Andrew Johnson

From: Robert Singer [rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 15 October 2010 00:23
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: Your comments

would you like me to edit for typos etc?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 3:42:24 PM
Subject: RE: Your comments

One e-mail would work best....

I have added this:

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

where I am explaining your theory near the beginning

Re: Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Yes elsewhere, you state they collapse - however, I will add that you got it right sometimes (this in of itself proves muddled statements have been used by you).

Re:

> I don't really care if you publish this but to be fair
>
> [23/09/2010 21:27:46] Robert Singer: i am entitled to get from you what proves 1 and 2 is dew and how you explain why they are differnt
>
> this was stated in frustration and doesn't help your case at all./

I have taken this out then and have re-worded the following paragraph thus:

> I then pointed out to Singer that the evidence was so compelling – and conclusive – a proportion of it had been submitted to the court (as mentioned above). He then replied:
>
> > *[23/09/2010 21:13:20] Robert Singer: don't care about the court case only care if this is a correct statement: my observation that Judy can prove conclusively that a dew was used to make the impact holes and destroyed building 7, but she cannot prove conclusively that a dew brought down 1 and 2 (you have already admitted the collapses are different)*
>
> I encouraged Singer to re-examine the court documents – and other evidence on Dr Judy Wood's website regarding the destruction of the WTC towers. I had already spent considerable time in reviewing his articles and sending him comments to make

corrections. I had also spent time reading and commenting on earlier articles he had written.

Re:
your biggest issue with me as that you claim I have muddled the evidence when I have not. Pakalert and everyone else did. I don't believe it was a mini nuke so why not concentrate on the others who have muddled. I am not interested in the muddling issue.
I am only interested in whether you can prove a dew was responsible for both "collapses"
My position is 7 was first controlled demolition to keep you from finding out it was metaphysical and now 7 is a Dew to keep you from finding about it was metaphysical. In one case the controlled demo theory was false the other (dew) is true, but both keep you from finding out what really caused the twin towers to collapse. Regardless of what proof you have that the dew caused both, you would it seems to me to have reconcile why now they would be considering Judy wood (she is mentioned in one of the articles) where before she was an outcast and a kook. This to me appears to be consistent with a plan to cover up something.
No, you did muddle it up - I asked you to separate DEW and Mininukes - because they are opposing and mutually exclusive theories - your explanation was that Judy was being "exposed" - my explanation, which is based on more evidence (as I wrote at the end) was that it was yet more muddle up - not cover up - and you did not make this distinction in your own article about PakAlert. So what I have said is correct - all the stuff about Dr Judy being a kook has been repeated ad nauseam anyway and has nothing to do with what you wrote about. In any case, even Jones mentioned DEWs last year - so it's all a big muddle up or an attempt to take ownership of the research and steer it in a certain direction (the wrong one).

Re:

and needs to be revised:

Robert originally contacted me because he considered that the way the World Trade Centre was destroyed on 9/11 was related to what some people have called “The War on Terra” – the idea that some group is actually at war with the Planet Earth itself.

Robert explained to me that he had been in touch with a woman who told him that the destruction of the WTC was an indication that those who have been engaged in the War on Planet earth had *lost* the battle. This, he explained, was due to the energy “released by the earth” which caused the towers to turn to dust. This was because those that perpetrated the attack on 9/11 were *testing* how strong the earth was at that point.

I never said that. When I contacted you in the beginning it was because you disputed controlled demolition as a theory and I agreed with you.

You have the term war on terra, I never heard about it.

So one more time, 9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings collapsed was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping

4th Paragraph now reads:

Robert originally contacted me because I disagreed with the idea that Controlled Demolition was the method by which the WTC was destroyed. Robert contended that "9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings' "collapse" was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping!"

Re:

I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though when the initial draft of the article came back from Robert, I was uncomfortable that he wanted to try and get Dr Judy to talk about Astrology! The reason for this seemed to be that Robert had perviously posted another article about the Astrological Significance of 9/11 – entitled "The Planetary Archetypal Situation on 9/11/2001". This article, whilst interesting – and perhaps very significant, was certainly *not* what Dr Judy Wood had ever discussed on her website – or anywhere else for that matter.

