

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

If this is how Jim Fetzer and Ace Baker deal with such a *miniscule injustice* (i.e. their accusation that I sent hate correspondence), should we consider carefully the way in which they appear to dealing with a much larger injustice – i.e. the crimes associated with 9/11?

I do not like writing articles that focus on matters such as this, but I have tried to write this in a clear, focused and dispassionate manner. This is very difficult to do when there is so much at stake.

If people reading this article cannot now understand the behaviour of Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer with regard to Hutchison Effect being linked to 9/11, then there seems to be little hope they ever will. Therefore, I do hope that there is some truth in the phrase “Those who have eyes will see and those who have ears will hear”.

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

Transmutation - Sometimes materials subjected to the Hutchison Effect seem to change at a molecular or even atomic level. This could be the explanation for the apparent rapid rusting at GZ, where steel rusts like iron. Also, some photographs show unusual effects on the aluminium cladding used on the twin towers that look similar to effects produced on Hutchison's aluminum samples.

Wood, Hutchison, and Johnson appeared on two Ambrose Lane shows, "We Ourselves," and discussed the similarities between the WTC event and the experimental evidence produced by the Hutchison Effect. "I have been collecting data over the last year and a half or so and I have found these distinct and unusual characteristics, which I have given names such as 'fuming' and 'toasted' cars – I have even noticed flipped cars in some pictures," said Wood. "In some cases, the flipped cars are sitting next to trees that are fully covered with leaves."

"If the flipping of the cars was caused by big explosions or 'wind' from the towers coming down," asked Johnson, "how did the leaves stay on the trees?" Material scientist George Hathaway observes that the Hutchison Effect causes either lift or disruption of the material itself. Lift explains the flipped cars.

In some of his experiments, Hutchison observed "spontaneous combustion" where "fires appeared out of nowhere." He also confirmed that Col. John Alexander and others from the U.S. military visited him in 1983 and filmed his experiments with a team from Los Alamos National Laboratories (LANL). (http://www.weourselves.org/mp3/wpfw_011808_judy-andrew2.mp3) Canadian MP Chuck Cook and Dr Lorn A Kuehne of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) contacted him in 1986 and told him his work was "a matter of National Security." (<http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJ8.html>) Hutchison says he's been told that defense contractor, S.A.I.C., has his technology and has been developing it. (http://drjudywood.com/media/071212_JohnHutchison-TruthH.mp3)

Asked about ongoing dirt removal and hosing down at the WTC complex, Hutchison commented, "I think there is an ongoing reaction or 'infection.'" Wood noted that the damage done to the Bankers Trust (Deutsche Bank) building was repaired, but then they decided to take the building down. This evidence indicates there is a continuing reaction there. Rusting beams in the Bankers Trust building and in the temporary PATH train station also suggest ongoing reactions too.

At the end of the first show, a caller said, "This is a revelation beyond revelations...this trumps everything...If this story ever gets out, it will change the course of the United States' and the whole world's history."

Another caller said during the second show, "I am thinking that these revelations we are hearing this morning should have the people so excited and so outraged that they should be flooding the lines to their congressmen and news people to get this message out as the number one story of the year."

For more information please see:

<http://www.hutchisoneffect.ca/>

WPFW Related: <http://www.wpfw.org/>

<http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/>

<http://www.weourselves.org/>

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

Chambers 20th Century dictionary, 1996, CD ROM edition, (as above). Please read all of Ace's e-mail to check I am not quoting him out of context. The facts seem to be, then: Andrew Johnson *did not* send hate mail to Ace Baker and Ace Baker *did* send hate mail to Judy Wood. Jim Fetzer did not mention that Ace Baker had sent hate mail to Judy Wood and others. Why was Jim Fetzer struggling so much with definitions and "working out" who was doing what? He has edited many books and presumably has had to deal with such issues many times.

Request Denied

[Fetzer offered me the opportunity to "call in and discuss"](#) the issue:

Reading a statement that is, in my opinion, wildly out of proportion to a remark made in passing is not. Call in and we'll see if I'm right. OK? Thanks for asking.

So he suggests that reading out a statement is "wildly out of proportion" to what was said by Ace Baker – he is therefore suggesting my request is unreasonable. [In a subsequent response, Fetzer](#) then went on to suggest that he didn't know what the definition of "hate correspondence" was and he implied I was wrong to suggest I did know the definition of this term. (Most people in Jim Fetzer's position do have access to various english language dictionaries). He said:

I am beginning to get the impression of a child throwing a tantrum. This is not becoming, Andrew. Even your fans may be a bit dismayed. Your demands are excessive and grossly out of line. In a word, "No!"

