

# The Vancouver 911 “Hearings” - Encouraging Conjecture, Discouraging Certainty, Obscuring Known Truth

Andrew Johnson

ad.johnson@ntlworld.com, 06 June 2012

## “Conspiracy Culture”

People who have a more “fixed” mindset, believing (more or less) that what they have been presented with by mainstream news and “academic” sources is true, often scoff arrogantly at people like me. I have scratched through the “surface reality” to reveal the murky layer underneath. Perhaps the principle reason why they scoff is that they assume there is no evidence to back up or prove the things they just cannot accept are true – and it’s not worth their time to look.

Sometimes, as I work through and review this material, I can forgive them for thinking “there is no nothing to see here”. The reason I say this is because numerous false assumptions are being made in many areas of “conspiracy culture”. This means that what is presented as being true is sometimes not provable – at least, not to the extent that is being claimed.

One good example of this is the chemtrail phenomenon – which I have studied in some detail and written quite a bit about. A number of groups have whipped themselves up, almost into a frenzy, because they assume that all the trails they see in the sky are toxic spray – which is constantly raining down on them and poisoning them. However, carefully reviewing the evidence seems to show that the toxic spraying cannot be as widespread as people are claiming. I do not want to write too much about this here, because it is not the thrust of this article. For the moment, I will say that we have evidence that some toxic spraying has taken place and we do have some

very, very strange videos and photos which clearly show weather, cloud and contrail anomalies which cannot be explained in conventional terms. To leap from there to a conclusion that “constant toxic spraying” is taking place is not currently supported by the available evidence. Also, I think it is worth considering the tendency for groups of people coming to an unsupported conclusion can be utilised by those keeping secrets to help ensure that those secrets are still covered up. Such is the power of disinformation...

## Uncertainty

With so much uncertainty in the “conspiracy” or “alternative knowledge” culture, is it any wonder that some people scoff arrogantly? When one reviews all of the information available, how much of it is “open to debate”? Stop and consider how the language used within the culture is peppered with phrases relating to uncertainty. For example, common terms are “conspiracy theory”, “hypothesis”, “truth seeking” (implying that the truth has not been found), “the truth is out there” (not “in here”). Radio talk shows often have titles such as “out there”, “the unknown” or “planet X”. When one becomes involved more deeply in the alternative culture, it often seems like all certainties “melt away” and the whole of reality becomes more fluid. Do we then become “conditioned” that certainty is no longer available? What truth can we “truly establish”?

We can establish truth and certainty when we have available evidence – and the more evidence we have available, the more we can establish with certainty. Unfortunately, in “conspiracy culture”, it sometimes seems “unfashionable” to establish anything

with certainty – it almost seems like establishing truth and certainty is discouraged – due to the level of conjecture and the amount of information which is interpreted in so many different ways. People seem to look to “leaders” and there even seems to be a kind of “hero worship” – which can, at times, mean that people don’t think for themselves enough.

### Discouraging Certainty

I would like the reader to consider that this culture of discouraging certainty is actively used and promoted by those wishing to keep important secrets, which allow them to “stay in the driving seat” of affairs on planet earth at this time. An area where certainty can be established, if the reader chooses to review the available evidence, is in relation to what happened at the WTC on 9/11. For many, they simply cannot accept this could be the case – on the one hand, they assume that they already know the truth, as told by the mainstream media and “international experts” and so on. Then, on the other hand in “conspiracy culture”, they sometimes assume the truth cannot be known – because there are “too many conflicting theories”. Few consider, as I have suggested above, that “conspiracy culture” itself can be used as a cover up for truths that can be - and are already - known.

People reading this may already know of my association with Dr Judy Wood who, through her meticulous research, has established some profound and detailed truths (not theories) about what happened to the WTC. So profound and world-changing are these truths, that many methods and techniques seem to have been employed to keep people from seeing, realising and comprehending these truths. What is the reason for this? This is how a friend of mine recently put it:

[Dr Judy Wood] being victorious - in her message to the public - results in the entire overthrow of our ruling elite - I wonder if she knows that - and the consequent forces aligned against her.

