

9 or 11 “Clues” about Simon Shack and a 3D-Analysis of Flight 175

Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)
21 May 2012
UPDATED (AT BOTTOM): 16 Jul 2012
September Clues

Around the beginning of June 2007, a new video –

called “September Clues” appeared. It presented an analysis of the events as they were shown on TV on 9/11/2001. It tried to present the evidence that some of the images we were shown of the events could not have been real. The person who had produced/edited this video used the pseudonym “Social Service” and

he seemed to be associated with a band of the same name.

Around this time, I had been following the discussion and presentation of the so-called “video fakery” and “no planes” evidence by people such as Nico Haupt, Rosalee Grable and Ace Baker, and so I was very interested in this new video series and I watched all of it.

Over the next few months “Social Service” produced additional “episodes” documenting further anomalies in the video record of 9/11. One of the interesting things he noted that, as the events unfolded on TV, a number of phone calls were made to various TV stations where witnesses claimed to have seen a plane hitting the tower. Oddly, most - if not all - of these calls that were aired were from media people – TV producers, their wives or other staff from TV stations. Some of the callers - like

Teresa Renaud - seemed to describe events they could not possibly have seen clearly, based on where they said they were when they made the call (this is illustrated in one part of “September Clues”).

If you watch the September Clues series, you will probably see why I was impressed by the detail that “Social Service” had studied and pointed out in his videos.

Social Service released several updates to September clues and it finally ended up as 8 ten-minute segments and a couple of additional “epilogue” videos. Around this time, it was revealed that Social Service’s name was “Simon Shack”.

It seemed Shack could be “onto something” - as he was being attacked by quite a number of people –

even by “fellow” 9/11 researchers like Ace Baker and

Anthony Lawson. One particular area of “confrontation” was the so called

“nose out” video – where it was illustrated that in one video, the nose of the plane appeared to have penetrated the whole WTC tower! (Arguments then circulated about the details of this).

Andrew Johnson Offers Support to Simon Shack

In July or August 2008, on a forum, Simon Shack made a request for some web storage space for his videos. At the time, I had set up some web space, and paid a 1-year subscription – but then the people I set the

website up for didn't want it and I had no real use for it, so I offered some of the space to Simon Shack to store his video files etc, and I gave him the passwords. Additionally,

I purchased a domain name for Simon Shack

www.septclues.com - at modest cost.

Sometime after this, because I thought Simon Shack was interested in finding the truth, I asked him if he would be interested in recording a "Podcast" about his "September Clues" research and also about his thoughts on

the research of Dr Judy Wood. This research has proved that an energy weapon or weapons, which appear(s) to operate on a principle of "field interference" was/were used to destroy the WTC complex.

(It was also used as the basis of a Qui Tam Fraud case). Simon Shack never responded to my request – and I moved on to other things without repeating my request. However, this didn't really matter, because it later became clear what his thoughts on these issues were.

Approximately 1 year later in August 2009,

Simon Shack wrote to me pointing out that the webspace I had given him was "no longer accessible". This was because the package I had originally bought (for someone else – not me and not Simon Shack) had "expired" and I had chosen not to renew it. I therefore sent Simon Shack the passwords to access the Website control panel so that he would be able to use his own credit card to pay for a renewal – in no way did I block access to the site.

Since 2007, I have given out hundreds of copies of September Clues on DVD. Whilst arguments about details are ongoing, I still find parts of the analysis of the "plane" related video clips compelling. Despite everything, Shack's research helped to illustrate that real planes could not have crashed at any of the 4 sites, it also highlighted other oddities, such as a

news reporter going to LAX airport to meet with families and friends that would have been waiting for people to disembark from the hijacked flights (which never made it to LAX airport). However, when he got there, he found only 2 people waiting – and that the airport was going to be evacuated.

911 Actors!

Over time, I have become more suspicious of what Simon Shack has been doing – especially when he started to claim that all the video and images from 911 are fake.