Here, he starts to call me a child (again), suggests my "fans" (who are they?) will not be impressed, and then he says my "demands" are "excessive and grossly out of line". What I made were actually 2 *requests*, not *demands* – see the subject of the original message. Fetzer then - point blank - refuses my *request*. In the process, he tries to muddle what I said and suggest I am being unreasonable – all because I asked him to read out a 90-second statement to correct a false statement about my actions that was made on his broadcast with Ace Baker.

[It should be noted that in a previous broadcast of the Dynamic Duo on 31st July](#), where Dr. Wood and I had discussed the idea the Jim Fetzer was misquoting Dr. Wood's research and attempting to "take ownership" of it (in the sense that he could "steer it" or more easily mix it up with other things – which is not the same as "taking credit" for it), Jim Fetzer took much of the first segment of the programme to read out his own statement about what was said. (This will be the subject of a separate article.) In other words, Fetzer gave himself the same "right of reply" that he refused me i.e. he did not offer to come on and "debate" the issue, he made a statement about what he thought. Why did he refuse me this same opportunity?

[Ace Baker's next e-mail then seems to go further by asking me to make corrections](#) to my original "Part 1" article (to which I had already added a section at the bottom to include Baker's responses to questions I posed in the article). Was his strategy to try and cover up or distract from his own false statements about me sending hate correspondence, as well as not making an apology? Why would I want to spend time making supposed corrections suggested by someone who has made fake videos, said I sent him hate correspondence and sent hate mail himself? What's wrong with this picture?

<p><u>Toasted Metal & Effects</u></p> <p>A number metal effects have been observed in samples from the WTC and these show similar features to some of the samples made by John Hutchison</p>		
<p><u>Transmutation</u></p> <p>Sometimes, materials subjected to the Hutchison Effect seem to change at an elemental level – could this be the explanation for the rapid rusting – steel is turned into Iron?</p>		
<p><u>Holes</u></p> <p>Samples seem to end up with “voids” in them, following their experiments. Could this effect have created holes in WTC6 and other buildings?</p>		
<p><u>Fuming</u></p> <p>Could this be related to the fuming at ground zero? Could it also be the result of ongoing reactions?</p>		

these internet posters and have not previously been involved with them in the way that I have with Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer (both people I, at one time, trusted).

[Ace Baker initially responded](#), saying:

I don't recall the passage in question from yesterday's show. If someone will send me a recording or an accurate transcript, I will respond.

In the same message, bizarrely, he also said:

While awaiting a review of my comments yesterday, and while on the subject of hate, you may quote me as follows:

"I hate Judy Wood. Judy Wood is a liar, a fraud, and a despicable human being. Judy Wood knows perfectly well that there is no Hutchison Effect. In my opinion, based on the evidence, Judy Wood is a conspirator to mass murder, participating intentionally in the disinformation campaign associated with the crimes of 9/11. Judy Wood is therefore deserving of my hatred, and the hatred of all good and honest people."

He made some other comments in this e-mail which were not relevant to the apology I had requested from him (a comment which had somehow slipped his memory). You can read the full message by clicking the link above.

Round about this time, there was a sequence of e-mails (not all of which are appended here) mentioning various topics, such as the Hutchison Effect, Molten Metal and various other things, but nowhere was the matter of me sending hate correspondence discussed, neither was evidence of it produced by Ace Baker (or Jim Fetzer). In one of these e-mails, Jim Fetzer said:

*Something has gone wrong between Judy and me that I do not understand. I have stood by her through thick and thin and paid the price of ridicule and harassment. It has not been fun. Because I have believed in her, I have gladly borne the burden. If you can tell me why she abandoned me, that might be worthwhile. **It's a mystery to me.***

By the end of this article, perhaps the mystery Jim Fetzer referred to will be solved.

As the discussion seemed to have gone off my “request for correction”, [I sent a message providing Ace Baker with a transcript of his statement](#) and I also repeated the request that he or Fetzer (as the show's regular host) correct it – or, they should provide evidence of the hate correspondence I had sent. When I had read through additional e-mails, [I decided to send another message, requesting that a specific statement be read out by Fetzer](#) at the start of his next show, which read as follows:

"I have a statement which Andrew Johnson has asked me to read out:

On 26th Aug, during a discussion with Jim Fetzer, Ace Baker said:

"I've been getting the hate correspondence from – from Andrew Johnson and so forth..."