Over the last few years, I have tried to compile the evidence that shows certain people are working on behalf of those forces – wittingly and unwittingly - to keep people from being certain about what happened. I have published some of this evidence – and a commentary about it –

in my free book/ebook called “9/11 Finding the Truth”. Overall, these forces – the ones encouraging doubt and uncertainty - have been largely successful. However, thanks to the efforts of a small number of folks in the USA and in the UK (mainly), we have shown that these intensive and intricate PsyOps aren’t working on everyone. My own efforts at summarising, compiling and distributing all this evidence about what happened to the WTC and evidence about who is covering it up - have not been without success. There is no denying, however, that I am, all too often, “outgunned” by folks with collectively more time, money and expertise in disseminating attractive or authoritative-looking disinformation. Which brings me to the latest part of a psychological operation.

### Vancouver “Hearings”

Some time ago, Jim Fetzer decided to organise a new conference about 9/11 research - to which he invited Dr Morgan Reynolds and Dr Judy Wood. Dr Morgan Reynolds declined to attend. Due to the way Fetzer has covered up and muddled up important aspects of Dr Judy Wood’s research (see

“9/11 Finding the Truth”), she chose not to even respond to the invitation.

When I first heard about this event, I felt that this was being done in desperation. It also seemed

reminiscent of the Toronto “Hearings” which were organised by another group last September. (At which time

I also wrote about those “hearings”. The hearings were concerned either with promoting false information or encouraging a general uncertainty about what happened on 9/11.)

An obvious question comes to mind here – Jim Fetzer and many of the speakers from these 2 conferences are US based – yet they have chosen to hold both of these events up in Canada. Perhaps they are afraid of being prosecuted under

the Smith-Mundt act, which was related to how propaganda is allowed to be used by the government in the USA. In 1985, an amendment to the act wanted to ensure

“no funds authorized to be appropriated to the United States Information Agency shall be used to influence public opinion in the United States, and no program material prepared by the United States Information Agency shall be distributed within the United States.”

I am sure that the Vancouver hearings are propaganda. For example, instead of Jim Fetzer being honest and saying “Dr Judy Wood has not responded to my invitation to the conference”

he has simply invited someone else to speak about her research:

\* Clare Kuehn, “Were DEWs used to decimate the Twin Towers?” (40 minutes)

A University of Toronto graduate in history and student of philosophy, mathematics and the arts, she will discuss Judy Wood, WHERE DID THE TOWERS GO?, and will present evidence for the use of “DEWs” as “Directional Free or ‘Low-Input’ Energy Weapons”.

It must be realised that this person was not recommended by Dr Judy Wood, nor has she given this person permission to act as any kind of authority on her research, or a representative acting on her behalf. It seems from the information above that Ms. Keuhn is not even qualified to present the research with anything approaching the level of expertise that Dr Judy Wood possesses. It seems, therefore, that this conference is a very specifically orchestrated opportunity to introduce doubt and uncertainty into an area where this should not and need not be done. Why did Mr Fetzer invite Ms. Kuehn? Why did she accept his invitation? Clearly, it remains to be seen how she presents the information – and what she omits. However, the “pedigree” for this conference is not good. Another of the speakers is Jeff Prager:

\* Jeff Prager, “Proof of Ternary Fission in New York City on 9/11 (40 minutes)

Founder of an award winning magazine for Senior Citizens, in 2002 he tried to prove 19 Muslims hijacked four planes and attacked us. By 2005, he realized this was false, sold his business, left the US and began to investigate 9/11 full-time. See 9/11 America Nuked.

Mr Prager simply cannot prove his claims and, therefore, is wittingly or unwittingly being used to introduce doubt, uncertainty and disinformation.

