve Jones had made and represented a basic flaw in his thermite hypothesis. Shockingly, at around this time, Michael Zebuhr was murdered and another of Judy Wood's students had a fire in their apartment. Since that time, some people have tried to suggest that Judy Wood and even Jim Fetzer might be somehow linked to these terrible events. However, there is no evidence that I am aware of which gives credence to these views. It basically seems like a smear campaign against Wood and Fetzer. Sometime after this, Judy received personal threats around the time she published the highly controversial "Beam Weapon" paper. (This paper, however, is founded on basic photographic evidence, seismic data and visual observations of the actual event, as well as an analysis of the profound level destruction observed. The scale of this destruction was not really portrayed well on TV. With the scale of destruction, one would have expected to see some kind of conventional "nuclear" or large volume of visible "hot" explosions. None of these things were seen.) Ostracism From an observer's stand point, it seemed to me that people like Rosalee Grable, Nico Haupt, Gerard Holmgren, Morgan and Judy seemed to have unveiled an "additional layer" of the 9/11 Cover Up. Also, it seemed that tactics of ridicule and "trashing" were being used against this group of people in a disturbingly similar pattern to those used, for example, by people in the "mainstream" who won't accept that 9/11 was an Inside Job. One example of this happened more recently, when Prof Reynolds was "booted" from SPINE because the rest of the group did not seem to like him discussing the

evidence that something other than planes hit the WTC buildings. In message board discussions, whenever the evidence that something other than Big Boeings might have hit the WTC, or that some type of unconventional technology may have also been used in the destruction of the towers, "trolls" invariably appear – usually anonymous and often very promptly. One can imagine that, if this evidence is important and does indeed indicate advanced technologies were used in the perpetration of the "9/11 illusion", elements of the Military Industrial Complex would both have the means and the motive for covering this up. This can be done both by "paid agents" and unwittingly by those people who are unwilling to examine the evidence that people like Steve Jones are not necessarily working to expose all aspects of the cover up. If people have, after the shock of 9/11, "placed their faith" in someone like Steve Jones, there is perhaps an understandable reluctance to "step back again", examine the evidence and see if the same old games are still being played. "Meet the No Planers" In September 2006, as discussion of what hit the WTC was raging, a media Hit Piece was published in the UK – in The New Statesman. This targeted David Shayler's brief remarks about the "No Big Boeings" (NBB) evidence as a way of debunking the other "9/11 Inside Job" evidence he discussed with the reporter. This article caused considerable consternation among UK campaigners - some people blamed our lack of progress at exposing 9/11 as an Inside Job squarely on David Shayler's shoulders for speaking out about the NBB evidence. Some even said this proved he must still be working for MI5, because he was clearly working "against the wider interests of the movement". This sort of thinking seemed to ignore the very powerful commitment that Shayler had repeatedly shown – travelling all around the UK, giving talks describing how 9/11 was an inside job - for no fee - and staying with friends and other campaigners (myself included). Jerry Leaphart and NIST/NCST Review Meeting On Dec 14th 2006, I received a message from Judy Wood advising me that NIST/NCST were holding a conference call meeting with some people at NIST to review the plan for production of a report detailing how WTC 7 was destroyed. This meeting had allowed public depositions to be made and was going to be Webcast. Judy asked me to record the Webcast, especially as she had been contacted by an attorney, Jerry Leaphart, who had seen Judy's analysis of the WTC destruction and what to make a deposition to the Conference Group. As part of his deposition, Jerry wanted to make comments to the NIST/NCST panel about the destruction of the WTC. Public depositions were limited to 5 minutes duration. This day was significant for the reason that no representation was made to the NCST/NIST panel by either Steve Jones or anyone directly associated with "his group". Indeed, Alex Floum would seem to have been a prime candidate for making such a representation, if not Steve Jones himself (as he refers to the NIST studies repeatedly in his own paper). So, the question remains, why did Steve Jones not bother to participate or in the event, or even comment on it? This, to me, seemed like another strong indicator that the parameters under which Steve Jones was working had either been "preset", or he had decided not to venture beyond a certain point in his quest to uncover how 9/11 was perpetrated. Ironically, Steve's group is called "9/11 