I was in a draft mode and didn't even think about the implcations of who to interview, I removed her name immediately. This is superfulous information. There was no intent on my part to link her to astrology whatsoever. If you detected any issues it was the fact that I was killing myself to write 7000 words in 4 days to have it done for 9/10/

I will remove that section then. I have re-worded the following paragraph

In September 2010, Robert came up with an idea for a hypothetical Grand Jury hearing in which TPTB ("The Powers That Be") - as Robert and others call them - heard evidence from, among others, Nikola Tesla and Dr Judy Wood. This article was called "Breaking News: Nikola Tesla Testifies at NY Grand Jury on 9/11". I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though later, and he used some of the quotes I suggested for his hypothetical scenario. He also included my own statements in this interesting article and these were quoted

accurately.

Re:

I don't know that I am absolutely right about it, all I have said is that I have a complete coherent picture of the day including why only 3000 people died, why one building collapse first, why the invasion was called off and why bush said to go shopping. I can't be absolutely right because all I have is a prima facie case. I can't prove it was metaphysical because it isn't proveable.

My whole point is that you have gone too far in muddling together 2 different aspects of 9/11 research when it was completely unnecessary. You have therefore added another few clouds to the already cloudy picture when this could have been completely avoided. You posted your article before I had time to finish commenting on it and thereby added another "muddle up factor" from my stand point.

And yes, I did take time to listen to you and try and understand what you are saying - even when I don't agree with the relative significance you place on things.

Re:

> this is what bothers me the most. You have put me on the defense for no useful purpose.
> My position is that if it was metaphysical test it leads one to make a difference in the world by living sustainably and creating positive energy.

Exactly - if you had changed it to remove the muddling of DEW and Nukes, it would have been a largely pointless article - because what was happening at Makow and PakAlert was had happened several times in the last 3 years - for example with Webre and Moret - i.e. "same shit different day" Your mention of thermite in that capacity was novel, but to me, not useful, nor something I would NOT do myself - because it has the potential to add more confusion - which is what I personally work hard to avoid (otherwise I wouldn't be here now).

> Even if I were to be proven wrong in another life what was the harm?
>
> On the other hand if you are correct and they were flaunting free energy in our face on 9/11 and keeping us addicted to fossil fuels (which in the current collapse it is not longer an issue)what purpose did your theory serve?
>
> This is just like the impact holes that I said were thermite when I knew they were not.
> If in telling a lie you cause something positive to happen (in this case the reader kept reading because he was convinced there was thermite somewhere on 911) is that a wrong thing to do?
>
> You wanted me to change it and had I done that would it had served any useful purpose.
> If I were writing this article I would present Singer's prima facie case and the implications: live sustainably and give up negative energy, followed by Judys scientific case that a dew was used to turn both buildings to dust on 9/11 and the implications of TPTB using a dew.
> At the same time if you have an explanation for why one tower collapsed before the other or why only 3000 people died or why the invasion of Iraq was called off you can offer it.

I've already explained why the position about free energy having been weaponised is important - and I have written my own version of what you said in "World of Abundance or Scarcity". I have already given you an explanation for "why" - as part of the war on human consciousness, not planet earth itself.

It's about clarity rather than muddling of lines of research - about keeping facts clear so that conclusions can be firmly drawn. That's why I felt the need for me to respond your article(s) here.

At the end of the article I have added one thing:

> However, Singer and I agree on at least one thing that we should “live sustainably and give out positive energy.”

I have attached the final version and I will post this - and yes, I do have other things to do, you are right.

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 14 October 2010 21:10
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: Turn to dust

i am still reading but I did try to explain to you the muddled issue:
destruction of the WTC. So, why I have taken Singer to task here is because he has seemingly, in writing this article, joined the “muddle up” of 9/11 research and evidence. His reason for doing this seems to be because he is convinced he is correct about his “metaphysical catechism” explanation for why 9/11 was

No it is because everyone else has it muddled.
And BTW my explanation of the towers is they collapsed and largely turned to dust.
I will check my past articles but I like the idea they turned to dust so I am not sure you have that correct.

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

Here:

CIA, to tell the common man the "truth" about what really happened: that is, it was mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) instead of controlled demolition that caused the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11. **Unlikely**. Click here to read a 9-point refutation of the idea that nuclear devices were used to destroy the WTC buildings.

