

9/11 - Evidence and Analysis Volume III

Scientists See WTC - Hutchison Effect Parallel



The Hutchison Effect and 9/11 - An Ace in the Hole?



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



9/11 and The Hutchison Effect - Handling the Truth



John Hutchison on the Dynamic Duo Radio Show
Feb 28, 2008




The Hutchison Effect and 9/11 - An Ace in the Hole Part 2



The Hutchison Effect and 9/11 - An Ace in the Hole Part 3

See <http://www.checktheevidence.com/> for more information and Free DVD's



For the full articles, with hyperlinks, please go to
<http://www.checktheevidence.com/>

Andrew Johnson – Redefined!

[In a later e-mail from Ace Baker](#), he did not correct his statement and did not apologise to Andrew Johnson. He decided, apparently to redefine “Andrew Johnson” thus:

"On Dynamic Duo August 26, I was speaking about my challenge to John Hutchison, offering him \$100,000 to reproduce his alleged 'Hutchison Effect' levitation. In sorting my thoughts, I began a sentence with 'I've been getting hate correspondence - from Andrew Johnson and so forth . . .' I should have said, 'from Andrew Johnson and company'.

So, to try and avoid apologising to me, Ace has now re-defined “Andrew Johnson” to be any group of people Andrew Johnson is seen to be associating with. This seems to pair up “nicely” with Jim Fetzer trying to redefine the meaning of “hate correspondence”. With such fluid and muddlesome (a new word) definitions - of both people and well-known phrases - we could be faced with endless possibilities for redefining reality and truth!

I have included several other e-mails below, to allow people to see a fuller context of the remarks made, but have not included the entire thread, because it would be very long, and include many statements and remarks not relevant to the central issue in this article, which I have attempted to describe in the summary below.

Summary and Conclusion

- 1) Ace Baker made a false statement about me sending hate correspondence to him.
- 2) Ace Baker sent hate correspondence to Dr. Judy Wood.
- 3) I *requested* an opportunity to set the record straight on the Dynamic Duo, on terms I DEFINED (reading out a 90-second or so statement).
- 4) Fetzer suggested I call in to “discuss” it - I refused, because there was nothing to discuss.
- 5) Fetzer tried to say I did not understand the English language (or words to that effect). He tried to muddle the definition of "hate correspondence".
- 6) Fetzer redefined the word “request” to be “demand”.
- 7) Ace Baker did not initially respond to my request for an apology.
- 8) Ace Baker responded to redefine "Andrew Johnson" to include any group Andrew Johnson seemed to be associated with - so that Ace's refusal to apologise was (apparently) justified.

I would therefore suggest Ace Baker and Jim Fetzer allowed themselves to cause a small injustice to me by Ace lying about something I hadn't done. I offered them a simple opportunity to correct that injustice (twice). They refused the opportunity, tried to say they hadn't really done anything wrong and suggested it was completely inappropriate for me to request an apology. This is a bit like saying “Well, I don't agree with your definition of ‘gun’ and ‘fired’ and in any case, even if I did, it was your fault for not moving out of the way when the gun went off”.

Perhaps Andrew Johnson should make a \$100,000 challenge to Ace Baker to produce the non-existent “hate correspondence”. Perhaps this would “win me some fans” as people would surely suggest to Ace Baker that he takes up my challenge?

PRESS RELEASE SCIENTISTS SEE WTC - HUTCHISON EFFECT PARALLEL

14th and 18th January 2008, Washington DC, USA - In two appearances on a Washington DC Pacifica Radio Station, WPFW, on a show hosted by Author and Political Commentator Ambrose I. Lane, Sr., Dr. Judy Wood, a former Professor of Mechanical Engineering, and John Hutchison, experimental scientist, discussed how photographic and video evidence suggest that the World Trade Centre (WTC) towers were destroyed using Directed Energy Weapons (DEW). Many of the observed effects resemble those seen in John Hutchison's experiments.

In early January 2008, Wood posted a new study on her website (<http://drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>), which relates effects seen in photographs taken before, during and after the destruction of the WTC complex, to effects seen in Hutchison's ongoing experiments. Wood and Hutchison co-authored the study.

John Hutchison is a Canadian inventor and experimental scientist who has been working with “field effects” for almost 30 years. The Hutchison Effect is a collection of phenomena discovered accidentally by John Hutchison in 1979 during attempts to reproduce the work of Nikola Tesla. Hutchison uses radio frequency and electrostatic sources. The Hutchison Effect occurs in a volume of space where the beams intersect and interfere. The results are levitation of heavy objects, fusion of dissimilar materials such as metal and wood, anomalous melting (without heating) of metals without burning adjacent material, spontaneous fracturing of metals (which separate by sliding in a sideways fashion), and both temporary and permanent changes in the crystalline structure and physical properties of metal samples.

Hutchison has reproduced his experiments many times and the results are recorded on video and have been included in a number of TV documentaries that focus on unusual scientific experiments. Hutchison's metal samples have been repeatedly tested by scientists, including a group at the Max Planck Institute in Germany, confirming Hutchison Effects.

The article by Wood and Hutchison (<http://drjudywood.com/articles/JJ>) documents effects and events seen in the vicinity of the World Trade Centre and compares these with observed characteristics of the Hutchison Effect.

The observed effects include:

“Weird Fires” - The fires seen near the badly damaged cars do not seem to ignite nearby office paper. Some photos show firefighters walking very close to or even through the fires. A video by John Hutchison shows similar looking “fires” on a model metal boat.

Bent Beams and “Jellification” - Samples that Hutchison produced show very unusual effects on metal. Sometimes the metal “jellifies,” turning soft and losing form, leading to severe bending or fracturing of the sample. Sometimes samples erupt from the centre and sometimes they turn to dust, similar to what happened to the WTC on 9/11.

Ongoing reactions - Hutchison's samples often show an ongoing reaction, even after the energy field is removed. This “non-self-quenching” reaction seems to occur at the nuclear level. This also appears to be happening at Ground Zero (GZ). Dr. Wood's study suggests that the WTC site is still being “decontaminated,” with trucks moving dirt into and out of the site, while “hosing down operations” continue, which Dr. Wood and Andrew Johnson photographed and recorded on video in January 2008.

Andrew Johnson has not sent Ace Baker any hate correspondence and Andrew Johnson would politely request either a written or on-air statement from Ace Baker to retract or correct his earlier statement about Andrew Johnson having sent Ace Baker hate correspondence, unless Ace Baker can provide verifiable copies of any hate correspondence which he thinks came from Andrew Johnson.

For further information and analysis, I request that all interested parties view the 9/11 Hutchison Effect series of articles posted at <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>, where they can view the contents of all e-mails pertinent to these matters and listen to the audios of the various broadcasts.

Thank you.