Scholars for Truth and Justice", and yet there was no mention of this event, or a representation made by any member of that group (as far as I am aware). Was this just incompetence? (Maybe – but where have we heard this idea before?) Hustler Article and The Thermite theory In January 2007, US Hustler magazine published an article "Was 9/11 An Inside Job?". Apparently Judy Wood was initially contacted by the author, who later contacted Steve Jones. The article exaggerated the qualifications of Gordon Ross (who has an article posted on the Journal of 9/11 Studies) whilst diminishing those of Prof Judy Wood. It also quoted that Jim Hoffman was a physicist when he is not. Though I was glad that more exposure was being given to 9/11 being an Inside Job, it was interesting to see the thermite theory being presented in a mainstream publication, and that some basic errors and omissions were evident. I decided to compile a short rebuttal article with the comments supplied by Profs Wood and Reynolds, Jeff Strahl and Veronica Chapman. Rick Siegel and the 9/11 Mysteries film Recently, it has been brought to my attention by Rick Siegel how subtle changes have been made to his footage from 9/11 Eyewitness when it was used in the film 9/11 Mysteries. For example, Rick has discovered these problems with the film: 33:50 - Shows the first of Rick Siegel's footage of the North tower "This video was shot from New Jersey. Smoke rises from the base of the building as an explosion is heard" (Basically this is OK and with original sound from DVD) 34:08 - Second time around the same footage but the sound is replaced! Just after the dark filter effect we see the north tower collapse but the sound has been replaced with something completely different. A siren can be heard to distinguish that this is not the original sound. MAJOR DISINFO #1 Rick makes several other important observations about this film, which should be studied carefully. This does not look like "artistic licence" – rather, it looks like a deliberate attempt to distort or change the evidence. This film also includes a presentation of the thermite theory, though it does also cover the level of destruction at the WTC quite well (but not does mention directed energy weapons as a possible cause, although this concept was embryonic before the recent work of Judy Wood). Black Projects and Alex Floum When I had read Judy Wood's Beam Weapon (now often termed Direct Energy Weapon - DEW) paper, it seemed clear to me that the evidence she compiled showed clearly that Black Technology had been used in the destruction of the WTC – to me, there was no other possible way the sheer scale of destruction – as indicated by the surprisingly small pile of debris seen following the decimation of the towers – could have been caused. The problem was that she/we couldn't say exactly what had been used or how. Nevertheless, in essence, this was little different to saying that WTC 7 underwent controlled demolition (and even Steve Jones agrees with this), even if we couldn't say how the explosives were planted or by whom – or what explosives were used. Following an e-mail from Alex Floum complaining about the conduct of Jim Fetzer and asking the list/group members whether the ST911 domain should be transferred to a "new society", I replied that I thought that Steve Jones should proceed with his Journal of 911 Studies domain/site whilst Jim's site should remain in his control. I also stated my thoughts that Black Technology was used on 9/11 and we were seeing an orchestrated "damage limitation" operation to prevent people from considering or delving deeper into this controversial area. I was surprised that no one attempted to ridicule my statements and I was also marginally surprised by Floum's response. He asked me if I was the same person who started the thread on PhysOrg regarding the freefall times of the towers. This thread had closed months ago, and had attracted many thousands of views and responses. Why he should have asked me this question in relation to any of the points I made, I do not know. He asked if I could send him links to information about the use of "high

tech” on 9/11 – I referred him to Judy’s paper (as if he wasn’t aware of it already). I received no response to this. Steve Jones’ Request to Me in the same message that had prompted a response from Floum, I mentioned Steve Jones’ apparent inability to address the basic points of evidence that Judy Wood had raised. Soon after, I received a message from Steve Jones asking me which questions he couldn’t answer, so I pointed him at the list that Judy Wood had prepared. I expressed my unhappiness at what had happened with ST911 and my dislike of personal attacks. He suggested that I get together with other researchers and write a paper about Directed Energy Weapons being used on 9/11 and submit it to his Journal of 9/11 Studies for peer review. He mentioned that “personalized attacks would not be allowed”. I then replied to him saying that I was not a research scientist (and I had made this clear to him when I joined ST911) so even if I did write a paper, it would not have any real credibility. I also then pointed out that Judy’s paper, though unfinished, would qualify as a Scientific paper and contained no personalised attacks on Steve Jones. I received no response from Steve Jones to these points. Fetzer Jones Debate - Jan 17 2006 Following repeated requests, Steve Jones finally agreed to talk with Jim Fetzer on Jim’s “Dynamic Duo” show on GCN Live. Feelings were obviously strong and this seemed to have a significant impact on the quality of the discussion. Jim Fetzer talked unnecessarily over Steve Jones and voices were raised on many occasions. However, on listening to the broadcast (linked above), I made the following notes, referenced by the elapsed times shown below. 