Following the posting of my brief, but conclusive, analysis of the work mentioned above ("9/11 America Nuked"), Mr Prager wrote to me to offer the following "criticism":

You're a blithering, brainless, molecularly and neurologically challenged idiot. You're known to the detectives and the police force in your community as a complete idiot. You're known on the internet as the moron of morons, the Mans Moron. For goodness sakes, uranium at 93 Bq/kg with strontium, barium and thorium equally off the charts spells fission you twit.

Peace,

So, Mr Fetzer has therefore deliberately set up a conference which will not establish any truth – quite the reverse – it will encourage uncertainty and debate. Perhaps surprisingly, Mr. Fetzer essentially tells us that

this is, indeed, the purpose of his conference.

NOTE: None of these studies should be taken as conclusory but are instead being offered as exemplifying the kinds of issues that will be addressed during The Vancouver Hearings.

Another speaker at the conference is Alfred Webre. He is one of the few people who has interviewed Dr Judy Wood and John Hutchison together, in person.

It seems he, too, has since worked to introduce doubt and uncertainty even when he has claimed not to be doing this.

Alfred Webre was not too happy about me posting about this and wanted to sue me for libel!

A Hearing Without a Judge

It becomes clear that the title of this event is a misnomer. It is not a hearing at all.

On reading comments posted on the Amazon Books Website, in response to Mr Fetzer's review of Dr Judy Wood's book, one astute reader posted this:

The definition of a hearing is... " A proceeding before a judicial officer in which the officer must decide whether a crime was committed, whether the crime occurred within the territorial jurisdiction of the court, and whether there is Probable Cause to believe that the defendant committed the crime." BIG QUESTIONS ? 1. Will there be a judge from the United States present ? 2. Will there be territorial jurisdiction of the court in CANADA for a crime that occurred in the United States? 3. Who will be deciding the crime issues and definitions ? 4. Who is being tried ?

Good questions.

Hypothesis, Theory, Feasibility and Possibility

From the conference posting above, and from previous postings by Mr Fetzer, such as those in relation to the Amazon review of Dr Judy Wood's conclusive study embodied in her

book "Where Did the Towers Go?"?, it becomes clear what his strategy is. It is to insert doubt, confuse, confound and encourage uncertainty – perhaps, almost, engineering ignorance. His actions would, in different circumstances, result in him being charged with something like "conspiracy to cover up a crime".

Other posts by

Mr Fetzer characterise my writing of articles such as this as being "part of cult". Is this because he has nothing to offer in order to refute this analysis and deconstruction of his actions? His writings are almost as desperate as those (reproduced earlier in this article) by Jeff Prager (who quotes Mr Fetzer in his own "911 Nuked" publication – similarly designed to introduce doubt and uncertainty).

Those attending Mr Fetzer's event will probably be somewhat bamboozled by his false authority and articulate but often meaningless "waffle". Let me attempt to mimic his strategy, by presenting a short hypothesis about why it's not safe to assume that  $1 + 1 = 2$ . Here's how a philosopher (i.e. someone like Mr Fetzer) might attempt to persuade us that there is "room for doubt"...

"1 + 1 May Not Be Equal to 2"

In considering this most basic of problems, it has always been assumed that the "1 add 1 is 2". However, can we be sure this is always correct? Some have said that  $1 + 1 = 3$  and others have said  $1 + 1 = 10$ . So we need to study it further. Are there other ways of looking at this problem which may reveal important truths that have not been analysed closely enough before now? It is such an important issue, we need to be sure that we are correct – otherwise all other things which follow from this cannot be assumed to be true.

Let us start by considering the notion of interpretation of notation. For example, in the English language, the letter "I" has a similar notation to the digit "1" – therefore, it is possible that "1 + 1" may not be what it seems (it could be "I + 1" or "1 + I" or even I + I). Additionally, there are circumstances under which  $1 + 1$  may be equal to 10. One such "special case" is in the form of binary arithmetic – here, using base 2, the use of the digit 2 never occurs – it is represented as 10 (one "two" plus zero units).

Hence, we have to consider such issues as notation, representation and number base - it becomes clear that we cannot always be certain the  $1 + 1$  equals 2 and so care must be taken not to come to the wrong conclusion and we must establish the bounds of our hypothesis before coming to a conclusion.