He has made a video called "911 Actors" where he has claimed that relatives and friends of victims of the events – such as Bob McIlvane are actors and are simply "going through the motions" when they have been speaking about their anguish at public events. However, Shack presents no other real evidence in this video other than what he interprets as their odd behaviour. This sort of analysis or view seemed to follow on from other

(to me, more convincing) videos that showed that people did seem to have been "planted" early on to "cement" the official story – even as it was unfolding.

In his "911 Actors" Video, at 6:47, Shack declares (with a clever design) "What a Smart Scheme it was. A total simulation upheld by a group of actors doing what they do best: SIMULATION"

911 Skills!

Following this, in his “911 Actors” video, Shack plays in quick succession a number of photos of various researchers and figures who have spoken out against the official story of 911. If you look carefully,

at 6:57, you will notice that he includes a picture of Dr Judy Wood. Some of the other pictures that Simon shows really are of actors – such as Charlie Sheen. What subliminal message is Simon Shack trying to embed? (Note: he flashes up pictures and includes no specific evidence to back up any allegations – in fact, he makes no specific allegations in this part of the video.)

Dr Judy Wood Sent Hate Mail, Right?

Earlier on, I mentioned that it became clear to me why Simon Shack was not interested in the truth about 911 – as proved by Dr Judy Wood’s research. The inclusion of Dr Wood’s photo in his “Actors” video, described above, is one reason.

On his forum, he made a post that implied Dr Judy Wood had sent him some hate mail through a YouTube account. (This wasn’t the first time he had referred to this supposed hate mail.) In this same post he writes:

I see that Judy Wood has published a new book. However, her research is based on fake pictures. The sole purpose of her existence is, imho, to provide 'a plausible explanation' for the very stupid-looking WTC 'pulverization' animations.

So, Shack thinks the research is inconclusive because “the photos are fake”. It seems clear, if one reads the language used in the supposed hate mail sent via YouTube that it could not have been Dr Judy Wood. Simon Shack seems to think that because the YouTube channel is there, it must be Dr Wood’s. (There are apparent efforts of fellow posters to “bolster” this idea.) However, if you look at this channel, you will see that there are no videos uploaded on it – and it is decidedly “austere”.

Simon Shack also stated:

"Is this really Judy's YT channel", you may ask... Well, at the time I did ask Andrew Johnson (her research colleague whom I've been in touch with in the past) for clarification.

That may have been true when he made the post (May 6th 2011) – but soon after, he contacted me via Skype text chat and I confirmed to him that this was not Dr Judy Wood’s channel (more on this “chat” later).

Also, the message said Dr Judy Wood would “sue” Simon Shack, but Simon doesn’t make it clear in the post why Dr Wood would want to sue him. It is not clear now either.

I can confirm that the YouTube channel “DrJudyWood” does not belong to Dr Judy Wood and it does not belong to me. I do not know who it does belong to. Also, as far as I can remember, when I originally looked at this channel, it was only subscribed to one other channel – that of SimonShack (though that has since changed). I can also confirm that Simon Shack is the only person I am aware of that received hate mail from the YouTube channel with the name “DrJudyWood”.

Real Names Vs. Aliases and Psuedonym’s

People who have seen how I approach things will know that I avoid any kind of anonymity. There are a number of reasons for this, one of the

main ones being that the culture of anonymity that was created on forums some years ago is a big factor in making them what they are – for discussing subjects such as 9/11, they are largely a waste of time now. You don't know who you're talking to unless (like me) everyone uses their real name or can be immediately known by the name they use.

As it turns out, Simon Shack is actually a Pseudonym.

Simon Shack's real name is Simon Hytten and he disclosed this on his forum in March 2011. (Hytten is Norwegian for "hut" or "cabin" - hence "Shack".) So, Simon Shack has not been using his real name – only a possible translation of it.

It's All Fake!

Mr Shack (Hytten) has now gone to the ridiculous extent of claiming ALL 9/11 video and photo footage is fake - and he therefore claims it cannot be relied upon to determine how the towers were destroyed. Yes, really!