Somewhat curiously, [Fetzer responded saying I should call in to the show](#) (which, in calling from the UK, could be potentially costly) when Ace was next on with him – scheduled for Tuesday 2nd Sept 2008.

Fetzer then sent another message, responding on Ace's behalf saying:

My suspicion is that Ace meant "hostile" and it came out "hate". That would not surprise me as much as making such a mountain of a molehill.

So, Fetzer was suggesting that Ace didn't mean what he said – why couldn't Ace speak up for himself? Fetzer then also offered various adjectives to describe the mail I had sent which are similar to "hate correspondence". Was Fetzer trying to "muddle the issue"? I leave the reader to decide this for themselves.

Just Who is Sending Hate Correspondence?

[I then responded to Fetzer that I disagreed with his ideas on this and I did not wish to argue about the very particular and clear cut-definition of "hate correspondence"](#). I had only sent Ace Baker e-mails, so I will now quote the definition of "hate mail" from my Chambers 20th century dictionary, 1996, CD ROM edition:









hate mail - correspondence containing anything from insults to death threats, etc.

I was asking Ace Baker to provide e-mail matching this definition (which everyone is clear about – and if they weren't, the definition is above – and the one to which evidence in this matter should be matched). I have not sent Ace Baker any e-mails with any insults or death threats or similar types of remarks. I have just asked him a number of probing questions about his own actions, conclusions and his motivations.

[At this point, let us revisit the earlier message sent by Ace Baker](#) to myself and several others in which he included the words:

Judy Wood is a liar, a fraud, and a despicable human being.

I will leave readers to examine for themselves these words, contained in e-mail correspondence - sent by Ace Baker, and consider them in the light of the definition of "hate mail" given in the

Phenomenon	"The Hutchison Effect"	Anomalies at the WTC
<p>Weird Fires</p> <p>The fires seen near the toasted cars don't seem to ignite the paper. Some photos show firemen walking very or even through them. Are they "cold" fires?</p>		
<p>Bent Beams</p> <p>Samples that John Hutchison has produced show very unusual effects on the metal – sometimes severe bending occurs</p>		
<p>Jellification</p> <p>Sometimes the metal "jellifies" - other effects are also seen.</p>		
<p>Cars/Lift and Disintegration</p> <p>Some WTC pictures show cars that are upside down. (How?) One of the key effects John Hutchison has reproduced many times is a "levitation" or "anti-gravity" effect. Objects are sometimes seen to levitate or if they don't, they disintegrate.</p>		

9/11 AND THE HUTCHISON EFFECT **AN ACE IN THE HOLE – PART III**

Andrew Johnson - 09 Sep 2008

In researching 9/11, I have tried to stay focused on aspects of “primary evidence” – analysis of what actually happened – for example, through examination of physical evidence and verified witness testimony. However, in this series of articles related to the Hutchison Effect and 9/11, I have felt the need to document communications that I have been involved with, in regard to ongoing research and the reaction to it. Analysis of these communications is, to me, quite instructive in determining the way in which the 9/11 cover up is being perpetuated and managed.

I (and others) have previously queried how the perpetrators might be working to sustain the 9/11 cover up. One way would be to shut down discussion or analysis of the most damning evidence pertaining to what really happened. Another way is to make repeated attempts to discredit or “trash” certain researchers - or even simply involve them in fruitless debates or “spit fights” of one kind or another – and this is precisely what seems to have happened over the last few years.

That Supposed Hate Correspondence

In *Ace in the Hole – Part 2*, I pointed out how I had been accused (live - on air) of sending hate correspondence to Ace Baker. This happened on a show I have (once) guest hosted – *The Dynamic Duo* on GCN Live. Now, of course, this in itself, is a very minor thing. After all, one has to be pretty “thick-skinned” to function in an environment that is populated in the way that it seems to be, so it shouldn’t be a “big deal”. Far worse things have happened to far better people, right?

Well, I decided to write this article to try and document how certain figures seem happy to create an injustice (however small), then fail to take responsibility for their own actions/words. They are then offered an opportunity to correct that injustice, in a dignified manner, but then they refuse, essentially stating that the person who was on the receiving end of this injustice was actually at fault in some way.

Request for Correction

This matter unfolded as follows. Following Ace Baker’s statement that I had sent him hate correspondence, [I sent an e-mail to both him and Jim Fetzer](#) (CC’d to several others), stating the following:

I am writing to request that you broadcast a correction to the statement that Ace Baker had received “hate correspondence” from me. I have posted all the recent correspondence I have had with Ace Baker in the “Ace in the Hole 2” article, and none of it fits this description.

Alternatively, if Ace Baker can produce a message attributable to me (including e-mail headers which prove that it came from an e-mail server I use), then I would like to see that message, and there will be no need for such a correction to be read out.

So, I was basically asking Ace Baker to provide evidence of this supposed hate correspondence I had sent, or apologise to me. I decided to request an apology because this statement went out “on air” to a particular audience, and I knew the statement was wholly untrue. Of course, on various internet postings, there are a number of remarks posted about me – but I do not know

"THE HUTCHISON EFFECT AND 9/11 **AN ACE IN THE HOLE?"**

Andrew Johnson - 1st March 2008

In 2006, Dr. Wood had posted her first study of the destruction of the WTC complex and in an appendix linked some information regarding what has become known as the “Hutchison Effect” - as a possible energy phenomenon that might have some relevance to what happened on 9/11.

In approximately mid November 2007, Dr. Wood had cause to revisit the idea of the Hutchison effect and she sent John some of the WTC photo evidence she had been studying, for him to comment on. It was a pleasant surprise to find that John was willing to discuss areas of correspondence between WTC photo evidence and the effects seen in his own experiments. Most other people with a science background that we had contacted had not expressed any interest in, for example, discussing the links between the Cold Fusion cover up and 9/11. (See [CB Brooklyn’s article about Prof Steve Jones and 9/11](#)).

John was very helpful to us and sent us ideas, pictures, information and photos of documents he has kept. He has [a number of “Blogs” that he has created](#), where he has posted hundreds of images related to his work and interests. Some of the things he has posted are very candid and open. John sent us scans or photos of various documents and photos showing how his work has been investigated by Scientists, the Military and in various TV documentaries, almost since the time he started his experiments, back in 1979.

On **25th December 2007**, having discussed a number of points of evidence with me and with John Hutchison and got agreement that he could be listed as a co-author, Dr. Wood began posting a new series of web pages entitled [Anomalies at the WTC and the Hutchison Effect](#). A few days later around **12th Jan 2008**, Dr. Wood added a kind of “overview list” to the front page, to show a summary of the main evidence, which we found to be quite compelling, and the preliminary feedback that we got generally indicated the same feeling.