43:38 – Steve Jones shouts there was “significant damage” (twice) to the bathtub (but lower Manhattan still didn’t flood). He talks about quantifying data, but in this context what does “significant” mean? He didn’t say what volume of water flowed – he merely listed a number of news reports which described some damage to the slurry wall (the bath tub). Such news reports didn’t seem to me to constitute a sufficiently quantified rebuttal to what Judy had written – it seemed to me more like a set of statements intended to debunk the basic evidence. 45:58 - Steve Jones mentions the paper about WTC dust particle sizes by Paul Liroy et al. Though Steve talks about a table of dust particle sizes, his use of this data is rather misleading, in my opinion – he seems to be trying to say that the pulverisation and dustification which Judy had discussed did not really happen – only large particle sizes resulted. However, a look at the abstract (my emphasis) of the paper above seems to indicate this paper, alone, would not be a good basis on which to judge the level of pulverisation: Abstract The explosion and collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) was a catastrophic event that produced an aerosol plume impacting many workers, residents, and commuters during the first few days after 11 September 2001. Three bulk samples of the total settled dust and smoke were collected at weather-protected locations east of the WTC on 16 and 17 September 2001 ; these samples are representative of the generated material that settled immediately after the explosion and fire and the concurrent collapse of the two structures. We analyzed each sample, not differentiated by particle size, for inorganic and organic composition. In the inorganic analyses, we identified metals, radionuclides, ionic species, asbestos, and..... 54:00 – Steve Jones states that the “Spire shakes and falls” but he doesn’t explain how - we can’t see any additional explosions on the video, so what is the energy causing this shaking and falling? 55:00 - Steve makes strong, repeated emphasis on sulfidation of the steel and makes a vague reference to the use of RDX but does not offer any other specific details of explosives. He then mentions “supercoarse dust” – an odd term because it is clear that some of the dust was very fine – fine enough to be visibly suspended in the air for many minutes or hours. 55:52 - Steve states that he wishes NIST would release more videos of collapse. It seemed odd to me that he did not report that he had asked them to release such videos – seeing as he is considered by many as the foremost researcher from the academic community who has looked at this area. 59:00 - Steve asks if Judy’s paper explains the destruction of WTC 7. This is a curious question – it seems that most researchers agree on conventional Controlled Demolition being used on WTC 7! So, whilst I was uneasy about Fetzer’s conduct of the interview (which was perhaps partly understandable after the “goings on” with the assault on ST911), I was very uneasy about some of the points Steve Jones made and the apparent tactic of debunking the evidence for the amount of pulverisation or related destruction of the WTC

complex. [youtube: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uO9lv_4ZfNI] “Ambushed!” (by Greg Jenkins) Some time ago, Prof Wood advised us of an impromptu interview which had been sprung on her after she had given a presentation at the NPCC. She had driven 600 miles and had previously not slept for 48 hours. People can watch this interview and form their own opinion of it. I will take the liberty of suggesting, however, even though the questions and information exchanged in the interview are revealing in themselves, Prof Wood would likely have been even more congenial under different circumstances. [Edit: Judy did not actually give a presentation herself that day - please see this article for more details.] John Albanese Signs Up for UK 9/11 Forum! Recently, John Albanese signed up for our UK forum to post information about a new film he has produced about disinformation. He then seemed to make allegations about Profs Wood and Reynolds, which I challenged him about. I have yet to see any evidence to support these serious allegations. 