

Part 6	2:46	According to someone at the FBI, the reason was: someone claimed there were 3 nuclear warheads sent to America that morning. One of them hit the pentagon and it was found to be nuclear – that means it was - it was really hard proof and a very convincing thing. They claimed that the other two were inside planes which hit the world trade centre. So they say that the American officials were in fear that these 2 things up on top of the tower will produce the real nuclear explosions. So they decided to collapse the tower just to minimise the damage(s) because at ground level the damage will be very (much) less than at 3 or 400 metres above the ground.
	3:28	Interviewer: If they exploded at level or floors 78 and 99...
DK:		Oh it will destroy the entire New York probably because it's a half megaton...
	7:17	News broadcast used to suggest secondary device on the plane – yet previously he discussed video fakery saying the plane crash was impossible. This is confusing.
Part 7		Wikipedia discussion and deleted article. 90% x-rays - <a href="http://www.fas.org/nuke/intro/nuke/thermal.htm">http://www.fas.org/nuke/intro/nuke/thermal.htm</a>
Part 8		Assumes solid rock. 100m radius, 150 KT nuke. What about the hole or plug from where the device was put in? When was it put in? Zones of damage – greater than 100m wide presumably.
Part 9		Pulverised dust is underground – pressure of gases – but no gas – you mean vaporised rock? No thermal radiation because underground – so no heat... Stays hot for 1 year.... No evidence of this was brought forward at WTC.
	7:50	77m below ground. Tower starts to melt into the explosion (but then the cavity is exposed to the air!! Out comes the heat! This did not happen! Bathub would've been breached (it wasn't) and flooded the whole area – steam explosions, boiling water etc
Part 10	5:43	You claim the tower fell into the hot zone and melted, yet the video clip shown shows the top of the WTC tipping over slightly and turning to dust! What you described in your diagram IS NOT WHAT WAS SEEN!

Dmitri cannot explain Hurricane Erin's presence, nor the silent disappearance of the WTC. Look at his diagram of a "nuclear furnace" created beneath the WTC which it "melted down into"! This is pure nonsense! We saw the steel turning to dust!!

### WTC Nuke theory - Self Contradiction - WTC is Melted and Turned to Dust at the same time.

Those watching Khalezov's analysis can be easily be taken in by the authoritative-looking diagrams and presentation. However, a little scrutiny reveals basic contradictions within the analysis itself and with other available photographic evidence.

The website Bibliotecapleyades has a re-posting of Dimitri's analysis<sup>47</sup>. In part 10 of the analysis<sup>48</sup> we start getting to his rather detailed description of what happened when the supposed 150 kiloton nuclear device exploded. I have saved a couple of still shots below. Here we see his description of the nuke explosion being forced up into the tower.

## WIKIPEDIA CENSORSHIP OF 9/11 EVIDENCE AND LEGAL ACTION

26 Apr 2010

*Most of our faults are more pardonable than the means we use to conceal them.*

*–François, Duc de La Rochefoucauld, Maxims, 1665*

On Apr 8th/9th 2010, Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez posted a Wikipedia Page describing the research of Dr Judy Wood. He included references to Dr Judy Wood's Qui Tam case against NIST's contractors<sup>26</sup> and he referenced her qualifications. The page was originally posted here:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dr.\\_Judy\\_Wood](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dr._Judy_Wood)

The page was then moved to this:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judy\\_Wood](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judy_Wood)

but it was later deleted (as can be seen at the link above). Another page was created in 2007<sup>43</sup>, but this was also deleted shortly after it was created.

Mr Rodriguez appealed the deletion<sup>44</sup> but he was finally blocked from discussing the matter. However, this really shows the true colours behind Wikipedia's agenda – they will not accept articles on certain subjects and data – even when they are truthful and accurate – and of great importance. The result is that vital information is kept hidden – and a false view of reality is created.

Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez, the poster of the article comments:

*The thing about Wikipedia is that monopolies form very quickly between the administrators. Meaning, if one administrator opposes the article I post, he can easily convince and recruit other Wikipedia moderators to join in the censorship, regardless of how they feel about it. They simply will agree with him, because they have formed a relationship.*

*So, it only took 1 or 2 closed-minded administrators to convince roughly 5-10 to go along with the censorship, and any time I tried to appeal, it was shot down by the same group.*

### Other 9/11 Researchers and Wikipedia

Kevin Barrett, Steven E Jones and David Ray Griffin have their own Wikipedia Pages – they have not been deleted. Clearly, Wikipedia defends the official story of 9/11, so these pages will likely not be entirely complementary. But why have their pages not been deleted, in the same way as Dr Judy Wood's page has? Readers can draw their own conclusions.

### An Example of Other Wikipedia Censorship

Wikipedia has a proven track record of censoring or mis-representing many of the most important topics which threaten to overturn the current scientific, economic or social paradigm, such as those relating to the Starchild<sup>8</sup> and the person who has done the most to promote understanding of it, Lloyd Pye<sup>45</sup>:

### Partial Text of Original Article

(Wikipedia Deleted it before any of us saved the exact posting).

Dr. Judy D. Wood, Ph.D Dr. Judy D. Wood is a former professor of mechanical engineering with research interests in experimental stress analysis, structural mechanics, optical methods, deformation analysis, and the materials characterization of biomaterials and composite materials. She is a member of the Society for Experimental Mechanics (SEM). co- founded SEM's Biological Systems and Materials Division, and served on the SEM Composite Materials

diagram above – please watch his presentation to make sure I am not misquoting him). So, the contradiction is – how can the building “melt down” into the furnace, yet also turn to dust?

Additionally, the idea that the heat and melting would solely be confined to the structure of the WTC is rather difficult to swallow – such intense heat would radiate out into the surroundings.

Also, as we can see in the photos below, *the basements survived! At no point* did they form part of a “nuclear furnace”.



Figure 4-1 - GZ workers descend into the subbasements below WTC2. While there is extensive damage, there is little building debris at the bottom of the hole. There is no sign of molten metal. A worker in the distance walks along a massive core column. (photo filed 9/18/01) Error! Bookmark not defined.



Figure 4-2 This photo was taken inside the mall. The store sign “innovation” is visible on the left. (photo filed 9/19/01) Error! Bookmark not defined.

See below – how were the people able to walk around in there, and not be irradiated or burned or both, so soon after the event? Look at the 2<sup>nd</sup> photo – where is the evidence of such high heat? This alone completely negates the validity of this latest variant of the “WTC Nuke” theory.

### Some Correspondence with Dmitri Khalezov/911Thology

This is a short section of some lengthy correspondence with Dimitri

To:911thology

Sent: 11 February 2010 20:01

To: Lisa Lyon

Subject: "New" 9/11 Photos Released - that have been on Dr Judy Wood's site for about 3 years

Dear Lisa,

We spoke on the phone a few months ago. Perhaps now is a good time to re-schedule Dr Wood to talk about what these “new” photos tell us - from a scientific point of view - and how she used them as a basis for legal action - and what happened. It would be a pivotal broadcast if it could take place.

I would be willing to come on as well if useful.

Regards

Andrew Johnson

UK

---

I received no response to this e-mail, and Dr Wood was not contacted by anyone either.

On 18th February 2010, with George Noory on Coast to Coast AM, Richard Gage of a group calling itself “Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth” appeared for 3½ minutes<sup>30</sup> to talk about their request for a new Congressional Investigation and a series of Press Conferences happening around the world. Gage referred to evidence for “explosive controlled demolition” of all 3 “high-rises that went down almost at free fall on 9/11”. He also mentioned “nano-thermitic composite materials” found in the WTC dust. George Noory asked Richard Gage if he thought the investigation would “ever get opened up again”. Richard Gage also mentioned the Khalid Sheikh Mohammed trial.

After Richard Gage’s statements, George Noory said “As I’ve said on this program before, it’s worthy of a new investigation, especially when several major members of the 9/11 commission have felt that the commission did not do a thorough job. That’s all people are asking for – let’s just find out what happened – with a thorough job. We owe it to ourselves to get that.”