He confirmed this in a Skype chat I had with him.

Simon's Skype Chat

On several occasions, Simon Hytten has contacted me via Skype text chat. On Aug 24th 2010, he asked me:

[24/08/2010 22:29:08] simon shack: Andrew, why don't you return to our forum? Tell me frankly now: are you somehow connected to the UK intelligence agencies? Don't get offended now - you know that I'm a quite normal person making my utmost to understand the oddities of this planet.

Some slightly odd questions. However, I have never posted on Simon Shack's "clues" forum. He did have another forum (z6.invisionfree.com/Reality_Shack) though I am fairly sure I never posted there either. I confirmed to Simon that I do not work for any UK (or other) intelligence services – and that I work for the Open University – as I have stated many times. I encourage everyone and anyone to study what I have posted and I openly challenge them to find errors or misleading statements or any evidence at all that I am anything other than just an ordinary person.

During in this chat, Simon Hytten made his position clear:

[24/08/2010 22:35:11 | Edited 22:36:36] simon shack: Yes but you must know that people analyzing the fake 9/11 videos- and making scientific conclusions around them - are entrenched in a fallacy? Such as Judy Wood?

Sadly, Simon misrepresents the truth. Dr Wood's research is based on at least the following:

- 1) Photographic Evidence
- 2) Video Evidence
- 3) Witness Audio Testimony
- 4) Audio features (e.g. relative silence of towers turning to dust)
- 5) Weather data
- 6) Seismic Data
- 7) Official reports – such as dust analysis (Cahill).
- 8) Photos from places like FDR drive ½ mile from WTC.
- 9) personal trips to the WTC site. On each of her visits to the site, for example, she has

- a. taken her own photographs (See Figure 154, page 153 of Where Did The Towers Go?)
- b. sampled air quality
- c. made observations about the material characteristics and documented anomalies and changes
- d. documented unusual treatment of the site
- e. spoken with first responders, victims' family members, and survivors who were in the towers shortly before they were turned to dust.
- f. directly observed and documented structural and material changes

Conversely, Simon Hytten's research is primarily based on video and photo evidence – some audio and the odd bit of witness testimony. Simon Hytten completely ignores the other 4 or 5 categories of evidence – I have not seen him discuss them anywhere in any of his lengthy posts.

Later in the Skype chat, Simon seems to think that Richard Gage is a researcher – and that his “methods” are comparable to Dr Wood's:

[24/08/2010 22:38:28] simon shack: Both Richard Gage and Judy Wood look at the videos and draw

conclusions from them. This is a fallacious way of going about the research.

Sadly, Simon does not seem to realise what

I had previously posted about Richard Gage and AE911. (I have posted more information since this conversation with Hytten.) It seems that Hytten's mind is already made up about proving what happened to the WTC:

[24/08/2010 22:46:18] simon shack: I - and NO ONE ELSE - will ever be able to prove exactly how the WTC complex was demolished. Do you understand? That's why Richard GAGE concentrates on his UNPROVABLE matter.

Again, Simon ignores what I had already written and posted about Richard Gage and recklessly lumps things together in a way which displays ignorance of the facts. He says “NO ONE ELSE - will ever be able to prove exactly how the WTC complex was demolished”. Wow. He sounds sure of himself. Is he afraid of someone doing just that? Let's not forget, Dr Judy Wood started a fraud case based on the evidence she collected – Simon Hytten has, to date, not done anything similar.

Simon Says “Believe...”

Also in this Skype chat, Simon addressed the question of the towers' disappearance:

[24/08/2010 22:41:08] Andrew Johnson: How were the towers "demolished"?

[24/08/2010 22:41:16] simon shack: Let me believe that they were demolished quite conventionally, ok?