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

In [Ace Baker's e-mail](#), he said he was about to attempt to produce or reproduce the Hutchison Effect experiment. He said

"As it turns out I have experience with Tesla Coils. As a young teenager, I helped build a Tesla coil device. It was a Boy Scout project."

His e-mail included further details about how he had made the [Tesla Coil](#) – a device for generating a high voltage discharge, and that he was going to attempt to make two smaller coil assemblies that same weekend. This timing seemed quite interesting, though I have to confess that, at the time, I was a little puzzled at why, he had chosen to do this, but I did not think too much more about it.

About two hours later on 18th Jan, Ace sent [another e-mail](#), saying he had actually managed to obtain Tesla Coils on e-bay and that they would be delivered on Sunday by Special Delivery. (Which mail delivery services work on Sunday? Why did Ace want them so quickly?).

Subsequently, on Monday 21st Jan, [Ace sent another e-mail](#) saying "Success! I have reproduced the Hutchison Effect!" In that message (which was also sent to John Hutchison) was a link to a YouTube video which Ace had made of his experiment. (The [original video that Ace posted](#) was moved to a [different place on YouTube](#))

[I responded to Ace, asking if he could post a YouTube video](#) (not realising he had already done so, due to only rapidly scanning the subject line of his message and not reading the body). The video showed a doll's house with a toy table moving jerkily around and then "flying up" into the air. A reflection of the toy table was shown in a small mirror. The video seemed to be of good quality.

On watching the video, I was rather uneasy – my feeling was that what he had made was a fake video, though I didn't have enough information to be certain, so I made no further comments at the time. I could see he had gone to some trouble to make the video – which, to me, meant one of two things. (a) The video was genuine and Ace really had managed to reproduce the effect. (b) Ace had made a fake video for some other unknown reason. I could not really convince myself that (a) was the correct reason, because I was certain that John Hutchison had spent quite some time in getting his experiments to work successfully (in the early days, he was unable to produce effects reliably, but latterly he is able to produce effects very reliably). I was therefore suspicious that Ace's presentation was not .

John responded to Ace's posting of the video saying that he thought it was "cute".

However, I left this all "on one side" as I was about to return to the UK. On returning to the UK, I wrote a press release, which was reviewed and edited by Dr. Wood and Dr. Reynolds. The press release discussed the main points of correspondence between the WTC photo evidence and the various aspects of the Hutchison Effect. It also mentioned the discussion of 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect on Ambrose Lane's show. When we did the shows, we were pleased with the audience reaction – especially the initial reaction we got from one caller who said:

"This is a revelation beyond revelations...this trumps everything...If this story ever gets out, it will change the course of the United States' and the whole world's history."

On 30th Jan 2008, the press release was posted on several Websites, including [PR Log](#) and [OpEdNews](#). The reaction was generally quite small, but mostly positive.

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

"Oh, that's great, I love it when people start speculating on motives".

Ace then adds:

My motive is to get people to believe that Hutchison is a fake – that's my motive.

So, are Baker and Fetzer unconcerned with the large volume of evidence that John has amassed? (It seems pointless to ask this sort of question too many times.)

Ace Baker then reads out John's e-mail, but fails to mention that *this text is what John Hutchison attempted to post on Ace Baker's blog*, and that it was John's best recall of it. (An entry posted on a blog is normally "lost" if the user does not make a copy, and it is subsequently not approved.)

Fetzer then re-asserts that his treatment of John Hutchison, when he appeared on Fetzer's show, was justified , because of John's background. He then says:

This is something that Judy Wood, Andrew Johnson and others don't seem to have processed.

I think evidence presented here shows that I, and others, have very much "processed" what Jim Fetzer has been doing – and I have documented evidence to suggest what his motive could be.

In the second hour, a caller (John) from Canada rightly pointed out that just because Ace has produced a video which reproduces *some* of the aspects of the Hutchison Effect, it does not prove that John Hutchison is a fraud (Fetzer agreed with this logic). The caller then does a quite a good job of mentioning the additional evidence such as the metal samples and Dr Wood's comparison to the effects seen on 9/11 (but even though he appears to have read this article, he failed to mention Ace's opportunity to meet John Hutchison in Seattle). However, Ace then responds and says:

I don't think that Judy believes in it [The Hutchison Effect], unfortunately, I've come to the opinion that Judy Wood is... um... fits right in to the model of disinformation.