For the past 3 years, I have been working to both raise awareness of Dr Wood’s own independent, thorough and publicly posted investigation into the same events that Richard Gage and his group claim to want to have investigated. This investigation has resulted in a “Qui Tam” action by Dr Wood, details and documents about which are posted here<sup>31</sup>:

It seems that discussion of this case has been censored and covered up by almost everyone – Coast to Coast have been advised of it several times over the years, but to my knowledge have never once mentioned it. This is odd, bearing in mind that George Noory said, on 18th Feb 2010:

“That’s all people are asking for – let’s just find out what happened – with a thorough job. We owe it to ourselves to get that.”

Some of my own work has been involved with checking the claims made by Richard Gage and his associates Steven E Jones, Neils Harrit. Harrit and Jones were featured on Coast to Coast on 30th Apr 2009, in an interview with Linda Moulton Howe of earthfiles.com<sup>32</sup>. It is also interesting to note the connection between Steven E Jones and Dr Eugene Mallove – another former Coast to Coast guest<sup>33</sup>. This prompted me to send the e-mail (included at the bottom) to Linda Moulton Howe and George Noory, a few days later, after I had listened to the broadcast. In the e-mail, I provided links to evidence which proves that thermite could not have destroyed the WTC towers and could not account for the “collateral damage”. I also linked to a critique of the so-called “scientific, peer-reviewed paper” which was discussed in the interview. I also pointed out their evidence had not been included in any type of legal challenge, which is also highlighted in this 10-minute video I made<sup>34</sup>.

and Jamaya Islamiya terrorist organizations, which were absolutely groundless accusations, though registered in some courts of law and easily verifiable). However, since I knew from my former service (the Soviet nuclear intelligence) of the existence of the in-built nuclear demolition scheme of the WTC (which existed from the beginning of the 70s, being designed by the 'Controlled Demolition Inc. '), I could testify that before the court of law, if anyone asks me to do so. Besides I could testify to some other sensitive details of the 9/11 perpetration, because I personally knew some of its top planners from the Mossad (I mean personally, not by hearing some rumors about them). I could provide also some legal documents regarding some top Mossad figures' participation in the 9/11 and regarding how some US officials and French secret services managed to cover them up. In case it helps, I could do it.

Finally - just watch the movie. It is all there. I realize that you are a busy person, but this movie worth seeing, by no means you will feel sorry for spending your time watching it. But there is one warning - you have to watch it very attentively and all the 26 parts.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely yours,

Dimitri.

Please consider the evidence which links the Exopolitics issue to 9/11 - through Alfred Webre - and people like John Alexander - who kept tabs on John Hutchison in the 80's (and he makes no secret of this). <http://tinyurl.com/911hestudy/>. And we can heavily implicate weather control on 9/11 too <http://tinyurl.com/911erinstudy/> - I will now be gently challenging the Exopolitics and UFO/ET "scene" to discuss this information. There a lot more "signal" (i.e. data) than "noise" in the pages linked above to work with - and I'd take it to a court of law (not that any could or would deal with it, however).

And can you explain how a "plane" crash can affect the earth's magnetic field 3500 miles away?

---

Oops - looks like nukes are obsolete...

Andrew Johnson

UK

false. As you know 9/11 is a very complicated subject. Yet Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth deliberately avoids those topics. We leave it to others to make those arguments and present the evidence to the public, to Congress, and so on.

If you will tell us the total amount of your donations to us we will refund all of your money. You mentioned that you donated over \$100. What is the exact amount, if you know it? Please provide your check numbers if you have them. We do not want to leave the perception or the reality that we have taken advantage of you financially.

Will you accept our offer of a refund as a complete and equitable solution to this situation?