Also on **12th Jan 2008**, I travelled to Washington DC having been invited to go onto Ambrose Lane’s show [“We Ourselves”](#) on **Mon 14th Jan** and **Fri 18th Jan**. At that point, I was not sure whether I would be appearing with Dr. Wood on the same programmes, but thankfully, she was able to make the trip. As anticipated, Dr. Wood and I appeared on Ambrose Lane’s “We Ourselves” programme on 14th and 18th of January and we were honoured to be joined on the 18th of January by John Hutchison himself, who confirmed details of his work and some of the witnesses to it, and he also expressed an interest in some of the effects seen at the World Trade Centre. He also agreed that the ongoing effects at the Deutsche Bank (Banker’s Trust) building were indicative of some type of infection. (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](#).)

About six hours after the radio show, also on **Fri 18th Jan**, [Alexander \(“Ace”\) Baker sent an e-mail regarding the Hutchison effect](#) to Dr. Wood, myself and several others. Baker is a fellow 9/11 researcher, whom I admired for his notable [“Chopper 5 Study”](#). This study was a detailed video analysis showing that the live WNYW (Fox 5) helicopter video of UA Flight 175 striking the World Trade Centre is a fake. I had also been impressed with way that Ace had dealt with rebuttals to his analysis from Eric Salter, another researcher, who had been quite rude to Ace. Ace [had also appeared several times](#) on Jim Fetzer’s “Dynamic Duo” radio programme, and Prof Fetzer often introduced him as an “expert in digital processing”.



- Ace was not interested in the relevance of the Hurricane Erin study – despite the clear evidence of field effects in relation to the Hurricane itself, 9/11 and the Hutchison Effect. Why?
- Ace seemed to say he did not want to fund research into an alternative explanation for the destruction of the towers, yet he said he was interested in how they were destroyed – does this make sense? If he is genuinely interested in finding out what happened on 9/11, then why didn't he offer or consider finding some "better" alternatives?

I leave the reader to draw their own conclusions about the overall meaning of this "episode". Does it illustrate how the cover up of 9/11 truth is working?

Addendum – Ace Baker on Dynamic Duo - 26 Aug 2008

On 26th August 2008, [Ace Baker appeared on the Dynamic Duo](#). Part of a segment in the first hour discussed Ace Baker's "Challenge" and mentioned the posting of this article (before this addendum was posted). [At time code 2:36 in this clip](#), he stated, in regard to this "challenge":

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

This was a curious statement, as *all* the e-mails I have recently exchanged with Baker are included in this article in their entirety. (I have deleted the actual e-mail addresses to reduce bot spamming). Why couldn't Ace's description have been more accurate, saying "I have been getting correspondence from Andrew Johnson" or "I have been getting critical correspondence from Andrew Johnson" or even "Andrew Johnson asked me some questions about this, to which I responded."? Anyone reading this article, and the e-mails can clearly see there is no "hate correspondence" here. Additionally, it is not my style to indulge in such correspondence, as a study of my web postings, articles etc. will reveal.

He then discussed my website and how I posted the earlier articles in this series. [He then referred to the e-mail that John Hutchison sent to Dr Judy Wood](#) (which she forwarded to me) regarding [John's attempted blog entry posting](#). Ace *incorrectly* states that John Hutchison contacted me directly – he did not, as the e-mail header shows.

Fetzer then read out the title of this article ("Ace in the Hole Part 2"), and the "subtitle" I posted on the front page (which read: "What is the real motive behind Ace Baker's new "Hutchison Effect Challenge?") Fetzer then stated:

On 7th Feb 2008, [Dr. Judy Wood appeared on the Dynamic Duo](#), with guest host Dr. Morgan Reynolds, to discuss the Hutchison Effect and 9/11. It was intended that John Hutchison would also appear, but John had to take an important call, so he was unable to join the discussion.

As had been posted elsewhere, [Dr. Wood had filed a Qui Tam](#) case against a number of contractors who contributed to the fraudulent NIST NCSTAR reports. (Dr. Wood's filing of a "Request for Correction" earlier in the year laid the foundations for the Qui Tam). As things turned out, more documents towards this case had to be filed by Friday 29th February 2008. A lot of work had to be done to meet this deadline, as Dr. Wood wanted to incorporate newer information into the submission.

On Weds 27th February, [Ace Baker sent another e-mail](#) to a group of people (including John Hutchison). In this message he said that he would be appearing, again, on Jim Fetzer's Dynamic Duo radio show to discuss further aspects of 9/11 video fakery and also ... his work on the Hutchison Effect. Though Ace had advised us on the 26th Feb that he would be appearing on the 27th, in his latest message, Ace included links to 3 new video clips he had made which seemed to reproduce some of the effects that John Hutchison had seen in his experiments.

It felt odd that Ace would be discussing the Hutchison Effect with Jim Fetzer before Dr.. Wood – but it seemed to be clear where Ace was heading with his discussion.

The 3 new video clips were of good quality, and in one of them, Ace appeared on the left, juggling balls, whilst the Hutchison effect demonstration occurred over in a framed area to the right. In another clip, the background showed a small Tesla coil, discharging, whilst the effect took place in a framed area in the foreground.

Before the Show with Ace

When Ace had said that he was going to be discussing the Hutchison Effect on the Dynamic Duo with Prof Jim Fetzer, [Dr. Wood expressed surprise that Ace would be going on before her](#), discussing things that related to an area in which he had no special expertise.

[Fetzer initially responded](#) saying he did not know what Dr. Wood meant, because he hadn't asked Ace to talk about the Hutchison Effect, only video fakery. [Dr. Wood pointed out](#) that Ace Baker had said he would be talking about the Hutchison Effect in the same e-mail that Fetzer then responded to! [Fetzer then said](#) he'd missed this in Ace's e-mail, [but had not imposed any restrictions](#) on Ace as to what he should talk about, but he did offer to switch the appearances over. Dr. Wood was not able to appear on the Wednesday night, so Ace Baker was still scheduled to appear.

Ace Baker on Dynamic Duo

[Ace Baker appeared with Jim Fetzer on the Dynamic Duo, as planned, on 27th Feb.](#) In the first hour, Ace discussed other video fakery research he had been doing, but in the 2nd hour, he discussed the Hutchison Effect. His opening statement more or less set the tone of what was to follow:

"There are a lot of disciplines that are relevant to 9/11 [research] and, while nuclear physics and quantum mechanics are not my areas of expertise, video fakery is."

Ace had posted some videos on his relatively new [Blog \(started in Feb 2008\)](#). Ace Baker does have [his own website](#), where he has some 9/11 research posted, but the Hutchison-related information, as well as a critique of other 9/11 video fakery research, has been posted on his Blog (perhaps for the purpose of obtaining more comments etc).