Curiously, Ace then re-asserts his general support for the *rest* of Dr Wood's 9/11 research and study of what happened at the WTC and states that she is "absolutely right" about the effects seen - such as dustification of the towers, the bent beams etc.

Perhaps ironically, most of the remainder of the show is taken up with Ace's discussion of his model of the ways disinformation can be promoted.

What was the purpose, if any, of this broadcast with Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer?

He started by describing a video he had edited together showing *some* of the aspects of the Hutchison effect. The 1 minute 10 second compilation of clips showed only the levitation effects and even though he showed a clip with the cannonball, he did not show the cannonball levitating. (Neither did his clip show any metal effects such as snapping bending or “jellification”, which can be seen in the videos I edited of Ambrose Lane interviews).

Ace Baker then went on to discuss the video clips he had made and how he had faked the levitation effects by using a magnet to make objects stick to the wooden surface, whilst they were filmed upside down. Then he would move the magnet around for a few moments, before finally removing the magnet so that the object fell down (thus appearing to levitate). Ace went on to explain that he had seen videos of John Hutchison’s demonstrations about 10 years ago (on a low quality tape) and assumed that he was seeing things being filmed upside down. I had also seen similar videos 10 years ago and, at that time, without much additional information or exploration probably would have then agreed that it was trickery of some kind. Later, I did gather more information and realised there was a lot more to this – such as the interest of people like Boyd Bushman at Lockheed Martin.

Clearly Ace had spent some time setting up these demonstrations – putting magnetic or metal pins or pieces in the toys/samples in the correct place so that they would work well in the demonstrations. He also later explained how he had split the screen and done a video overlay, which allowed him to appear and a cat to appear at the same time as the “effects” were happening.

Hutchison and Tesla

Ace mentioned that John Hutchison was trying to mimic the experiments of Tesla and then Ace went on to describe Tesla’s brilliance – for example for inventing a system of alternating current for use in electrical power transmission over cables, but Ace incorrectly attributed the invention of the Vacuum Tube to Tesla. ([This is credited to John Ambrose Fleming, who invented the first practical electron tube called the 'Fleming Valve'. In 1904](#)). Ace then went on to acknowledge the possibility that something very powerful and mysterious that had been kept secret, but he said he thought the John Hutchison videos were fake. (Indeed, [his 28th Feb 2008 blog entry unambiguously declares “John Hutchison is a Fraud”](#)). Curiously, the filename that this entry was saved under is entitled “judy-wood-falls-on-her-sword.html”). In the programme, he said

“It’s tough for me. There is no bigger supporter of Judy Wood’s work than I, but [I feel have to] offer whatever input I can in my strongest area of expertise which is – while I don’t really know that much about quantum mechanics – I do know a thing or two about video.”

Does Ace believe that using deception is a way of showing support?

Ace and the Red Bull

Ace had also set up a demonstration of a red bull can bobbing around and then crushing, comparing it to one of John’s own experiments with a Red Bull can. He explained he had to put steel screws in it because the can was aluminium, and therefore not magnetic. He explained how he had reached in and crushed the can every so often, as he filmed it, then he edited out the portions of video where his hand appeared. He explained how he carefully arranged the lighting, and then did a video composite – showing the clocks on the right hand side, so that the viewer would think there were no edits in the video. It would therefore appear [Ace had clearly gone to quite a bit of trouble to make this video](#).

Ace Baker’s Double-Standard?

It is worth mentioning that Dr Wood is not the only person to have suggested how the WTC complex was destroyed. People such as Dr Steven E Jones have suggested thermite or thermate (or some variant thereof) was used to destroy the WTC. Ed Ward and others have previously stated that “micro-nukes” must have been used. Ace Baker has not, however, offered \$100,000 to Prof Steve E Jones for a demonstration of thermite, nor has he offered Ed Ward, or anyone else to my knowledge, any sum of money for a demonstration of micro-nuke technology. If Ace was being even handed in his assessment of 9/11 research, surely he would have made such an offer when these theories were first “put on the table”. Can we conclude there is some special reason why linking 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect is so “dangerous”?

