

## Andrew Johnson

---

**From:** Ken O'Keefe <tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** 25 September 2015 22:05  
**To:** ad.johnson@ntlworld.com  
**Subject:** Re: Contact re possible Interview re 911 matters

I do understand your position, you refuse to acknowledge that provable crimes have occurred and you believe people like me are wrong for focussing on who did it. I wish you all the best brother, I am not interested in working with you even though we agree on how it was done... shame really.  
TJP

On 25 Sep 2015, at 21:02, Andrew Johnson <[ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)> wrote:

Ken

I am not sure you truly understand my position (which I have stated on a few occasions publicly). It seems clear to me and most people that many people like Bush, Cheney, members of the Clinton Administration and members of the Israeli regime(s) had foreknowledge of 911. I don't doubt you have more knowledge of these aspects than I have.

I have a booklet I give out in which I mention Larry Silverstein. I've been giving this out for almost 10 years. However, making this into a legal case is a different issue - the issue I asked you about.

You wrote:

It also appears that you think everyone is a liar who believes the cause of the destruction of the Twin Towers was thermite/explosives, I think this is silly and childish as there is a huge difference between being wrong and lying, surely you know the difference but seem to pretend you do not.

I have lost count of how many times this has been said to me. To be clear for you, it can be proved this assumption must be false. Most people I have spoken to, when I have carefully gone through the evidence with them, accept this proof. They sometimes accept that SOME OF those promoting these false explanations (Steven E Jones and Richard Gage) must be knowingly lying. Is this clear yet? Why are you bringing words like "childish" into this discussion? I don't understand this.

My proposal was that we discuss this in an interview type situation. What are your thoughts?

If you're really not interested, just say so and we can both move on...

Andrew

---

**From:** Ken O'Keefe [<mailto:tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** 25 September 2015 20:28  
**To:** [ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)  
**Subject:** Re: Contact re possible Interview re 911 matters

If I understand you correctly you are citing previous 9/11 cases that were not successful in order to reject the fact that evidence in the public realm already proves obstruction of justice, foreknowledge and very likely insurance fraud. You are doing this to avoid acknowledging that it is possible to prove a crime without proving the way the crime was committed because that would destroy your contention that we must prove how 9/11 was carried out in order to prosecute the guilty parties. You are holding this position despite the

absolute fact that even 1st degree murder cases can be prosecuted without a body, which means a complete lack of how the murder was carried out. From my view it looks clear that you have painted yourself into a corner and simply do not have the wherewithal to get out.

There is no need whatsoever to make a legal case for you Andrew, if you do not by now know that obstruction of justice and foreknowledge of 9/11 is 100% provable then you need to do further research, it is that simple. But I am pretty well convinced at this point that you are so vested in an angle that you will not allow this.

I am not misled about anything Andrew, I believe some thermite and/or nano-thermite was used, along with explosives, as a diversion/confusion tactic and that directed energy was the cause of the destruction of the Twin Towers. So please stop confusing me with people who say otherwise. It also appears that you think everyone is a liar who believes the cause of the destruction of the Twin Towers was thermite/explosives, I think this is silly and childish as there is a huge difference between being wrong and lying, surely you know the difference but seem to pretend you do not. And while you may be able to prove some people liars, it hardly matters, hell you have already called me a liar so it is not surprising everyone else is as well.

You completely ignored my perspective on why a programme dealing with this issue must be done to the highest standard. You seem to think a homemade video will cut it. And clearly if anyone with a counter view (wrong as they certainly are with regard to the destruction of the Twin Towers) is to be seen and called a liar as opposed to simply being called out as wrong. You are happy to maintain the division rather than look for any room for agreement.

And lastly you have just about completely alienated me when I was genuinely willing to work together in a way that I feel would be most effective. I can hear you calling me a dis-info agent once again. Or is that someone else? What do you reckon brother, am I a liar and dis-info agent?

TJP

On 25 Sep 2015, at 19:08, Andrew Johnson <[ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)> wrote:

Ken

If you want to go through with me, in a video, the evidence pertaining how you would go about building a legal case to convict named individuals, that's fine. I would be interested to hear your proposals.

But, I am quite familiar, for example, with earlier cases by Stanley Hilton, Ellen Mariani and a few others. I am also quite familiar with what happened to those cases (are you?)