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

seemed to be stating that he was wanting to prove that John Hutchison was a liar (and Dr. Wood was a liar, independent of the facts put before him, both in this e-mail exchange and in earlier ones. Also, it is not called "The Hutchison and Wood Effect."). This, to me, shows a disturbing lack of desire to discover what actually happened on 9/11. If Dr. Wood's study is incomplete or inaccurate or even inappropriate, then why can't Ace come up with a better method to find the correct explanation? How will proving John Hutchison a fraud (even though Ace was already convinced of this) help determine what *did* happen on 9/11? I was given to ask myself, therefore, what is Ace's true intent and focus? *Who was he doing this "stunt" for - himself?*

In his answer to question 4, again he seems to blatantly ignore data:

4. The challenge has nothing whatsoever to do with hurricane Erin or the Alaskan Magnetometer data. It has to do with the scientific claims made by John Hutchison. Hutchison's claims pre-date 9/11, and continue to this day.

Could it be that there is a strategy to distract people away from looking at the basic data - which starts to clearly show that *field effects* (for example, effects on the earth's magnetic field) did indeed play a significant role on 9/11? Is all this an exercise to create more and more forum verbiage to drown out any serious discussion of evidence? Is he trying to set up a fake exercise to test the existence of something which has already generated over 500 lbs of anomalous metal samples?

I must admit to being somewhat surprised at Ace Baker's answers to these four questions – especially his apparent “blanking” of the Hurricane Erin data, so to clarify this, I sent one further e-mail with some follow-up questions. [I asked him if his "Hutchison Effect challenge" really had nothing to do with 9/11 research. He replied:](#)

1. Wrong. The Hutchison Effect Challenge is related to 9/11 research, in that it will require honest researchers to eliminate "Hutchison Effect" from consideration.

I then asked him if he thought Hurricane Erin was not relevant to what happened on 9/11. He responded:

2. Right. Hurricane Erin is unrelated to 9/11.

Finally, I asked him if he really had no interest in finding out how the towers were dustified on 9/11. He said:

3. Wrong. I am very interested to learn how the towers were blown up. But I'm also interested in documenting the strategy of the govern-media psy-op team.

So what strategy has Ace documented? On his blog, he has repeated several times that “John Hutchison is a fraud” and has simply just made some fake videos. Ace has made his own fake videos, simulating 2 or 3 of the effects (incompletely). Ace has also completed a study of TV fakery. In both cases, he has not “moved” his evidence into a legal framework, as Dr. Wood has done. He has not submitted an affidavit in a court case, as John Hutchison has done. ([I also submitted an affidavit for Dr. Wood's Qui Tam case.](#))

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

The motion of the can in John Hutchison's video is not the same as in Ace Baker's video – it is more fluid. Also, the can flexes and bends in the middle slightly as well as at the end. Also, at the end, it appears to go out of view, then come back into view a couple of times.

Ace and Jim Fetzer then discussed briefly how the Wikipedia article on John Hutchison is “skeptical” of his experiments, claiming he cannot reproduce them. This is untrue. Wikipedia seemed to be an unusual source for Jim and Ace to quote, considering the pedigree of Wikipedia when it comes to the discussion of 9/11 research. They did not quote any of the other significant articles about the Hutchison Effect, such as those listed on [a site called RexResearch](#), though they did note Wikipedia Page had been edited around the time the show went on air.

Ace then went on to discuss John Hutchison's “toy UFO” video, which used a wire attached the toy UFO. Ace describes how the UFO is levitating, but there is a “problem” because of the string. The truth behind this experiment is that it was *not a levitation* experiment in the same way as the others were. This was for a **high voltage** experiment – with the voltage being delivered *through a wire* (not a string).

Ace and the Boat Experiment

Jim Fetzer and Ace then discuss the Boat Experiment video, where John has placed a boat in a shallow tank of water. The water “shimmers” and the boat wobbles slightly. [Additionally, fires periodically light and extinguish around the sides of the boat.](#) http://drjudywood.com/videos/video_comments.html#boat

Ace suggests that, because we can't see the right hand end of the boat, someone is likely to be holding it and moving the boat. Ace then discusses the strange fires which skip around the boat and then says they disappear within one frame and the water goes calm. This description is inaccurate, as the water is moving and flames are seen approximately 10 seconds into the video. Later in the video, however, flames are seen when the water is calm – this is repeated at 1 minute 10 seconds. At 1 minute 25 seconds, flames are seen when the water is calm again. Ace suggests the fire is real and that John may have “flash powder” or something like that, but this does not seem plausible as the same points on the boat ignite more than once in the sequence (and I can see no evidence of editing). Also, is it possible to get such fire effects without smoke? Is it possible to get such fire effects of that colour, lasting for several seconds, rather than just a single flash? I really don't think this is flash powder. The fire/flashes in the [YouTube videos](#) don't resemble those shown in the boat video - there is much more smoke, the flashes are short-lived and they are more explosive.

Ace suggests the tub is vibrated by a sander. Why would the tank need to be vibrated? How does it help the supposed fakery? Surely the vibration is not really very interesting in itself – but the fire is – so why bother faking the vibration?

Ace then offers to make a reproduction of the boat video (which again, would take quite some trouble and perhaps at least \$100 for the materials?). Why do this?

At the end of the show, Fetzer thanked Ace for coming on and said he would “have to have [him] back”.

Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison on Dynamic Duo (Commentary)

[On 28th February, Dr. Wood and John Hutchison appeared on the show with Jim Fetzer.](#) Fetzer had had stomach flu for some time and seemed fairly quiet. Nevertheless, he did ask John Hutchison about his educational and career background, and his source of income for more than the last 30 years – this is far more than he has done with his other guests. John replied candidly, with no trace of reticence or concern.

9/11 AND THE HUTCHISON EFFECT **AN ACE IN THE HOLE – PART II**

Andrew Johnson
Aug 19, 2008

Some time ago, [I posted a series of 3 articles](#) which attempted to document the peculiar machinations of Alexander "Ace" Baker and Prof Jim Fetzer in relation to [a study posted by Dr Judy Wood regarding 9/11 evidence and Hutchison Effect Evidence](#). [Dr. Wood also posted an article](#) highlighting the unusual attitude that Jim Fetzer took to John Hutchison when John appeared as a guest on his "Dynamic Duo" show on 28 February 2008.

In the articles I wrote, I contended that the evidence collected by Dr. Wood - and the reaction to this same evidence - strongly imply that the basic thrust of the argument is correct – that some type of technology related to that used to create the Hutchison Effect was indeed employed in 9/11.

Since Dr. Wood posted her original "Hutchison Effect" study in early 2008, she has posted an additional series, which includes [a good deal of data regarding Hurricane Erin, which was closest to NYC during the events of 9/11](#). As part of this study, Dr. Wood has [obtained magnetometer data, logged by instruments in Alaska during the events of 9/11](#). These data show very interesting variations in the earth's magnetic field during the events of 9/11. Reaction to this study seems to have been more muted, though the data is now getting some exposure.