Observations/Conclusions

- Ace said he was convinced that John Hutchison was a 100% fraud but Ace was still willing to offer \$100,000 and travel to Vancouver at his own expense as part of this challenge. Why?
- Ace seemed less interested in using his own TV fakery research in some kind of legal action than he did in attempting to debunk John Hutchison (and essentially Dr Judy Wood too).
- At appearances in Seattle and Portland, John Hutchison brought some of his samples as an exhibit. [He allowed the audience to examine and photograph these samples](#). (If John were a fraud, why would he do such a thing?) So, it is clear to those people who handled the samples that the things they were holding in their hands were not the result of “video fakery”. Also, many samples have been given to other people around the world – so we have lots of physical evidence which shows the Hutchison Effect is *real*.
- Ace Baker had previously offered to come and meet Dr. Wood in, Seattle in 2006, at a presentation she was giving then. The presentations that Dr. Wood and John Hutchison gave in Seattle and Portland in May/June 2008 were advertised weeks or even *months* in advance. Ace could have attended one or both of these presentations if he wanted to. He could have seen the samples for himself. So why wasn’t Ace there to ask questions and to examine the samples?
- Below are a few of many photos the Dr. Wood herself took on one of her trips to see John Hutchison.



Later, John described how Scientists such as Rene Louis Vallee and Andrei Sakharov had studied the Hutchison Effect and had suggested many of the effects were caused by an interaction between the electrostatic and RF fields, but that this interaction was not immediate – the effects only happened some time after the fields had interacted.

As Judy and John discussed some of the effects on the steel and the glass at the World Trade Centre, Jim Fetzer seemed noticeably quiet and there were a number of longer silences as Judy waited for Fetzer's reaction.

After an interesting discussion about the residual effects at Ground Zero, Fetzer switched to asking where John Hutchison was on 9/11 and then he asked John thought about Ace Baker's attempts at copying Hutchison's effects. John said he thought Ace was "having fun" with his video project, and Fetzer then said that because John's effects were "so peculiar and so odd" that the possibility of video fakery should not be ruled out. Before John had a chance to answer this point, Fetzer started talking to Judy again, and moved on to the next section of the webpage. Judy then said "what happened on 9/11 was pretty unbelievable – does that mean it didn't happen?"

In the remaining minutes of the programme, there were a number of rather long silences as Judy pointed out the unusual aspects of the data. Judy asked if the perpetrators of 9/11 would want people to look at the data. Jim Fetzer, without responding, then asked John if his phenomena had anything to do with 9/11. John responded saying he thought there was a "high probability" when considering how much research had been going on into other directed energy weapons and how powerful they were.

Fetzer then thanked Judy and John for coming on, but asked no further questions and made no further comments. He did not seem to express the same enthusiasm for his guests as he usually does, although perhaps this was due to his illness.

Ace Baker Sends More e-mails around Weds 27th

A sequence of e-mails were sent by Ace Baker, around the time of the Weds 27th Dynamic Duo. In the [first of these](#), Ace stated:

Hutchison is a video faker, pure and simple. There is no Hutchison Effect. I'm sorry. Hutchison makes silly upside-down videos.

He then went onto explain how the thought some of the videos had been made and he said:

He's been caught red-handed using strings on the toy UFO thing.

Ace repeated some of the points he had made in the program, but he seemed far more certain of what he was saying and also he seemed quite angry:

As long as he was just pushing UFO's, I didn't care. But when he stepped into 9/11, and video fakery, he stepped onto MY TURF. Under NO circumstances will I allow John Hutchison to pollute 9/11 research with his trickery.

This seemed to be a very odd statement. The only context in which UFO's had been mentioned was in relation to the video of the high voltage experiment, which Ace took to be something else (levitation using a string). Why did Ace react so vigorously to John? In any case, all that John had

(They have already been involved with evaluating and documenting John Hutchison's experiments.)

2) Why was Ace willing to put up this amount of money for this demonstration, as opposed to, say, putting it into a Legal Case to sue the media regarding TV fakery? (I asked Ace Baker this question because he has stated he is an expert in video fakery and [has published a detailed study on the 9/11 "Chopper 5" video](#), in which he concludes that the video has been heavily doctored, using video compositing, to present fake images as real.)

3) If Hutchison-Effect-like technology was NOT employed on 9/11, then would Ace be willing to pay for research to answer questions regarding (a) Inverted cars (b) horseshoe beams (c) explosion of Scott packs (d) witness accounts of levitation effects etc.

In other words, I was trying to ask if Ace wanted to see the truth of 9/11 uncovered. (He did not dispute the validity of the points of evidence (a) - (d) above.) Finally, I asked him:

4) What were his thoughts on (a) The Hurricane's path (b) The Alaskan Magnetometer Data?

In the same message, I said I was very interested in alternative explanations, based on good evidence, for the effects seen on 9/11, as I thought that this is what the search for 9/11 truth was for. I stated that I was open to a different, consistent interpretation of the evidence, if it answered all the questions regarding that same evidence.