I am referring to the Pakalert article and using the word collapse generically.

Here I quote you

Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Thermite cannot have been responsible for turning towers to dust. Let's see this nanothermite in action please!

and

Dr. Judy Wood, former professor of mechanical engineering, with expertise in material science concludes the buildings were destroyed using some type of “field effect technology” related to the Hutchison Effect and the presence of Hurricane Erin. [6]

Jones, sweet and innocent, looks like he belongs in the Bush administration not in the counter culture community.

Wood, marginalized and tossed out of the 9/11-truth movement happens to look like a hippie.

Dr. Wood raises important questions about the so-called collapse and the dip of the Earth's magnetic field at the precise moment of the supposed first plane "impact" [7] but the 9/11 Truthers refuse to acknowledge her research and her work has been intentionally left out in their search for the Truth.

You reviewed this text and did not tell me to add turn to dust or I would have.

Why don't we skype on this?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 12:58:29 PM
Subject: "Was 911 a Metaphysical Catechism.doc"

Comments and corrections welcome - but I will likely post this in the next day or 2 on http://www.checktheevidence.com/

I haven't mentioned it in this article, but how many people know you're Katherine Smith and are you bothered?

Andrew Johnson

From: Robert Singer [rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 15 October 2010 00:32
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Am not sure of the status

I commented about this section already

It seems in this article, Singer had a “bee in his bonnet” that he was absolutely right about the metaphysical catechism conclusion – and all the “noise” being generated was therefore to cover up this idea. In previous discussions with Singer I did not disagree that 9/11 was indeed part of a larger agenda – and that things like the symbolism did have a deeper meaning. He seemed to be saying in his article that “promotion” of Dr Judy Wood’s research and the discussion of “mini nukes” was the “new cover up” to replace the thermite cover up story.

I don't think it accurately describes our conversation. But at this point we can one of two things.

I can go through and make my suggested comments for you to review and decide to include or you can publish it the way it is.

And you don't have to worry, even though I think you have misrepresented the facts and the tenor of our conversation, I will not be writing anything in rebuttal.

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 3:42:24 PM
Subject: RE: Your comments

One e-mail would work best....

I have added this:

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

where I am explaining your theory near the beginning

Re: Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Yes elsewhere, you state they collapse - however, I will add that you got it right sometimes (this in of itself proves muddled statements have been used by you).

Re:

> I don't really care if you publish this but to be fair
>
> [23/09/2010 21:27:46] Robert Singer: i am entitled to get from you what proves 1 and 2 is dew and how you explain why they are differnt
>
> this was stated in frustration and doesn't help your case at all./

I have taken this out then and have re-worded the following paragraph thus:

> I then pointed out to Singer that the evidence was so compelling – and conclusive – a proportion of it had been submitted to the court (as mentioned above). He then replied:
>
> > *[23/09/2010 21:13:20] Robert Singer: don't care about the court case only care if this is a correct statement: my observation that Judy can prove conclusively that a dew was used to make the impact holes and destroyed building 7, but she cannot prove conclusively that a dew brought down 1 and 2 (you have already admitted the collapses are different)*
>
> I encouraged Singer to re-examine the court documents – and other evidence on Dr Judy Wood's website regarding the destruction of the WTC towers. I had already spent considerable time in reviewing his articles and sending him comments to make corrections. I had also spent time reading and commenting on earlier articles he had written.

Re:

your biggest issue with me as that you claim I have muddled the evidence when I have not. Pakalert and everyone else did. I don't believe it was a mini nuke so why not concentrate on the others who have muddled. I am not interested in the muddling issue.
I am only interested in whether you can prove a dew was responsible for both "collapses"
My position is 7 was first controlled demolition to keep you from finding out it was metaphysical and now 7 is a Dew to keep you from finding about it was metaphysical. In one case the controlled demo theory was false the other (dew) is true, but both keep you from finding out what really caused the twin towers to collapse.
Regardless of what proof you have that the dew caused both, you would it seems to me to have reconcile why now they would be considering Judy wood (she is mentioned in

one of the articles) where before she was an outcast and a kook. This to me appears to be consistent with a plan to cover up something.