Dr. Wood and I were invited by Jim Fetzer to make two appearances in his "Dynamic Duo" show slot on GCN Live. These two appearances took place on [30th July 2008](#) and [31st July 2008](#), and will be the subject of a separate article.

Decoy and Distract?

On 18th August 2008, Dr. Wood and I [received and e-mail from Ace Baker](#) with the subject:

Ace Baker - \$100,000 Hutchison Effect Challenge

Ace Baker was apparently offering "\$100,000 if John and/or Judy can reproduce the H-Effect." The message contained a link [to an entry on his blog](#), in which he set out the general terms of his challenge. Strangely, however, Ace neglected to include John in the "CC" or "To" fields. When Dr. Wood noticed this, she forwarded her copy of Ace's email to John.

John Hutchison is, at times, [quite a prolific "blogger" himself](#) and he contacted Dr. Wood to state that he had posted a response to Ace Baker's challenge on Ace Baker's own blog, but it seems as though it was not approved or posted there. [John advised us of the general contents of his post, from memory, soon after he had tried to post it.](#)

Some time previously, Ace had offered a sum of \$5000 if he could film "Hutchison Effects" in John's lab, but Ace never followed through, so this seemed to represent a substantially larger offer. However, I was very curious about this new offer, because Ace had previously stated "John Hutchison is a 100% fraud". If Ace believed this, then what was the point of offering a large sum of money? [I was therefore given to ask Ace Baker the following questions:](#)

1) Who would he be approaching to validate the effects, and how will their qualifications compare to those of George Hathaway, Col John Alexander, Hal Puthoff and others?

done was comment on some of the evidence that Judy had collected regarding the World Trade Centre. It was Judy who contacted John and John had sent information and comments – John was not "polluting 9/11 research". Ace had stated that he is Judy's greatest supporter, but it was apparent that Ace was not supporting Judy's research expertise.

Ace had accused John of trickery because he could make videos which mimicked *some* aspects of John's experiments. Ace had not reproduced:


- a) the levitation of the cannonball
- b) the metal effects
- c) the fire effects
- d) the bending and flexing motions in the can

In fact, Ace had not properly reproduced any of John's videos. For Ace to call John a fraud seemed a very bold and reckless, because we had substantial evidence that John's experiments had been validated many times. We had documents from Scientists, we had TV documentaries and letters from Canadian and Government groups showing how they had been actively researching the phenomena John had discovered. In addition, it was Ace himself who admitted he had been dishonest and deceptive about the videos he presented. Is this a good way to find the truth about something?

Ace claimed to have explained some of the other effects that John had generated:

The bent rod is . . . a bent rod. He heated it up, bent it, and let it cool. Notice how it's charred in the middle, like where the bend is?

This, again, seemed like a rush-to-judgement. I had observed a number of metal samples from John, such as these:



Ace had not bothered to check the diameter of the rods which John had bent – up to 3 inches in diameter. I had seen no evidence of "burn marks". Was John a blacksmith as well as a video faker? (That is, he would need a hot kiln and metal shaping tools to do this.)

Though not video fakery per se, the metal sample with the knife in it is equally silly. The knife is stainless steel. The metal looks like a very soft aluminum. He poured some liquid aluminum around a knife. When it cooled off, he took a grinder to it. Voila! Fused knife! Please.

JH: Yes, I did.

JF: Whereabouts?

JH: I'm in New Westminster, British Columbia. I grew up in North Vancouver, by the way.

JF: In North Vancouver.

JH: Yes, I was away in Europe for a while...inaudible — (Jim Fetzer interrupts...)

Did Fetzer interrupt because he was afraid John was going to talk about his scientific research?

JF: I presume you went to school there. High school for example?

JH: Well, I had a private tutor and we were mostly in... I was in to chemistry quite a bit and I was in the chemical lab. Also gunsmithing and machine tool work. A little later on I got in to the Tesla stuff which is kind of intriguing.

Doesn't Fetzer want to talk about the Tesla stuff that is "kind of intriguing"?

JF: Well, you never matriculated to a university. You didn't actually... I don't have a university degree. You don't have an academic background or a scientific background other than what you learned in the process of your tutoring and your self learning.

JH: That's right. Yes, and thank God for that because if I had gone through the normal route, then I'd be programmed to not think outside of the box.

JF: *(Coughing)* Excuse me. I've been under the weather all week with a nasty case of the stomach flu. How have you made your living, John?

JH: Well, I have made my living through various, well, defense contractors, giving demonstrations for them as well as... that's Canadian... as well as American, and from Germany, and of late, I've been doing a lot of television shows. There's really high demand for that so ...they pay large amounts of money for coming here to film.

Doesn't Fetzer want to talk about the fact that various defense contractors have made extended visits to John's lab to film his work?

JF: And before you got in to the effects and so...for your discoveries, how were you, you know, making ends meet?

- 5) What do you think of Col John Alexander's statements that John Hutchison is seeing the effects of "PK" (Psychokinesis)?
- 6) Why would LANL express an interest in basic video fakery and spend 4 months working with John?

[Ace responded a short time later saying:](#)

*> 1) How would you explain the up-turned cars at the WTC?
Good question. Certainly very powerful weapons of some type were used to disintegrate the towers.
> 2) How would you explain the beams bent into a loop at the WTC?
Good question. Ordinarily bending steel like that requires foundry conditions.*

So Ace did not have an alternative explanation for what happened at the WTC, but he still thought it was a powerful weapon. Ace rejected the idea that a letter from the Canadian Government to John said that his work was a matter of National Security:

*> 3) Why did the Canadian Govt. class his experiments as a matter of National Security? (see attached - as posted on his blog)
I read the letter. It does not classify "his experiments as a matter of National Security". It is rejecting Hutchison's request for information on the grounds of National Security. Please.*

Ace's response was, to me, a very unusual response – the letter clearly linked John's experiments with National Security issues, even if the exact meaning is somewhat ambiguous. Ace's next response was also very surprising to me:

*> 4) Why did people like Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander want to contact him? (see attached- as posted on his blog)
Have Mr. Puthoff and/or Col. Alexander contact me, and I'll explain to them how Hutchison's videos are made.*

This demonstrated an unusual lack of humility. Hal Puthoff and Col John Alexander are well known in "alternative knowledge" circles. Alexander is best known for his involvement in the [Non Lethal Weapons programme](#). Puthoff is an experimental Physicist and he has published many papers and a textbook on "Quantum Electronics". He has ties to the NSA, so like Alexander, seems to be connected to the Military Industrial Complex.

So, Ace was suggesting that he'd be able to convince two well known figures, both who have ties to the Military Industrial Complex and have expressed interest, over several years, in John Hutchison's work, that John was a fraud? This claim of Ace's was quite extraordinary to me.