Take care,  
Mark Graham  
Volunteer Coordinator  
from 911forum.org.uk:

"Lastly, I should let you know that I recently messaged Richard Gage and AE911Truth to ask him to contact Dr. Judy

Wood, and as a result, I have been removed from the Petition Signers list on AE911Truth.org, despite the fact that I have donated over \$100 dollars to Richard Gage and his organization over the past several months. As of the morning of March

4th, my name was removed from the AE911Truth petition, so it appears that I have been removed from the petition simply for asking about Dr. Judy Wood. This is very concerning, because I have not done anything wrong by asking Richard Gage to talk to Dr. Judy Wood and consider her research, yet AE911Truth.org has removed me from their petition simply for asking about her once in a private email. In addition, Richard Gage has never replied to any of my emails over the past several months, not even one of them, but Dr. Judy Wood has responded to several of my emails in just the last week. Oddly enough, Dr. Wood predicted that Richard Gage and Dr. Jones would 'blacklist' me for mentioning her, and she was right. "

---

From: Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez [mailto:abrahm@mindoutpsyde.com]

Sent: 12 March 2010 03:41

To: 'Mark Graham'

Subject: RE: Abraham, a message from Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth

I HAVE DONATED AND SUPPORTED YOU VIGOROUSLY, AND YOU SILENTLY REMOVE ME FROM THE PETITION SIMPLY FOR ASKING RICHARD GAGE A QUESTION IN A PRIVATE EMAIL?! Very professional. I bet treating supporters the way you have treated me is "within" the scope of your message?

A more appropriate response would have been to send me an email back saying "Dear Supporter, sorry, but your request is outside the scope of our message." But instead, I was SILENTLY removed from the petition.

Why am I JUST NOW being told that my request was outside of the scope of focus, AFTER I was removed from the Petition?

I am sure you can understand why I am so upset.

By the way, regardless of whether you agree with Dr. Judy Wood's conclusions about what brought the buildings down, why did AE911Truth not support her legal efforts to bring about 9/11 Truth? Her Qui-Tam whistleblower case, filed in 2007, made it all the way to the Supreme Court, yet Richard Gage has not even filed a Qui-Tam case yet. Why is that? What is he waiting for? Why didn't he support Dr. Wood's case, regardless of whether he agreed on her conclusion?

Proof of her case:

- List of Evidence that must be explained found here: <http://drjudywood.com/wtc>

### The National Thermite State

The evidence indicates that Richard Dolan has now subscribed to the "National 9/11 Thermite programme". In other words, it seems that Richard Dolan's presentation was set precisely within the boundaries of what some of us now call "The Official 9/11 Truth" - which consists, roughly speaking, of planes crashing into the WTC, Bombs in the Buildings (BiB) and the use of "Magic Thermite" (or even "Space Thermite") - which can either be an incendiary, an explosive, paint on, an example of advanced nano-technology - or a welding material or whatever you need it to be.

Here again, we see a repeated pattern that, specifically in relation to Dr Judy Wood's research into the events of 9/11, people in the "alternative research community" are seemingly unable to look at factual evidence and instead they ostracize those presenting it.

### Did Richard Dolan just "make an innocent mistake"?

Some people reading this may think that Richard Dolan just has "a difference of opinion". Can we have a difference of opinion about whether thermite melts things or turns them to dust?

Or, they may say "well, he can't talk about what you talk about because it's too controversial." Another person said to me "well, maybe he just can't take the truth of it."

These reasons for not talking about the most profound, most well-researched and most compelling 9/11 evidence could apply to other people, but not to Richard Dolan. This is a guy who writes about UFO's and Aliens - over 1,000 pages in his 2 volumes so far. Surely he's not worried about profundity or controversy? Popularity, then?

### Popularity vs. The Truth

I have heard a number of other people say things like "Well, if we talk about the connection between 9/11 and Weather Control, or there being no plane crashes on 9/11, it won't be popular..." Perhaps Richard Dolan's decision to not discuss court-submitted evidence, and instead focus on something which turns out to be highly speculative at best, and provably bogus at worst, stemmed from this feeling - i.e. that discussion of this evidence would not be "popular".

But if we take this view to an extreme, certainly at the current time, we might as well just go back to the Official Story of 9/11 (namely Muslims gone bad + lapses in US Security) and have done with it - after all, that is still, despite our best efforts, the most popular story!