Perhaps we are talking at slightly cross purposes - as I thought you understood, myself and Dr Wood's main concern is the destruction of the WTC complex and how that was done. Yes, we can prove that thermite was not the main cause of destruction and those suggesting this are liars (as I've already said). We CANNOT prove that no thermite AT ALL was used. We can prove that no large explosions took place and we can prove that the building was not cut into chunks before it was destroyed. It's vitally important you understand this evidence if you are to distinguish those who are misleading you from others who are pointing out what actually happened. In a similar sense to what you were saying, if you want to establish "who did it", you have to know what method they used to do it - i.e. in a shooting, you wouldn't convict someone who had been waving a bow and arrow around etc.

We CAN prove the buildings turned mostly to dust before they hit the ground. We can also prove that Steven E Jones worked for Los Alamos National labs at one time and he also worked in the field of "cold fusion". As I keep repeating, this is related to the global propaganda/cover up of fuel less energy sources So this is a much bigger concept than corrupt intelligence agencies/groups (Israeli or otherwise).

As I said before, just because one talks about Israel/Mossad etc being involved some how does not make it OK to promote proven false explanations of the destruction of the towers.

The whole idea behind making a video with you was that we would EACH be able to make these points, clarify to people what "went down" at the WTC and perhaps thereby help people to understand even more effectively how much groups like Mossad knew - and even how they might be involved with perverting the truth "movement"

What are your thoughts?

Andrew

---

**From:** Ken O'Keefe [<mailto:tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** 25 September 2015 10:02  
**To:** Andrew Johnson  
**Subject:** Re: Contact re possible Interview re 911 matters

Here we go again Andrew, this is why it is such a toxic subject to deal with. First off I have spoken to Judy personally and I am not mischaracterising what she has said, she feels any look at the who is not only useless but calls the investigators integrity into question. She also rejects the possibility that thermite/nano-thermite and/or explosives were used at all, even as a possible diversion/confusion tactic. In doing so she completely alienates those who identify empirical evidence of these substances being used by effectively characterising people citing this evidence as liars or dupes.

Proving many criminal acts regarding 9/11 is not only possible, it is completely realistic right now with evidence that is in the public realm. Foreknowledge of the event is self-evident with some Israeli agents as you know, and if we had access to the failed lie detector tests this would be rock solid, this lays collusion and/or responsibility right on the door of Israel. Proving perversion/obstruction of justice is an absolute, especially with the arrested and quietly released Israeli's and the total destruction of evidence and perverting the crime scene, this is a serious crime and arrests can occur right now. Proving insurance fraud and conspiracy to demolish asbestos filled buildings is also very possible if true subpoena powers were exercised. You do not need absolute proof of how someone was murdered when you have a dead body Andrew, in fact you do not even need a body to convict someone of murder;

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/how-do-you-prove-murder-without-a-body/article19610440/>

If you can convict 1st degree murderers without even having a body (which is proven with just one link above), then it is completely possible to prove 1st degree murderers guilty without any reference as to how they did it. This fact considered logically undeniably establishes that proving criminal acts on 9/11 in a court of law without proving exactly how this crime was carried out is likewise complete possible. Do you acknowledge this point Andrew and are you willing to concede this publicly? That will tell me a lot about your integrity and will open the door to real collaboration between us.

This is a big question brother so I will ask it again; Do you acknowledge that we do not need absolute proof of how 9/11 was carried out in order to arrest and convict many players in the 9/11 false flag? And are you willing to concede this publicly?

It would say a lot if Judy Wood's (and yourself for that matter) would acknowledge this fact so those serious about proving the who are not alienated; like myself for instance. Aside from this Andrew are you going to character assassinate me again when I do not parrot what you want? Are you going to reveal my private information about approaching Richard when I do not do what you want? Because this type of bullshit I have no time for brother, I will leave all such nonsense to you, while also keeping in mind that I am still having a dialogue with you after you rubbished me and called my integrity into question in a public forum. What does that say about my patience and willingness to work with all reasonable parties. But if this is simply a yelling match of calling each other liars and throwing tantrums we can stop right now.

As for Richard, I have gone to the page you cite and while I do not agree with Richard on many, many things, calling him a liar is more like a spat between kids then worthwhile or intelligent or even correct, in the evidence you present I did not identify the lie, what I saw was incorrect statements at best. I have indeed taken up the issue of who is responsible with Richard and he is not adverse to being involved with a production that would deal with that directly, are you and Judy likewise willing to do that?

I have made clear that I will not do a homemade Skype interview with you and Richard and I have explained my reasons more than once, but here it is again; if you want to have maximum impact and reach so as to spread the truth in the most profound and impactful way then you must package it in a very professional and polished way. There are many reasons for this but an understanding of human psychology and the methods of public relations and their utility is important to know if you are serious about maximum impact. If you disagree with me Andrew this is your right, but if you do I will simply say that I have managed to spread messages of significant truth with considerable reach and even used the mainstream media to get such messages out and I have done this in a very conscious, strategic way. The results speak for themselves so if we do disagree on how to present this subject I am wondering if you will once again call my integrity into question or claim that I am afraid or dishonest or whatever while ignoring my very genuine offer to collaborate but under certain parameters?