9/11 WAS an Inside Job – so what? It has to be said that despite the many great efforts and significant sacrifices made by many individuals who are trying to campaign for the truth behind 9/11 to be revealed, little has changed in the last 5 years. The “police state agenda” has unfolded before us and enough measures are already in use to see that it is real. It seems that the perpetrators are not really bothered that we know 9/11 was an Inside Job. What can we do about it? They can still unfold their agenda without any significant resistance. “Ding, Ding – Round Two!” It would be nice to think that the fight to uncover 9/11 as an Inside Job only had “one round” and that we were well on our way to winning it. However, it seems to me, that we have now come to the end of “round one” and “round two” is now in progress. The perps are well-resourced and well-trained and are now beginning to land many more punches on those who are the closest to uncovering the links between the 9/11 Cover up and the other areas (like black technology and the energy cover up) which would undermine their power base. Cui Un-Bono?! I have summarised in a table below who seems to have benefited and who seems not to have benefited in the “goings on” described above: Judy Wood identified against her will Steve Jones lauded and applauded for his “Why Indeed...” paper. Judy Wood lost her job at Clemson Steve Jones retired – and still salaried. Judy Wood’s student Michael Zebuhr murdered Steve Jones described in CBS News Piece as founder of ST911 (see also response from 911Scholars) Judy Wood receives death threats Steve Jones featured in “Impossible

Collapse” Judy Wood attacked for promoting “wild theories” Steve Jones thermite hypothesis evidence featured in 9/11 Mysteries Jim Fetzer’s www.st911.org stolen/defaced <http://stj911.org/> gets a glossy make-over Conclusion Most of us agree that the hijackers that supposedly took control of the supposed planes on 9/11 were not real. However, I would suggest we now seem to have some real hijackers in our midst – some of them already appear to have taken control of parts of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, for example – and others have suggested that other campaigning groups have been similarly “hijacked”. Others seem to be at work trying to limit the parameters of 9/11 research, as that research now takes those who look at the evidence into even more contentious and controversial areas of study. I felt that enough people would be shocked and reviled by 9/11 Truth to see through the tactics of pernicious debunking, discrediting and ridicule - but we now seem to have formed something like “The Official 9/11 Truth Campaign’s version of 9/11 Truth” - anyone who begins to challenge this “official version” is said to be “damaging the movement”. It seems that even very loose associations/organisations like ST911, once they begin to gain some traction, are targeted with the same old “divide and conquer” tactics. Some members of these organisations seem more attached to the idea that “unity and truth” are the same thing – when, all too often, those claiming to speak the truth, as history should teach us, usually have a particular agenda. Maybe the truth is that we should all be able to follow our own threads of research and paths of evidence, without the pernicious debunking by others and we should be allowed to draw our own conclusions. Perhaps as the links between the 9/11 scam and the many others that have been played out on the general population over the last few millennia will now become exposed, and this will lead to a new era in human understanding, with access to surprising new technologies which can be used in ways beneficial to many more people than just the ruling elite. Acknowledgements I would like to thank:

- Prof Judy Wood for her incredible insights, research, tenacity and dignity in the face of severe adversity.
- Prof Jim Fetzer for his continued efforts to maintain ST911 as a credible entity under very difficult circumstances.
- Prof Reynolds and Rick Rajter for their superb analyses of the plane crash evidence and also Prof Reynolds for graciously publishing, on his Website, the Hustler rebuttal we compiled.
- Rick Siegel for his amazing contributions to the fight for the truth and his lyrical and deeply insightful analysis of the evidence and the events as they have unfolded.
- Thomas Mattingly for his “mediation” and provision for public exposure of Reynolds/Fetzer/Wood’s evidence and analysis via The McClendon Group.
- Jeff Strahl for his concise and focused comments and contributions.
- Veronica Chapman for her succinct and acutely observed points.
- Jerry Leaphart for his diligent work from a legal perspective and for being a lone dissenting voice at the NIST/NCST panel conference.
- CB Brooklyn for his collation of evidence re Steve Jones and his willingness to post to the various message boards in order to expose this information.
- Gerard Holmgren, Nico Haupt and Rosalee Grable for being at the forefront of analysis of some of the evidence mentioned here long before many others were “on the case”.
- Many others for looking at the evidence and diligently working to expose it in ways they see as appropriate. Comments, corrections and feedback welcomed.