Truth is not affected by popularity - whether the towers turned to dust or burned down, fell down or "melted" is a question of *basic observation not popularity!*

### Why Did Richard Dolan Exclude all the most important Evidence?

I cannot resist trying to understand the reason why someone as intelligent, eloquent and articulate as Richard Dolan, who has been writing, researching and giving presentations in one of the most controversial fields there is (UFO's), would exclude from his discussion so much of the most important 9/11 evidence available. Why did he *completely* exclude this evidence - compiled, as it was, by the most highly and relevantly qualified scientist who has been publicly researching these matters for several years?

Why was there no mention *at all of any of* this evidence in a 77 minute broadcast? I can think of several possible reasons.

Perhaps Richard Dolan thought the evidence was insignificant - if that is the case, then we cannot really lend him much credibility in 9/11 research - seeing as the evidence he excluded from his discussion has been put into a legal case to challenge NIST's DEW-related contractors. (This was presented to the United States Supreme Court<sup>26</sup>). Also, some of the evidence is so basic that its importance (in my experience) becomes immediately obvious to those that are shown it on paper or on a screen.



## JIM FETZER AS A DISINFORMATION OP

06 July 2010

This letter was prompted when Jim Fetzer had an article entitled "Wikipedia as a 9/11 disinformation op" posted on a popular site called "Online Journal"<sup>53</sup>. I decided to write to editor to explain the tragic irony contained within the article. The editor never responded to my message.

---

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:info@checktheevidence.co.uk]

Sent: 06 July 2010 22:18

To: 'editor@onlinejournal.com'

Re: Wikipedia as a 9/11 disinformation op"

Dear Sir/Madam,

I was interested to see this article posted on your site. I have had a number of dealings with the author. He even invited me onto the steering committee of the Scholars for 9/11 Truth Group some years ago. I accepted<sup>54</sup>!

It was interesting to see how Mr Fetzer mentioned Dr Judy Wood in his article - but he mentioned nothing of the legal action she undertook against NIST's contractors<sup>26</sup> - who produced fraudulent reports about the destruction of the WTC. Neither did he go into any details about the staggering research that Dr Wood has completed in the last 6 or more years.<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> (Which would not be obvious unless people clicked on the link in his article.)

It was interesting to observe what Mr Fetzer did not mention in his article. He did not mention that Dr Wood's research proves a connection between 9/11 evidence found at the WTC and what is known as "The Hutchison Effect." He did not mention that he previously quoted Wikipedia as if it was an authoritative source in describing the Hutchison Effect.<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup> (the entry for the Hutchison Effect in Wikipedia is arguably much worse than the Scholars' groups' entry, but is subject to the same level of control). Neither did Jim Fetzer mention the thinly veiled threat he made to Dr Judy Wood in 2008<sup>55</sup>.

*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.*

Additionally, I would hope he was aware that Wikipedia Censorship of Dr Judy Wood is far more comprehensive than that of the Scholars group - articles about her get deleted, normally within 48 hours<sup>44</sup>.

Internet Forum censorship of Dr Wood's court case is also quite comprehensive<sup>56</sup>.

Also, Jim Fetzer, in common with most 9/11 researchers, did not mention Hurricane Erin's proximity to New York City on 9/11.<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup>

Having said all this, I would be thoroughly delighted if Online Journal chose to post this letter, in some form, on its website. This would make such a refreshing change from the censorship exercised by "alternative" news website, OpEdNews, in relation to a press release I tried to post there about the Hurricane Erin study<sup>57</sup> that Dr Judy Wood posted - over 2 years ago.

In conclusion, I will say that, due to the evidence I have compiled, I have come to consider Jim Fetzer as a 9/11 disinformation op. How ironic.

Yours Sincerely,

Andrew Johnson

He then describes a little about David Ray Griffin<sup>19</sup>. The broadcast was already reminiscent of Jim Fetzer's appearance on Richard Syrett's show a year to day before this broadcast.<sup>Error! Bookmark not defined.</sup>

At around time code 12:03, in discussing trans-national "control groups", Dolan mentioned the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the Bilderberg group and the Federal Reserve and he described how only a few people have time to research these entities. Unfortunately, Dolan did not point out that the author of the foreword to Griffin's first edition of the New Pearl Harbour<sup>20</sup> - which he mentioned only minutes earlier - is none other than CFR member Richard Falk<sup>21</sup>.