The ball is in your court brother, I have been very clear in my communication, I doubt I will repeat myself again.

TJP

On 25 Sep 2015, at 09:09, Andrew Johnson  
<[ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)> wrote:

Ken

Thanks for the update. Yes, I appreciate the schedule...

Just to confirm with you, Richard Gage has lied about 911 research and that evidence is on my website:

<http://tinyurl.com/911liars>

Also, Dr Judy wants to talk about what happened, because that is what she has researched. Your characterisation of what she said is skewed. Remember, Dr's Wood and Reynolds tried to sue contractors for Science Fraud in 2007 -because of their role in the cover up. Mr Gage and his group have done nothing similar.

Proving "who did it" will be impossible without evidence. Do you have it? Does Mr Gage? I've never heard Mr Gage try to blame anyone either - so why don't you take that issue up with him too. Fair?

Like I said, I am happy to record a discussion between you, me and Mr Gage if he wants to Skype with you and I will post it on YouTube having shown you the edit. The only budget required is one of time as I will fund everything else. Heck, I'll even buy you some lunch/dinner if that helps...

Best Wishes

Andrew

On 25 September 2015 at 08:41, Ken O'Keefe  
<[tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com](mailto:tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com)> wrote:

Aloha Andrew,  
Indeed there is never enough time in the day and I am preparing for a long trip abroad with multiple speaking engagements in the next couple of weeks. I cannot see any concrete plans being made before I return and as I have said, I cannot see doing all the work of planning and fundraising (producing) a film on this subject. But I am open to collaborating and possibly presenting such content, as long as a proper budget and the right team are in place. I have had an email exchange with Richard Gage about such a production, with message to him being that agreeing on the nature of 9/11 as a false flag is what is most important, while

disagreeing exactly how it was done can be healthy if we have an honest dialogue about the how. I personally believe that there was some thermite and explosives used to mask or confuse directed energy as the primary weapon of destruction. I believe Richard is not hostile to this, but my discussions with him are on a private level, please do not share, I have no interest in creating further divide. The personalities involved in this issue are very strong and on many levels irrational, I see Judy's position that we should not at all discuss the who as dangerous and irrational, as I do people insisting thermite or nano-thermite was the primary means of destruction. Some of these people will have to mature and open their minds for a really successful film to be made, or else it will only serve to drive the wedge further in. We really need to meet for me to articulate my concerns, if you can make it to London in the next 10 days or so we can do this. Just let me know.

TJP

On 24 Sep 2015, at 14:20, Andrew Johnson  
<[ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)> wrote:

Ken

Just a quick email to ask if you've had any further thoughts or info on the idea of an interview. I have been overloaded with work this week (due to changes in my area of work). I know you've been busy too - as I've been in contact with someone who was at the conference in Denmark.

I hope to try and call you next week when things might've settled down a bit for me work wise

For now, Best Wishes

Andrew

---

**From:** Ken O'Keefe  
[<mailto:tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** 14 September 2015 18:21  
**To:** Andrew Johnson  
**Subject:** Re: Contact re possible Interview re 911 matters

Do me a favour brother and contact me next week for this, Press TV is having serious issues with banking and I am not paid for half of my last production, which is very annoying I can tell you. I am talking with their production manager and trying to find out if it is worth putting forward a proposal because apparently they are not taking on new productions, for obvious reasons I

guess. Next week I will know more. If this avenue is closed it would require something along the lines of crowdfunding and a lot of pre-production work which I am not in a position to commit to. None of this is bullshit my brother, it is all true so like I have said I will not take this on unless the funding and resources are there. I am happy to meet and brainstorm how it could be done however, without Press TV.

TJP

On 14 Sep 2015, at 14:06,  
Andrew Johnson  
<[ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)>  
wrote:

Ken,

Send me your interview template or the thing that you referred to and I will call you later this week. Prob Weds or Thurs if I don't get sent more work for those days!

Andrew

On 14 September 2015 at 12:40, Ken O'Keefe  
<[tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com](mailto:tjp.kenokeefe@gmail.com)>  
wrote:

We are connected

On 14 Sep  
2015, at  
11:53,  
Andrew  
Johnson  
<[ad.johnson@ntlworld.com](mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com)>  
> wrote:

Ken

Just to email  
you to  
establish  
contact.

Many thanks

Andrew

1

2

3

4