I found it most interesting that Simon chose to believe that the towers were demolished (despite the evidence which proves they were not – such as the lack of sound and the lack of seismic signature – neither of which are photo or video evidence). His whole study in September Clues is meant to be based on analysis of evidence – of video fakery and so on. So, when it comes to the destruction of the WTC, why does Simon believe all the evidence is fake? Why does he believe they were “demolished conventionally”? Why does he choose belief over knowledge – and evidence?

On the Ball

On 3 Aug 2010, UK Engineer, Researcher and Journalist (in the proper sense of the word),

Richard D Hall published

his intriguing and detailed “Ball Analysis” which was inspired by

a curious sequence included in September Clues where Simon Hytten notes how it appears that a “Ball shaped object” rather than “a plane shaped object strikes the tower, as shown in live NBC footage, shot from a helicopter. Curiously, this same shot is repeated on the evening news, but with the “ball” being replaced by a “plane”. Richard’s analysis explores the possible meaning of this.

In a later Skype chat, in 2011, Simon Shack said (presumably referring to the Ball Analysis):

[03/06/2011 22:12:26] simon shack: Well - your friend Richard Hall has obviously tried to distort the TV fakery evidence, has he not?

I pointed out that Richard Hall had merely used a segment from September Clues and re-analysed it – I’d hardly call that “distorting TV fakery evidence”. Hall presented it as an idea, not a “definite conclusion”.

911 Flights - Video and Radar

Richard D Hall and I had discussed some of the issues raised above and he himself, having published his “Ball” analysis still had additional questions about some of the video record. He decided to conduct a deeper and more thorough analysis and boldly attempted to “map” as many of the flight 175 plane crash videos as he could onto/into his 3D-model of Manhattan.

This analysis was published on 21 May 2012 and revealed that 26 clips of the flight 175 crash did indeed appear to match the Radar Data supplied by the NTSB (but there was a discrepancy of about 1400 feet/430 metres with the 84RADES Radar Data). This tended to rule out the idea of “simple video fakery” – which is what most other “no planers” argue. It seemed to bring us to the point of realisation that “another” technology had been used – one which created the image of planes in the sky – which really could be filmed/video’d. This also explains one of the fundamental difficulties with the “only video fakery” position – some witnesses did report seeing a plane – though there were sufficient variations in their accounts to suggest that there could have been issues with viewing the projected image from certain locations. One of the curious things is the “disappearing wings” observed in some clips [1]

[2]

– this should not happen with CGI!

[youtube:<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b5DgFcpsxes>]

Plane Sounds

Another problem with the video fakery is the sound – when I carried out my witness study, there were also considerable discrepancies as to the sounds reported – but this would make sense if it was not a real plane which struck the tower. The sound must have been generated some how, or is it even possible that people “remembered” the sound after the event – having seen it on television?

Soap Opera

With repeated arguing, insulting and ridiculing, much energy gets absorbed – which could otherwise be spent on finding the truth about 9/11. Speaking for myself, I try not to get engaged in such activities. Doubtless, some will accuse me of “wasting time” composing articles such as this.

It has become clear to some of us that the truth about the events of 9/11 can be discovered. It also seems to be possible to discover unpalatable truths about how the 9/11 cover up continues – on internet forums populated by rude anonymous posters, and through people posing as evidence-based researchers – who then wilfully ignore certain evidence and attack others who have done the most to verify and analyse the most powerful evidence available.

Conclusions

Here again we have the pattern of a 9/11 researcher establishing himself in the “research community”, completing some time-consuming and apparently very credible research. Yet, they then either ignore or just attack the most powerful, science-based and court-submitted evidence and research that is available. The forum they set up becomes another place where anonymous posters become abusive about the research and the person who has done the most with it. (The same has happened with forums at

www.911researchers.com and

<http://forum.911movement.org/> both of which closed down after some months/years of operation.)

Instead of Simon Hytten saying “well, I am not quite sure how the towers were destroyed – I haven’t studied the evidence enough yet” he states that he believes in “conventional demolition” and he posts supposed hate mail on his forum - which he suggests has come from Dr Judy Wood.