No, you did muddle it up - I asked you to separate DEW and Mininukes - because they are opposing and mutually exclusive theories - your explanation was that Judy was being "exposed" - my explanation, which is based on more evidence (as I wrote at the end) was that it was yet more muddle up - not cover up - and you did not make this distinction in your own article about PakAlert. So what I have said is correct - all the stuff about Dr Judy being a kook has been repeated ad nauseam anyway and has nothing to do with what you wrote about. In any case, even Jones mentioned DEWs last year - so it's all a big muddle up or an attempt to take ownership of the research and steer it in a certain direction (the wrong one).

Re:

> and needs to be revised:
>
> Robert originally contacted me because he considered that the way the World Trade Centre was destroyed on 9/11 was related to what some people have called “The War on Terra” – the idea that some group is actually at war with the Planet Earth itself.
>
> Robert explained to me that he had been in touch with a woman who told him that the destruction of the WTC was an indication that those who have been engaged in the War on Planet earth had *lost* the battle. This, he explained, was due to the energy “released by the earth” which caused the towers to turn to dust. This was because those that perpetrated the attack on 9/11 were *testing* how strong the earth was at that point.
>
> I never said that. When I contacted you in the beginning it was because you disputed controlled demolition as a theory and I agreed with you.
>
> You have the term war on terra, I never heard about it.
>
> So one more time, 9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings collapsed was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping

4th Paragraph now reads:

> Robert originally contacted me because I disagreed with the idea that Controlled Demolition was the method by which the WTC was destroyed. Robert contended that "9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings' "collapse" was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping!"

Re:

> I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though when the initial draft of the article came back from Robert, I was uncomfortable that he wanted to try and get Dr Judy to talk about Astrology! The reason for this seemed to be that Robert had perviously posted another article about the Astrological Significance of 9/11 – entitled "The Planetary Archetypal Situation on 9/11/2001". This article, whilst interesting – and perhaps very significant, was certainly *not* what Dr Judy Wood had ever discussed on her website – or anywhere else for that matter.
>
> I was in a draft mode and didn't even think about the implcations of who to interview, I removed her name immediately. This is superfulous information. There was no intent on my part to link her to astrology whatsoever. If you detected any issues it was the fact that I was killing myself to write 7000 words in 4 days to have it done for 9/10/

I will remove that section then. I have re-worded the following paragraph

In September 2010, Robert came up with an idea for a hypothetical Grand Jury hearing in which TPTB ("The Powers That Be") - as Robert and others call them - heard evidence from, among others, Nikola Tesla and Dr Judy Wood. This article was called "Breaking News: Nikola Tesla Testifies at NY Grand Jury on 9/11". I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though later, and he used some of the quotes I suggested for his hypothetical scenario. He also included my own statements in this interesting article and these were quoted accurately.

Re:

I don't know that I am absolutely right about it, all I have said is that I have a complete coherent picture of the day including why only 3000 people died, why one building collapse first, why the invasion was called off and why bush said to go shopping. I can't be absolutely right because all I have is a prima facie case. I can't prove it was metaphysical because it isn't proveable.

My whole point is that you have gone too far in muddling together 2 different aspects of 9/11 research when it was completely unnecessary. You have therefore added another few clouds to the already cloudy picture when this could have been completely avoided. You posted your article before I had time to finish commenting on it and thereby added another "muddle up factor" from my stand point.

And yes, I did take time to listen to you and try and understand what you are saying - even when I don't agree with the relative significance you place on things.

Re:

> this is what bothers me the most. You have put me on the defense for no useful purpose.
> My position is that if it was metaphysical test it leads one to make a difference in the world by living sustainably and creating positive energy.

Exactly - if you had changed it to remove the muddling of DEW and Nukes, it would have been a largely pointless article - because what was happening at Makow and PakAlert was had happened several times in the last 3 years - for example with Webre and Moret - i.e. "same shit different day" Your mention of thermite in that capacity was novel, but to me, not useful, nor something I would NOT do myself - because it has the potential to add more confusion - which is what I personally work hard to avoid (otherwise I wouldn't be here now).