[In Ace's response](#), he answered question 1 thus:

1. Hutchison/Wood are free to discuss any details/clarifications should they decide to accept the challenge.

This was not relevant to the question I asked – I asked who would help him to validate that the effects were real. Was Ace trying to divert his answers away from dealing with the evidence?

2. I am willing to offer \$100,000 to FOX5 to license broadcast-quality Chopper 5 footage. That challenge coming soon.

This also did not really answer the question I asked. I actually queried him about possibly making a legal challenge, based on his TV fakery research. Instead, he seemed to answer this by describing a proposed "bet" with FOX5. Again, it seemed as if Ace was diverting away from the evidence I was asking him about – he didn't respond at all regarding the issue of *legal action* being taken.

In answering the third question, Ace said:

3. There is no Hutchison Effect to have been employed on 9/11. No, I am not willing to offer \$100,000 to "some people". The purpose of this challenge is to demonstrate to the public that Hutchison and Wood are liars.

Here, he did not seem to interpret the spirit of my question as I had intended. I intended it to mean would he be prepared to fund *research*, rather than fund *debunking*. Would he be prepared, in principle, to fund research to advance an alternative explanation? In his answer, he



How did John get liquid aluminium to work this way? We can see on the right hand side the knife is quite well embedded into the metal block, though over to the left it does not seem fully fused. The marks of the surface of the block go in different directions, and certainly do not look like the results from using a grinder. In the picture on the right, why would molten aluminium would have left the wood unburned?

A Lack of Scientific Curiosity?

On 29th February, a deadline for filing documents in Judy's Qui Tam case, [Ace Baker sent another e-mail](#), noting how he had advised Judy, Morgan Reynolds and myself of his claim to have bought Tesla coils on e-bay in mid-January. He then said:

Dr.. Wood said nothing. Dr.. Reynolds said nothing. ... Mr. Leaphart said nothing. I had produced evidence of anti-gravity levitation, one of the most important and amazing aspects of the Hutchison Effect, and the silence was deafening.

This, to me, seemed to make Ace's motive clear. He seemed to be saying "I made a fake video. You didn't detect it was fake, therefore how can your judgement be trusted?" Unlike Ace, I did not want to accuse him outright of fakery, because I did not feel I had enough evidence to be certain that he had made a fake video. I did not want to get into a debate about this peculiar behaviour. He asked why we had not asked him questions about his experiment and how peculiar he found it.

John had sent Ace (and others) a follow-up email, noting that Ace's video was a joke. John pointed out that Ace would need a lot more equipment to produce the Hutchison Effect. (Note, John does not use Tesla coils for levitation.)

My response at this time was to [send Ace an e-mail message](#) with some of the most interesting questions regarding the Hutchison Effect.

- 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?
- 2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?
- 3) How would you explain the ongoing effects on the Banker's trust building?

Regarding John Hutchison, I asked Ace these questions:

- 1) How do you explain the samples of metal that he has shown us?
- 2) How do you explain the multiple witnesses to his experiments?
- 3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security? (see attached - as posted on his blog)
- 4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him? (see attached- as posted on his blog)

JH: Oh, way back past 1970?

JF: Say... anytime. Fill me in.

JH: Wow, that's back in 1970... prior to that, I was involved in a major court case against the Canadian government on gun control issues. And prior to that, was just on welfare, getting odd jobs... that kind of thing. So... it was a lot of fun. That's a long time ago. It seems like that.

JF: You're a kind of striking contrast cases because, of course, Judy has multiple degrees and academic background... around sixty peer-reviewed articles, and your background is completely the opposite.

Odd topic. Fetzer apparently doesn't agree with diversity in problem solving. The alternative to diversity is known as "inbreeding."

JH: Yes, I'm kind of wild and wooley there, but it's been an interesting adventure. (Dr. Wood's voice heard briefly here...) I get along fine with the scientists and that. We work together on different projects and ...

JF: Go ahead, Judy.

Judy: Yes, I've noticed something different with John than the typical student.
Wood: John thinks. The students... they check the answer in the back of the book and that's... you know... what the answer is.



So Ace was saying the Hutchison videos were fake, but still didn't explicitly disagree the Hutchison Effect evidence was similar to effects seen at the WTC. Ace didn't really fully address the fact that many videos of John's experiments were taken by other production companies, such as www.gryphonproductions.com and www.bluebookfilms.com.