The record is now clear that Simon Hytten wilfully ignores evidence, implants information to encourage doubt and then expects someone like me to accept an invitation to his house in Italy!

[03/06/2011 21:36:02 | Edited 21:36:16] simon shack: Would you come over for the big 10-year celebration in my house over Rome?

Each to their own, but to me having a

“9/11 anniversary party” on Sept 11 2011 is a strange idea – as is setting up a model of the twin towers for that party.

Messing with People’s Minds

Simon Hytten’s current position on 911 has become almost surreal – he states that ALL the photo and video record is fake, there were no victims and it was all a simulation. He has tried to persuade some people that basic observations (such as the towers turning to dust) may not actually be correct. Would anyone believe this? Apparently, they would – a friend of mine, who knows me personally - for a short time began to believe that Simon Hytten’s view that one couldn’t determine what happened to the WTC because all the videos were “fake”. The conversation with my friend illustrated to me that “following” someone can mean that they can “lead you” in the wrong direction. However, as evidence is not a person, you are not subject to being influenced by a personal agenda if you stick with analysing evidence.

Perhaps Simon Hytten's slow but sure "building up" of a following around September Clues can itself be seen as yet another "perception management" operation – perhaps this time made easier by the very convoluted nature of the video anomalies he originally set out to illustrate (i.e. it really does make you reconsider what is real and what is not).

Additionally, Simon Hytten's claim that some the victims - and/or their relatives – are actors – without actually being able to prove this idea - can also be very upsetting for many people. This can divert them away from looking at the genuine anomalies which do indeed lay in the video record of 9/11 – and do, indeed, allow us to find out what really happened.

Perhaps Simon Hytten is himself an actor – hey, he decided to use a "stage name", didn't he? I leave the reader to decide.

===

E-mail 1

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 07 August 2009 15:15

To: simonshack@libero.it

Subject: RE: septclues.com is down !

Hello Simon,

Sorry about this - I completely forgot to tell you - the space was due to expire on 19th July. I have been away for 2 weeks out of the last 4 and this all slipped my mind - especially as Servage did not send a reminder of any kind.

I hadn't planned to renew it as that space was originally purchased for someone else who then moved their website elsewhere (and they didn't offer me anything to cover the £75 I'd already paid out).

I didn't realise you'd linked stuff on the other forum either - I'd just assumed you had the video files stored there.

If you want to try and renew it, you can logon here:

<https://secure.servage.net/admin/?menuHeader=3&menuSub=1&page=index>

Username is: xxxx

PWD is: xxxxx

then there is a "captcha" to put in (for some strange reason).

The web space was set up for "wholetruthcoalition.org" but then it got moved.

You are of course welcome to do anything with the domain name www.septclues.com.

If you need me to help out further, I will, but if you can renew it yourself, 14 months of hosting will cost £74.97 - you can pay by paypal, but you will need to change the registered e-mail address on the

account.

The Septclues.com domain name will expire on 13th August
- again I had forgotten about this - it cost me £10 last year, and I expect it
will be the same this year.

You will find all the info accessible from the control
panel, once you've logged in.

All the best

Andrew

> -----Original Message-----

> From: simonshack@libero.it

[mailto:simonshack@libero.it]

> Sent: 07 August 2009 14:45

> To: ad.johnson

> Subject: septclues.com is down !

>

>

> Dear Andrew,

>

> The septclues webspace you kindly set up for me is
down :

>

> <http://www.septclues.com/>

>

> "The account has been suspended for non-payment"

>

> Please let me know as soon as possible if this is just
a

> temporary problem due to a late payment. Also, let me
know if you

> wish me to arrange for the payment myself (I have no
credit card

> but I have a paypal account with a little credit on it
- maybe

> Servage accepts paypal payments?)

>

> Thanks for a prompt reply ! As you may imagine, it is
a rather

> urgent matter as all my September Clues material
/pictures and

> Gifs are now unavailable at the 911movement forum !