Ace went on to suggest that the researchers from Los Alamos never actually visited John – he seemed to be suggesting John had made the whole thing up.

Ace further stated:

I'm 100% certain that Hutchison's videos were made exactly as I describe.

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

Also, if Fetzer truly thinks Dr. Wood had something wrong in her “Hutchison Effect” study, why didn’t he address this on his radio show, as he went through the “JJ” pages? (Fetzer raised no points of criticism during the broadcast). Before sending this message, Fetzer had no specific argument with anything John Hutchison or Judy Wood had said –he merely thought “there was a possibility of fraud”. This is true with almost every controversial issue – and the only way to resolve it is by considering the widest possible range of pertinent evidence.

Questions and Speculations

I find the above developments of some concern, both for what they are, and the additional questions they raise.

It was puzzling to receive initial communications from CERN via Fetzer – apparently supportive of Dr. Wood’s new research – research that had been publicly discussed several weeks earlier. How does Fetzer know people at CERN? Why didn’t any of these people contact Dr. Wood directly? Why was the communication routed through Fetzer?

What then caused the switch to a tone which was more sinister, mentioning the idea that “Judy’s reputation can be salvaged” – even though no evidence had been presented to show that her study was somehow invalid?

Is it possible that “psychological tactics” were in use by Fetzer? Perhaps he hoped that Dr. Wood would be very enthusiastic about CERN’s apparent interest – and pursue this angle in preference to some other one (such as work on the Qui Tam cases).

One possibility is that CERN would not want any information relating to free energy technology to become widely known. [They are large benefactors from energy related research:](#)

CERN, with an annual budget of more than EURO 600 million and more than 6000 regular users working in 500 institutes in 50 different countries....

The Hutchison Effect and Cold Fusion hold the potential to produce limitless, cheap, free energy – with relatively simple equipment, compared to what is used at places like CERN. [At CERN, however, things like “hot fusion” are \(unsurprisingly\) promoted within the organisation.](#)

So they, too, like the Military Industrial Complex have a very strong vested interest in keeping all this information out of public view or “in the realm of the incredible”.

As Dr. Wood did not express any specific interest in the CERN contact, did Fetzer then change his strategy from “Good Cop” to “Bad Cop” hoping that she would react to a more threatening posture?

Please consider the evidence and draw your own conclusions.

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

9/11 AND THE HUTCHISON EFFECT THE CHIPS HAVE FALLEN

Andrew Johnson - 11 March 2008



It was approximately 1 year ago that I felt there was a need to [document the circumstances surrounding the break up of the original Scholars for 9/11 Truth group](#), which became *9/11 Scholars* and *Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice*. After the split, the *9/11 Scholars* group was headed up by Prof. Jim Fetzer and *Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice* was headed up by Prof. Steve Jones, who had already been connected to the Cold Fusion cover up and Los Alamos National Laboratories and [who had been caught using faked or massaged data in his presentations.](#)

At the time of the split, I was still puzzled by certain aspects of what happened, and others in the group that were corresponding with one another at that time still had misgivings about being involved in *either* camp. However, I felt that the evidence was clear about Prof Steve Jones - and that Jim Fetzer had been able to [see problems with the way Steve Jones was acting and the way he was presenting data](#), therefore I had only minor reservations about being associated with Fetzer’s *9/11 Scholars* group.

Jim Fetzer Commends Andrew Johnson

On Mar 24 2007, following the split in the Scholars Group, Jim Fetzer [sent an e-mail to several people, including me, inviting them to join the Scholars Group’s “steering committee”](#). In this e-mail he said:

I have been impressed with your integrity and dedication and efforts to promote truth and exposed falsehoods about the events of 9/11. I need people like you to advise me in relation to the future of Scholars and to offer comments, criticism, and critique as appropriate.

This seemed like a good development, and when someone makes a statement such as this, one is more likely to consider the request seriously. I agreed to be on this committee. However, there was very little activity and the only question Jim Fetzer asked us during the time that I “served” on this committee was whether he should take action against Alex Floum over intellectual property issues. At that time, I suggested Jim not do this, because it was not really specifically related to the study, research or exposure of 9/11 issues and so did not seem worth expending any effort on.

The next discussion of any significance that I had with Jim Fetzer came in late September 2007, I had compiled a study of NYC “First Responder” witness accounts in an effort to find out how they

Ace is doing something with it? I admit I have been sicker than a dog with stomach flu and simply tried to solve what you took to be a problem, but if you couldn't come on Wednesday anyway and have already discussed it with Morgan, why is it such a big deal? No one holds your work in greater esteem than do I. Give me a break, OK?

One point here is that John Hutchison had not yet appeared with Dr. Morgan Reynolds on the Dynamic Duo show – though he had planned to, it never happened. Why did Fetzer ask Judy to “give him a break”? Once the Ace Baker broadcast and associated blog entries were complete, it seemed quite clear that a full-scale debunking exercise was underway, and this therefore seemed to justify Dr. Wood’s earlier concern.

“Bad Cop”

On Mar 3rd 2008, shortly after Judy Wood and John Hutchison’s broadcast on the *Dynamic Duo*, [Jim Fetzer sent another e-mail to Dr. Wood](#). The tone of this message was rather different to previous messages he had sent.

Just between us, if Judy were to back off her relations with Hutchinson, whom I consider to be a fraud, I think her standing can be salvaged. Whether she is willing to do that, I have no idea. But this is certainly an option that is available to her. We all make mistakes and have misplaced enthusiasm. But my opinion is that—absence physical explanations of the kind I asked of him at the time on the air—he is most unlikely to contribute to our/her success.

Here, Fetzer suggests Dr. Wood should not continue her association with John Hutchison. The reason given here is not based on any evidence - it is that Fetzer “considers John to be a fraud”. Fetzer specifies no particular evidence, merely that John could “not explain” his phenomenon. However, this statement by Fetzer is not 100% accurate – John did provide a basic explanation of his phenomenon during the broadcast, and it was thus:

OK. I don't normally go into theories too much – I have my own personal theory that it's affected on a subatomic level, but Rene Louis Vallee and Andrei Sakharov brought up some interesting reports, along with many others, on what happens here and we found that the RF fields are not the cause – or the electrostatics – it's something that happens after that. They seem to join or [be] combined in space and time to cause a[n] other effect – which happens to be like a shielding of the gravity pull – basically the reverse of gravity – and you see things lift off. Things go in a translational motion as well as ... if not, metals seem to start bending and twisting and pulling into different patterns and shapes. We also found it affects the background radiation, to quite an extent – where you get a couple of counts per minute.

John then names several scientists who have evaluated the phenomenon – and several of them have posted reports (see <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/JJ/JJAppendix1.html>) If John Hutchison was a fraud, why did he agree to come on Fetzer’s radio show (no fee is paid), where he could, in theory, be exposed as a fraud?