"1 + 1 Equals 2"

Perhaps the above example is too simplistic – ridiculous almost, but hopefully, I have made a good enough job of the "argument" (waffle) to illustrate how doubt can be introduced in an area where it is wrong to introduce it. One thing I will point out is that, in the above "discussion", I said nothing which was untrue. For those not familiar with Dr Wood's research, you can become familiar with it, in some detail, by watching the videos below.

Part 1:

YouTube:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ufWggCESyDg>

[youtube:http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ufWggCESyDg]

Blip.tv: <http://blip.tv/checktheevidence/dr-judy-wood-at-new-horizons-where-did-the-towers-go-part-1-5794751>

Part 2:

YouTube:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M4XDN9sY3GI>

[youtube:http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M4XDN9sY3GI]

Blip.tv:

<http://blip.tv/checktheevidence/dr-judy-wood-at-new-horizons-where-did-the-towers-go-part-2-5799727>

The evidence presented in these videos can only be explained by the use of an unconventional directed energy weapon and it rules out all other "conventional" explanations – including all those being presented at the Vancouver event. It removes all doubt and makes debate pointless and worthless.

Importantly, what the study also shows is that the evidence left over matches closely with evidence produced in John Hutchison's experiments. This knowledge is very dangerous for the PTB precisely because it is established as being true and is not conjecture at all. It also directly implicates certain individuals and companies as having specific knowledge about 911 and how it was done.

Now, after a number of years, no one has been able to refute the evidence. Rather, individuals such as Mr Fetzer have singled themselves out more and more clearly as people who want to divert attention from what the evidence shows – and proves. They have become, and continue to be, accomplices to a criminal cover up.

An Energy Weapon WAS Used To Destroy the WTC – This is not a Theory

This is the truth – in the same way  $1 + 1 = 2$ . Suggesting  $1 + 1$  may not = 2 is dishonest. When the evidence has been openly and honestly and fully studied, suggesting the WTC was destroyed by something other than an energy weapon is dishonest. The destruction of the WTC and all the terrible, horrible things associated with that were a crime. Covering up a crime is itself a crime.

Characterising these discoveries – these truths as "a theory" is precisely how Fetzer and those doing similar things get away with continuing the cover up. He characterises it as a theory "which he supports". This is how he retains credibility and diverts attention away from the fact that he himself is an accomplice to the cover up. He can say things like "Oh yes, most probably an energy weapon - but I don't know the exact type." All the evidence is available now for anyone with the means and the motive to follow it where it leads - right into the heart of the Military Industrial Complex – through companies like SAIC and ARA. (Isn't it strange how we never hear these truths being spoken of by ex-military Mr Fetzer and other military figures like John Alexander – who is also familiar with the work of John Hutchison.)

The Towers Are Gone – Do You Care?

With the upcoming debate in Vancouver (arguably a criminal cover up), those participating in it or considering buying a ticket to the conference, could consider asking themselves a few simple questions. Here is a Pop Quiz, suggested by Dr Judy Wood.

Were the towers once there? (yes or no)

Are the towers still there? (yes or no)

Did most (over 50%) of the towers turn to dust?  
(yes or no)

a) If your answer to question #3 was "no,"

Please review the empirical evidence more  
carefully or find someone who can.

b) If your  
answer to question #3 was "yes,"

- Does there exist a mechanism or technology capable of doing this?  
(yes or no)

If your  
answer to question #4b was "yes," we are in agreement.

If your  
answer to question #4b was "no," please explain your contradiction, claiming  
something occurred that was impossible to occur.

"1+1 may not = 2". QED. Save  
yourself \$25 or \$50 – plus your travel time and expenses and read Dr. Wood's  
book. Request your local library find a copy for you through Inter Library  
Loan, borrow a copy from a friend, or buy your own copy. Watch the videos  
linked above, or request DVDs and if demand is not too high, I will send them to  
you - free of charge.