### The Thermitic State

Having listened to the introduction, I should perhaps not have been too surprised as to how the rest of the broadcast unfolded. It wasn't long before the subject of the destruction of the WTC came up. Among other issues, Richard began talking about dust samples. He talked about people providing dust samples, but he did not, for example, name Janet McKinley as one of those providers (a minor point, but I mention it because including specific names, dates, times etc. makes it easier for people to verify the story for themselves). After the discussion of dust samples came the (inevitable) alleged molten metal... At time code 34:14, Dolan said:

*At the world trade centre, there was molten metal for weeks after the collapse – beneath the rubble – molten metal. Some of these girders showed signs of having been melted which you would need temperatures of ... outrageously high temperatures... and the jet fuel from the jet liners did not and could not attain such temperatures.*

Excuse me Richard, were you aware that Rudi Giuliani was one of the people who seemed to start these stories<sup>22</sup>? What was the fuel source? How was there a lake on West Street without steam explosions? For those unfamiliar with my line of rebuttal, please see Dr Judy Wood's discussion of these issues, either on her website<sup>23</sup>, or in videos about her research<sup>13</sup>.

Dolan then mentioned the detection of sulphur in the WTC dust and said,

*This is a key now, for what is known as thermite or thermate. There's been a recent study that came out – published on the web – I've read this study and it's a very impressive... um... and detailed study dealing with thermitic pyrotechnics in the World Trade Centre samples.*

Though Richard, unfortunately, did not state the name or other details of the paper explicitly, I think it is safe to assume he is referring to the paper by Steven E Jones, Neils Harrit<sup>24</sup> et al. This paper does not stand up to scrutiny – for a number of reasons – not least of which is that Thermite does not turn steel (or other materials) to dust, it *melts* steel. Also, the title and nature of the paper is essentially frivolous – for this reason... Why use the term "thermitic materials" in the title? Is it an admission that no thermite was present? Is it another evolution of the idea of "thermite analogues"?

What is thermite anyway? Answer: Aluminium powder and Iron Oxide (rust): The exterior of WTC towers contains aluminium and there were some rusty beams inside the buildings. Therefore how can this point to a smoking gun of thermite? You would expect to find aluminium powder and Iron Oxide in the remains of the World Trade Centre whether thermite was there or not!

For convenience, I created a blog which collects together most of the basic questions and points essentially expose the thermite theory<sup>25</sup> as a distraction – a theory as full of holes as the official story.

Dolan, however, has seemingly not considered any other options – at all. Dolan's cavalier disregard of evidence and information supplied to him by myself continued apace. At 35:49, he said:

*The dust samples were remarkably consistent and all of them showed signs - at a microscopic level of something that absolutely should not have been there – and what that is, is advanced, highly energetic*

- <sup>39</sup> <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr%20Judy%20Wood%20-%20Dr.%20Rebecca%20Carley%20on%20What%20Ailing%20America%20-%202024%20Sep%202008.mp3>
- <sup>40</sup> <http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Dr%20Judy%20Wood%20RBN%20-%20Ralph%20Winterrowd%20-%202020%20Sep%202009.mp3>
- <sup>41</sup> [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=276&Itemid=60](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=276&Itemid=60)
- <sup>42</sup> <http://www.enterprisemission.com/Norway-Message3.htm>
- <sup>43</sup> [http://www.checktheevidence.com/Misc/Judy\\_Wood\\_-\\_Wikipedia,\\_the\\_free\\_encyclopedia-saved\\_11\\_Apr\\_2004.mht](http://www.checktheevidence.com/Misc/Judy_Wood_-_Wikipedia,_the_free_encyclopedia-saved_11_Apr_2004.mht)
- <sup>44</sup> [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=283&Itemid=60](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=283&Itemid=60)
- <sup>45</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rd2G5EpkotE>
- <sup>46</sup> <http://www.godlikeproductions.com/forum1/message1029915/pg19>
- <sup>47</sup> [http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp\\_sociopol\\_911\\_154.htm](http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp_sociopol_911_154.htm)
- <sup>48</sup> [http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp\\_sociopol\\_911\\_154\\_10.htm](http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp_sociopol_911_154_10.htm)
- <sup>49</sup> [http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp\\_sociopol\\_911\\_154\\_09.htm](http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/sociopolitica/esp_sociopol_911_154_09.htm)
- <sup>50</sup> [www.ae911truth.org](http://www.ae911truth.org)
- <sup>51</sup> <http://www.911forum.org.uk/board/viewtopic.php?p=145077#145077>
- <sup>52</sup> <http://www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread610837/pg1>
- <sup>53</sup> [http://onlinejournal.com/artman/publish/article\\_6078.shtml](http://onlinejournal.com/artman/publish/article_6078.shtml)
- <sup>54</sup> [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=164&Itemid=60](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=164&Itemid=60)
- <sup>55</sup> [http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/a/AJ/handling\\_truth.html](http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/a/AJ/handling_truth.html)
- <sup>56</sup> [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=293&Itemid=60](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=293&Itemid=60)
- <sup>57</sup> [http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=226&Itemid=60](http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=226&Itemid=60)
- <sup>58</sup> <http://www.checktheevidence.com/>