Recently, part of the interview with Fetzer and Hutchison was transcribed for us by someone. One section makes particularly interesting reading:

Hutchison: 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

JF: John I want to welcome you to the Dynamic Duo.
JH: Hello-o...
JF: John – could you tell us a little bit about yourself – ye know - your background and your education – especially your training in science and technical subjects?

Rather than, say, asking John how he started to perform his experiments, or perhaps what he thought of the intriguing data that Fetzer and Wood had just been discussing, Fetzer chooses to ask a question about John’s training and/or education. Why did Fetzer seem more interested in this than in the bizarre data and effects that had also been touched on, both on Fetzer’s previous show with Ace Baker and with Dr. Judy Wood only moments earlier? Regardless, John replied candidly, and cheerfully. Fetzer then asked about him going to High School and pointed out that John did not “matriculate to a university” or have a university degree. John agreed, without any reservation or hesitation. Fetzer, still not asking about the anomalous data or effects, then said “How have you made your living, John?” What was unclear to me was how this was relevant to the study of the WTC evidence - which was the subject of discussion at the time John came on. How exactly was Jim Fetzer’s line of questioning relevant to the Hutchison Effect evidence itself?

As I mentioned in [the previous article](#), during the broadcast, Jim Fetzer seemed noticeably quiet and there were a number of longer silences as Judy waited for Jim Fetzer’s reaction. He made no points of science and did not specifically query or re-interpret any of the points of evidence in relation to the WTC that Dr. Wood presented.

When Jim Fetzer asked John Hutchison for an explanation of the Hutchison Effect, John Hutchison gave a summary describing how it may be caused by a poorly understood interaction between Radio Frequency (RF) fields and Electrostatic Fields.

Did Fetzer not consider it significant that the Hutchison Effect was actually named after John? If Prof Stephen Hawking had been on the program, because someone in the 9/11 Truth Movement had referenced [Hawking Radiation](#) for example, would Fetzer have asked about Hawking’s background in the same detail as he did of John Hutchison?

Dr Wood first learned of Hutchison’s work in October 2006 and she has said that she felt she could not endorse it or deny it without additional information and/or studying. It took well over a year for her to feel confident enough about the science of John Hutchison’s work, and to fully appreciate the striking parallels with what happened on 9/11. She reached that point, very carefully and methodically, by conducting research in that area of science.

Jim Fetzer, though has written a number of books and has studied and taught courses in the Philosophy of Science, is *not* an engineer, and not a scientist per se, and hasn’t studied the science. However, he seems to have few reservations about the methods employed by Ace Baker to mimic and by inference discredit John Hutchison’s work. Is this a credible position for Jim Fetzer to adopt?

After the Dynamic Duo Show

It seemed to be that Jim Fetzer had drawn the same conclusion as Ace Baker – that John Hutchison was a fraud, and he seemed to think that Ace had essentially demonstrated this beyond reasonable doubt. To make sure I had read the situation correctly, [I sent an e-mail to Jim Fetzer asking him 6 specific questions about what had been discussed](#) in the broadcast with Ace Baker. [His initial response](#) did not answer my questions. In it, Fetzer said:

9/11 AND THE HUTCHISON EFFECT **HANDLING THE TRUTH**

Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)
6th Apr 2008

Some people have now observed that the 9/11 Truth Movement is being directed and controlled, in order that only a certain amount of information is revealed – at a certain time, and in a certain way. I first began to understand how this seemed to be happening during [the break up of the original Scholars for 9/11 Truth Group in about Feb 2007](#). More recently, I feel I have, with the help of others, been able to document another significant instance of the attempted control of 9-11 related information. In completing this documentation, I have been somewhat concerned that I may be accused of some type of “ad hominem attack” against those whose statements and actions I am documenting. I feel somewhat similar about writing this article, for the same reasons. Weighed against this, I feel that certain truths need to be told in order that people have a chance to understand how the mechanics of the control of information related to 9/11 - and the energy cover up – are operating. In short, I have now come to the conclusion that, when trying to get to the truth, the history, behaviour and psychology of those presenting or discussing evidence has to be carefully considered.

In this article, I will present evidence concerning the latest attempts to cover up one of the “central secrets” of the 9/11 Black Operation. That secret, I strongly contend, is this: free energy technology, related to Hutchison Effect technology was used to destroy the majority of the WTC complex. “Free Energy” technology is a “catch all” term to describe a kind of technology that can be used to “get out more energy than you put in” (i.e. you apparently get the energy for free). Mainstream science rejects this idea on its face, because it is said it breaks the laws of thermodynamics. ([When looked at from a different perspective, however](#), this seems to be incorrect – it is known the energy is real, but assumed it is too difficult to construct technology to use or extract it to do “useful work”). Cold fusion is one example where many, many experiments show a small input energy can result, in certain circumstances, in a large energy output. (See www.lenr-canr.org)

Some of the effects observed in John Hutchison’s experiments are apparently the result of an output of very high energy levels, and yet his input energy is small – only a few kilowatts at maximum. (This is the energy required to operate a kettle to boil water).

In December 2007, Dr. Judy Wood posted her study of the very striking similarity of experimental characteristics of the “Hutchison Effect” to a number of pieces of evidence at the WTC. Dr. Wood and I were given an opportunity to discuss this issue on [Ambrose Lane’s “We Ourselves” show in January 2008](#) and on our second appearance, John Hutchison joined the discussion. Following this radio show appearance, two of the people associated with the 911 Scholars group – [Prof Jim Fetzer](#) (the founder) and [Ace Baker](#) (not a listed member of the Scholars group, but a regular guest on Fetzer’s radio show) - when challenged, began to behave differently towards Dr. Wood and I – at least in relation to the “Hutchison Effect” study. I attempted to document this “change in behaviour” in the articles linked above. Following the actions of Baker and Fetzer, I asked that my name be deleted from the 911 Scholars list.

In the articles linked above, I documented the very strong reaction of Fetzer and Baker – they both (essentially) agreed that John Hutchison was a fraud – and in saying this, ignored and considerable amount of evidence which suggested, beyond reasonable doubt, that John Hutchison’s work was valid.

This was not what I had stated to him. I had stated to him that I could not support his conclusion, as he had not criticised Ace for putting out a fake story about buying coils on e-bay and then making a fake video to explain away the Hutchison Effect. Fetzer had ignored evidence.

Fetzer continued:

If there is something to Hutchison's "effects", it would mean that he has discovered laws of nature (anti-gravity, unusual forces, etc.) the existence of which has heretofore been unrecognized (unsuspected, unconfirmed).

This is correct – but the conclusion that Hutchison has, indeed, discovered anti-gravity can only be drawn once *the evidence is evaluated*. Fetzer *ignored* this evidence – as already mentioned above. Fetzer continued:

I most certainly do not "support fakery and subterfuge over diligent research and analysis" and I cannot imagine what has given you that impression.