>

> best

>

> simon shack

>

>

> No virus found in this incoming message.

> Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

> Version: 8.5.392 / Virus Database: 270.13.45/2286 -

Release Date:

> 08/06/09 18:17:00

>

Related:

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com]

Sent: 09 August 2009 09:11

To: simonshack@libero.it

Subject: FW: Automated Reminder: Your Domain is Expiring 2009-08-13

-----Original Message-----

From: Servage Hosting [mailto:noc@servage.com]

Sent: 09 August 2009 04:02

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Automated Reminder: Your Domain is Expiring
2009-08-13

The following domain name(s) will expire in 5 DAYS:

Domain Name, Expiry Date
septclues.com, 2009-08-13

*****IMPORTANT*****

If the domain name(s) are not renewed during the next 5 days, they will stop working! This WILL affect all email and websites that use the domain. PLEASE RENEW AS SOON AS POSSIBLE to avoid disruption to your service.***

Thank you

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - www.avg.com

Version: 8.5.392 / Virus Database: 270.13.47/2289 -

Release Date: 08/08/09 18:17:00

[00:37:07] simon shack: Andrew, today I just happened to bump into this :

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GTSzHmHnR78> So I guess you are now officially suspecting me and September Clues to be some sort of 'cointelpro' operation. Very well. At least I know where you stand now - and I return this outrageously grave accusation straight to the sender - but only in private for now. To be sure, I have no videos up on Youtube saying similar things about you. In my world, this is called defamation and slander - you should be ashamed of such antics - but I certainly don't have the means to hire a lawyer and have you prosecuted for libel in the UK. Instead, I'll ask you for now to be fair and gentlemanly enough to reply to this footnote of mine

: <http://www.cluesforum.info/viewtopic.php?p=2372562#p2372562> Also, I do NOT authorize you to post on the internet these private exchanges we are having on Skype. How you can do so without asking me for my consent is beyond belief.

[00:54:04 | Edited 01:07:30] simon shack: And yes, we have strongly criticized Judy Wood on our forum - and I am ready to assume my own responsibilities for participating in calling out her act. But I have not, to this day, openly suspected you of being anything else than a deluded follower of her DEW dustification theories, based on her so-called 'scientific' analyses of fake, computer-generated imagery. I may have to reconsider these milder opinions of you if you fail to respond in a no-nonsense manner to this present communication.[21:47:40] Andrew Johnson: Hey Simon - you can read the article I posted on my website! It's all there for you!

[i.e. the article above][21:47:58] Andrew Johnson: It's important to be responsible for what you say and do[21:48:09]

Andrew Johnson: which is why I posted the skype[21:48:29] Andrew Johnson: I suggest you not talk to me any more or it might become more incriminating[21:48:57] Andrew Johnson: I tried to help you - and you chose to attack scientific research and lie about it[21:49:01] Andrew Johnson: your choice![21:49:28] Andrew Johnson: so I've nothing else to say really[21:49:57] simon shack: "Incriminating?" What crimes have I committed, Andrew?[21:50:30] Andrew Johnson: How about helping to pervert the course of justice?[21:50:52] Andrew Johnson: But I also meant incriminating in illustrating you have lied[21:50:57] simon shack: Come on - you are joking, right?[21:51:02] Andrew Johnson: Nope[21:51:22]

Andrew Johnson: But I have nothing else to say of value so why are you talking to me?[21:51:48] Andrew Johnson: People with an open mind will find everything they need on my website[21:51:53] simon shack: You're funny...[21:52:21] simon shack: I hope you really believe in what you do. Let's just leave it that. Bye![21:52:29] Andrew Johnson: Bye! Simon Shack has

now made his views more than plain:

<http://www.cluesforum.info/viewtopic.php?t=807&p=2371640#p2371650>

I'll stop

here for now. Please reply to this post of mine before you spam any other links to "Judy Wood's" blatant disinformation bullcrap on this forum.
Thanks.