## **RICHARD DOLAN AND THE NATIONAL THERMITIC STATE**

Dec 10<sup>th</sup> 2009



Richard Dolan is a Historian and noted author<sup>1</sup> and researcher into the UFO Phenomenon, with his main focus being on archival records which prove that official bodies know more about the phenomenon than they are willing to admit. Richard Dolan has also written about topics other than UFO's, however.

I have followed some of Richard Dolan's work – mainly on UFO matters - over the years and have found him to be an interesting and knowledgeable researcher, speaker and commentator. Fairly recently, I found myself agreeing with much of what he said with regard to the exopolitics movement – in that many assumptions about the nature of exopolitical “entities” seemed to be being made without a good basis. In 2005, I also privately applauded him for posting articles about 9/11<sup>2</sup>, when hardly any other UFO/ET researchers seemed to be considering it as any kind of important issue. (About the only other writer who has written about UFO's and 9/11 is Jim Marrs.)

On 06 March 2009, I had exchanged a couple of e-mails with Richard Dolan, initially to compliment him on a podcast he did with the Paracast in February 2009<sup>3</sup>. In the same message, I also mentioned areas of research I was involved with which I thought he would be interested in. I have included a copy of this e-mail below<sup>4</sup>. Richard responded – thanking me for my message, and he commented in his reply that he had met Jim Fetzer at a conference. He also mentioned he would continue to look into 9/11 – and he knew other people who were doing the same.

On 27<sup>th</sup> June 2009, I spoke at an “Exopolitics” event in Leeds, UK<sup>5</sup>, primarily organised by my friend, Anthony Beckett<sup>6</sup>. I was pleased that Richard Dolan had agreed to come and speak at the event too, along with my friend Lloyd Pye<sup>7</sup> who deserves everyone's thanks for his dogged perseverance with the Starchild Skull<sup>8</sup> research and all that goes with it.

On 26<sup>th</sup> June, to help promote the conference, I drove up to Leeds with Lloyd for a brief appearance on BBC Radio Leeds<sup>9</sup>. Anthony had told me that Richard Dolan was also hoping to appear in the interview, but due to problems with city traffic, he did not quite get there in time and missed the 10-minute slot we had been given. However, Richard met Lloyd and myself at the radio station and we went for an enjoyable lunch a short distance away.

During lunch, we discussed a number of things, including, as I recall, the latest Star Trek film which had been in the cinema a few weeks earlier. However, towards the end of the lunch, the conversation switched to 9/11 and I began to tell Richard about the research I had been involved

# 9/11 - Evidence and Analysis Volume V

RICHARD DOLAN AND THE NATIONAL  
THERMITIC STATE



WIKIPEDIA CENSORSHIP OF 9/11 EVIDENCE  
AND LEGAL ACTION



“RE-INCARNATED” WTC NUKE THEORY AND  
DIMITRI KHALEZOV





AE911 “TRUTH” AND OTHER SITES AGAIN  
CENSOR THE EVIDENCE



JIM FETZER AS A DISINFORMATION OP

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/>