I was given the impression in Fetzer’s earlier e-mail, in which he said:

I think Ace's point was that it is easy to simulate "Hutchison-like effects" and claim they are valid when they are not. That seems to me to be perfectly appropriate and I do not fault him for that.

Ace had produced a fake video and sent round a fake story about it. Fetzer “did not fault him” – if Fetzer *didn’t* support Ace’s approach to 9/11 research, then why did he say the opposite of this?

This same e-mail also contained a message Fetzer had sent to another person in our small group who had questioned Fetzer in a similar manner. To this other person, Fetzer wrote:

Andrew Johnson posed questions to me, which implied that, unless I disavowed Ace, he might have to consider withdrawing from Scholars.

Technically, this interpretation was not accurate. I had not suggested Fetzer “disavow Ace” for me to continue my association with the Scholars group – rather, I had said I could not support the group’s founder if he supported the methods that Ace had used. This was a subtle, but important difference – I said that I could not continue to be a member of the 911 Scholars group if its founder wasn’t *significantly more critical* of Ace’s approach – based as it was on a lack of evidence.

Jim Fetzer Answers Key Questions!

I further clarified my feelings and position that I wished to resign from the Scholars group in [follow-up e-mails](#) to Fetzer. [Fetzer's support of Ace's approach was confirmed in the next e-mail](#) I received from him, in which he had chosen to answer the questions I posed, thus:

1) Do you think it is a good way to assess the validity of a study by making a fake video, after initially giving out a false story about that video? i.e. Ace Baker said he had obtained Tesla Coils from e-bay to attempt experiments related to the Hutchison Effect, then he posted a video saying he'd reproduced it. In reality, he put out a false

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

Whilst I had suggested Fetzer was trying to cover up the Hutchison Effect's relation to the destruction of the WTC, I never accused him of fabricating evidence. Neither had I accused Ace Baker of fabricating evidence. Ace *himself* admitted faking a video – so I wasn't accusing him of anything other than what he had already admitted doing! Fetzer also said:

Make sure that you observe in this article or yours that I stand behind Judy's research but not Hutchison's. And be sure to explain our reasons for thinking as we do. That called playing fair by laying our cards on the table as well as your own.

So, here is all the evidence – all the cards, and all the chips for the reader to consider.

Fetzer sent a short follow up e-mail, where he responded to my note that I thought the quiz he'd set had been “fun, fun, fun”.

*Since I mentioned there were three differences between inductive and deductive reasoning and you (wrongly) mention a common misconception, I presume you already know you are wrong on that one. I'd **love to offer you a tutorial**, but you **are not a very promising student**. In any case, thanks for your good work of the past. All my best!*

So again, Fetzer makes disparaging remarks, rather than replying to the specific points I'd made about the evidence and the way he had analysed and criticised it – or rather, the way that he and Ace Baker seemed to have agreed that *ignoring* evidence completely was the best policy in this case.

By this point, of course, I knew what Fetzer was doing – and so again, I deferred to my sense of humour and [responded thus](#) (in reference to my earlier “fun, fun, fun” comment):

Can't you at least "mark" my attempts at "special pleadings" and "total evidence" [answers] - go on, please!?!

Or "has the Daddy Taken the T-bird away, then?"

Fetzer didn't seem to see the humorous side here, and [responded thus](#):

I had no idea I was dealing with a child! Thanks for clarifying that!

I had perhaps “taunted” Fetzer somewhat, during the exchange of e-mails, but I had not insulted his intelligence nor had I made disparaging remarks – I tried hard to stick to points of evidence, both regarding the Hutchison Effect and the WTC and his own analysis of these things. He responded without addressing the evidence and he suggested I was either “dumb” or “childish”. Is this an effective way to debate the truth of an issue?

Summary and Conclusions

Here are some observations. Prof Jim Fetzer, is an author or editor of multiple books, and he repeats this fact at regular intervals.

- Fetzer said he was impressed with my “sticking to the truth” but completely ignored my analysis of the Hutchison Effect evidence and he never sent any comments up until Ace Baker had been on his show.

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

[discussed this 6 weeks previously on Ambrose Lane's radio program](#). Why did Fetzer ignore all of this, and what I'd previously said?

Also, making a fake video proves nothing in of itself – this is *precisely* why *other evidence must* be evaluated before drawing conclusions!

5) Do you think that Ace has managed to reproduce any or all of the effects that John Hutchison has? (I noted on your show that Ace discussed the Red Bull Can experiment and described the can flexing and bending throughout the length of it, yet his faked video did not duplicate this phenomenon - therefore Ace had noted these anomalies, but had not reproduced them.)

They are close enough to raise serious doubts in most minds--indeed, in every serious scientific mind, in my opinion. I know we disagree. OK?

Again, Fetzer just thinks “close enough” is “good enough”. He suggests “every serious scientific mind would have serious doubts, in his opinion”. I myself have been described as having a “scientific mind”, but because I have evaluated the *evidence* I have *little or no doubt* that the Hutchison Effect *is real*.

6) Ace says he is sure the Hutchison Effect is not real, but he can't explain the evidence that Judy has collected. Why would he attack Judy for giving an explanation that involves a well-documented, almost 30-year old phenomenon?

Appealing to the Hutchison effect to explain Judy's work is to appeal to a mystery to explain an enigma. There is no explanatory benefit here.

This statement by Fetzer is almost meaningless and is based on no evidence – only his own opinion. The comparison of the WTC evidence and Hutchison Effect evidence is obvious to those who see the photographs side by side. Fetzer, at this point, ignores this evidence too.

Jim, some chips seem to have fallen here and I, as a fellow member of 911 Scholars am keen to get your views on "where they now lay". I need to work out if I can continue to be aligned with the 911 Scholars group, or whether it's founder would support the idea that guests on his show can, without criticism, use "debunking tactics" to attempt to discredit perhaps the most diligent research that the group might be associated with. The answer to this question is especially important to me now that that researcher has definitely used deception as part of his approach.

There was nothing wrong with what Ace has done. I applaud him for showing how easy it is to fake this stuff. You haven't shown it is genuine, but, for reasons I do not understand, are swallowing it hook, line, and sinker!

Again, Fetzer re-asserts his support for Ace promulgating a bogus story and making fake videos. He says he “does not understand why” I am “swallowing” the Hutchison Effect “hook line and sinker”. Again, Fetzer completely overlooks or disregards all the evidence presented here. Is Fetzer trying to make me feel stupid? This seemed to be the approach he would now adopt, [but in the next e-mail, Fetzer expressed concern](#) that I would “offer a very unflattering portrait” of him, as I had mentioned I was going to compose this article. The reader must decide whether Fetzer's view on this is fair or accurate – all I can do is present all of the evidence for review. My intent is