I wanted to confirm some of the answers Ace had given [so I sent him another message](#), asking him to confirm that his views on these points:

- 1) Everything JH says regarding his experiments is fake.
- 2) Los Alamos have helped him promote fakery of one kind or another.
- 3) All the metal samples he has are fake or not what he says they are.
- 4) You have no idea what caused the documented effects at the World Trade Centre.

[Ace responded](#), saying he thought all of John's videos were fake (**but I asked about the actual experiments, not just the videos**). Regarding the Los Alamos National Labs (LANL) connection, Ace said:

Or, it could be that the government is seizing an opportunity to promote false beliefs. They do that ALL THE TIME. If there is any documentation about LANL and Hutchison, I'll review it.

Currently, I don't have copies of substantial documentation, but I have seen at least 2 documents showing the connection, and Col John Alexander certainly doesn't deny his connection to John Hutchison.

Ace also confirmed he does not know how the WTC was destroyed.

Questions

The key questions in all of this seem to be:

- 1) Why has Ace Baker taken it upon himself to try to disprove the Hutchison Effect? Why is this so important?
- 2) Why has he gone to such trouble to make several different videos? (A new one appeared whilst this article was being written.)
- 3) Was the timing of his attack on the Hutchison Effect coincidental?
- 4) Why did he accuse Drs. Wood, Reynolds and Jerry Leaphart of a lack of Scientific Curiosity?
- 5) Why does he regard 9/11 Research as "his turf"?
- 6) Why does he seem reluctant to talk about the links between the Hutchison Effect evidence and WTC Evidence?
- 7) Why is his reaction so vehemently against the Hutchison Effect (e.g. "John Hutchison is a fraud") with no leeway for his own error. I.e. why doesn't he say "I am pretty sure it *isn't* related to the Hutchison Effect, but there could be something here."
- 8) Why is his research into the Hutchison Effect so different in character to his other research such as the Chopper 5 video?

Conclusion

I would suggest the reason is that Ace Baker knows that the Hutchison Effect is very relevant to what happened on 9/11 and he wants to discourage people from thinking this. I would suggest he did what he did to try to break up a small group of researchers, and to try to set them against one another. (I suggested this idea to Ace in a follow up e-mail and he did not respond to this point).

I would suggest Ace Baker knows more than he is letting on. Who else knows?



John Hutchison on the Dynamic Duo radio show, February 28, 2008

**A transcript of the segment introducing first-time guest, John Hutchison.
Acknowledgements: The transcript work by "Archie" is greatly appreciated.**

This was the first time Jim Fetzer had talked with John Hutchison and the first time John had been on "the Dynamic Duo" (with any host). This was an odd way to introduce a first-time guest to his show.

James: Now Judy, I've been informed that we have John Hutchison on the line.
Fetzer: So John, I want to welcome you to The Dynamic Duo.

John Hutchison: Hello.

JF: John, could you tell us a little bit about yourself, you know, your background, your education, especially your training in science and technical subjects.

JH: Well, my education is -- I flunked my coloring book and blocks. I'm self-taught, and I've been involved in many applications in engineering and research and one of them happened to be in to Nicola Tesla, which I was able to replicate a lot of his experiments. And pushing it beyond the envelope there, we managed to cause levitation of objects and also the destruction of objects, as it's called. And it gained interest in to the U.S. military back in 1983, which they did a lot of experiments and tests with it.

JF: So you grew up in Canada?

"How's the weather?" Doesn't Fetzer want to talk about the US military visiting his lab "back in 1983?" Their visit was four months long to learn what John was doing.

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

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:

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

one of them happened to be in to Nicola Tesla, which I was able to replicate a lot of his experiments. And pushing it beyond the envelope there, we managed to cause levitation of objects and also the destruction of objects, as it's called. And it gained interest in to the U.S. military back in 1983, which they did a lot of experiments and tests with it.

Fetzer: So you grew up in Canada?

Why does Fetzer ask about John's upbringing rather than the interest of the US military in his experiments? At this point, Fetzer knew that US Defence Contractors such as SAIC and ARA were defendants in the Qui Tam Cases of Drs. Wood and Reynolds, so why doesn't Fetzer have an interest in what John has to say about the Military's work with John? (Fetzer does not discuss this at all in the rest of the programme.)

Fetzer Ignores Evidence

Again, as documented previously, Fetzer wilfully ignores the strong correspondence between the WTC evidence and fully documented effects seen in John Hutchison's experiments – bent “horseshoe” beams, spontaneous cold fires, levitation, transmutation of materials and ongoing effects.

How can Fetzer threaten Dr. Judy Wood's reputation? What gives him the right to do so? What gives him grounds for using this sort of language when Dr. Wood's association with Fetzer is completely informal – she is not an employee, nor does Fetzer have any agreed method of working with her. Therefore, what on earth compels him to talk about “salvaging her reputation”? Can this e-mail therefore be perceived as some kind of thinly-veiled threat?

Another peculiar aspect of the message is that, rather than starting a new message, or replying to one from Dr. Wood, Fetzer had forwarded an article from the Washington Post entitled *The New Art of War*. He also changed the subject line of the message. Why did he include this article in the message to Dr. Wood – which was also copied to Jerry Leaphart and Dr. Morgan Reynolds? Why did it include a very long list of recipients, to which the original forwarded message was sent (this list included Steven E Jones and others)?

The *The New Art of War* article begins as follows:

If there were any doubts that the United States is preparing for war in space and cyberspace, testimony before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee last week would have wiped them away. According to Gen. Kevin P. Chilton, head of U.S. Strategic Command, “our adversaries understand our dependence upon space-based capabilities, and we must be ready to detect, track, characterize, attribute, predict and respond to any threat to our space infrastructure.” Although space threats have received much attention in the past, it was the possibility of cyberspace warfare that was given new emphasis at the hearing.

Was Fetzer giving some “coded indication” that Dr. Wood exposing the truth about what destroyed the WTC is a “threat” to the US's space infrastructure? Was he somehow indicating Dr. Wood's exposure of this evidence could be treated as an act of “Cyber Terrorism”? Is it a possibility that Fetzer is actually “going along” with the unfolding agenda - for tighter global control of ordinary people, whilst at the same time pretending he is working to prevent its implementation?

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.

It is interesting to note that there was an apparent "change in strategy" by Fetzer - sometime in February 2008 – from apparent support of Dr. Wood's study to his support of Baker's pernicious debunking tactics.

"Good Cop?"

[On Feb 5th 2008, Jim Fetzer sent Dr. Wood an e-mail](#) which had come from one of his contacts which included these paragraphs. This contact was enthusing about Dr. Wood's research:

*I've been meaning to write to you on a number of issues, not least your collaboration with my dear friend, Dr. _____, which I was instrumental in bringing about and for which he is very grateful. In particular for "**having opened their minds to the work of Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds as well as your own**".*

...and

*Hi _____, You've been right about Judy Wood, I have been studying the website and I had to update mine, this is of such importance that **I have c.e.r.n. people and international physicists on the edge of their seats** and today I will have a meeting with one of them. We we might just nail the evidence soon. Thanks!!!*

(It should be noted that Jim Fetzer has not posted any of his own original 9/11 research in the way Dr. Wood has, though he has other research posted on the possible involvement of [directed energy weapons in the death of Senator Paul Wellstone](#)).

From reading these forwarded messages, it seemed that people at CERN were interested in Dr. Wood's research. This seemed, on its face, like a very positive development – much of the research at CERN concerns Energy Phenomena of one type or another.

However, these messages were never followed up with anything more substantive and were therefore quickly forgotten about – especially once the Ace Baker "campaign" was underway.

The next few e-mail exchanges centred around Ace Baker's fake video debunking attempt, but on 26th Feb 2008, Ace Baker announced he would be appearing on Jim Fetzer's show. Dr. Wood thought this was rather an odd way to do things – that Fetzer was going to get someone else to talk about Dr. Wood's research with Fetzer *before* Dr. Wood did. [Dr. Wood therefore e-mailed Fetzer and several others](#) in a small group to say this much. It was an especially odd way of doing things because Ace Baker, as it was known by this time, had already circulated a false story that he had bought equipment on e-bay to reproduce the effect, but he then he made and posted a fake video to apparently reproduce a very limited number of the effects seen in John Hutchison's own work. Additionally, unlike Dr. Wood, Baker had no real relevant qualifications. Fetzer soon replied.

"This Doesn't Look Right to Me..."

[On Feb 27th 2008, Jim Fetzer sent Dr. Wood an e-mail](#) expressing concern that she had notified several others of the group that she was being critical that Ace Baker would be going on Jim Fetzer's show to discuss the Hutchison Effect:

Just between us, why didn't you send me a personal note when you noticed what you perceived to be a problem? What's going on there? I find that a bit odd. And you and John already appeared with Morgan to discuss the H-effect, so what's the deal if

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](#)

- 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.

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

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

For online versions of these articles see: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, or google keywords

found this: “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!***