> Even if I were to be proven wrong in another life what was the harm?
>
> On the other hand if you are correct and they were flaunting free energy in our face on 9/11 and keeping us addicted to fossil fuels (which in the current collapse it is not longer an issue)what purpose did your theory serve?
>
> This is just like the impact holes that I said were thermite when I knew they were not.
> If in telling a lie you cause something positive to happen (in this case the reader kept reading because he was convinced there was thermite somewhere on 911) is that a wrong thing to do?
>
> You wanted me to change it and had I done that would it had served any useful purpose.
> If I were writing this article I would present Singer's prima facie case and the implications: live sustainably and give up negative energy, followed by Judys scientific case that a dew was used to turn both buildings to dust on 9/11 and the implications of TPTB using a dew.
> At the same time if you have an explanation for why one tower collapsed before the other or why only 3000 people died or why the invasion of Iraq was called off you can offer it.

I've already explained why the position about free energy having been weaponised is important - and I have written my own version of what you said in "World of Abundance or Scarcity". I have already given you an explanation for "why" - as part of the war on human consciousness, not planet earth itself.

It's about clarity rather than muddling of lines of research - about keeping facts clear so that conclusions can be firmly drawn. That's why I felt the need for me to respond your article(s) here.

At the end of the article I have added one thing:

> However, Singer and I agree on at least one thing that we should “live sustainably and give out positive energy.”

I have attached the final version and I will post this - and yes, I do have other things to do, you are right.

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 14 October 2010 21:10
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: Turn to dust

i am still reading but I did try to explain to you the muddled issue:
destruction of the WTC. So, why I have taken Singer to task here is because he has seemingly, in writing this article, joined the “muddle up” of 9/11 research and evidence. His reason for doing this seems to be because he is convinced he is correct about his “metaphysical catechism” explanation for why 9/11 was

No it is because everyone else has it muddled.
And BTW my explanation of the towers is they collapsed and largely turned to dust.
I will check my past articles but I like the idea they turned to dust so I am not sure you have that

correct.

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

Here:

CIA, to tell the common man the "truth" about what really happened: that is, it was mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) instead of controlled demolition that caused the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11. **Unlikely**. Click here to read a 9-point refutation of the idea that nuclear devices were used to destroy the WTC buildings.

I am referring to the Pakalert article and using the word collapse generically.

Here I quote you

Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Thermite cannot have been responsible for turning towers to dust. Let's see this nanothermite in action please!

and

Dr. Judy Wood, former professor of mechanical engineering, with expertise in material science concludes the buildings were destroyed using some type of "field effect technology" related to the Hutchison Effect and the presence of Hurricane Erin. [6]

Jones, sweet and innocent, looks like he belongs in the Bush administration not in the counter culture community.

Wood, marginalized and tossed out of the 9/11-truth movement happens to look like a hippie.

Dr. Wood raises important questions about the so-called collapse and the dip of the Earth's magnetic field at the precise moment of the supposed first plane "impact" [7] but the 9/11 Truthers refuse to acknowledge her research and her work has been intentionally left out in their search for the Truth.

You reviewed this text and did not tell me to add turn to dust or I would have.

Why don't we skype on this?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 12:58:29 PM
Subject: "Was 911 a Metaphysical Catechism.doc"

Comments and corrections welcome - but I will likely post this in the next day or 2 on http://www.checktheevidence.com/

I haven't mentioned it in this article, but how many people know you're

Katherine Smith and are you bothered?

-

Andrew Johnson

From: Robert Singer [rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 15 October 2010 00:41
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: this is completely in accurate

No, you did muddle it up - I asked you to separate DEW and Mininukes - because they are opposing and mutually exclusive theories - your explanation was that Judy was being "exposed"

No explanation was and is that everyone else lumped them together and I was only reflecting the collective belief surrounding the new revelation from pakalert.

My discussion of Judy being "used" never exposed and for the last time

I did not make the distinction in your own article about PakAlert because my article was about PAKALERT.

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 3:42:24 PM
Subject: RE: Your comments

One e-mail would work best....

I have added this:

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

where I am explaining your theory near the beginning

Re: Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Yes elsewhere, you state they collapse - however, I will add that you got it right sometimes (this in of itself proves muddled statements have been used by you).

Re:

> I don't really care if you publish this but to be fair
>
> [23/09/2010 21:27:46] Robert Singer: i am entitled to get from you what proves 1 and 2 is dew and how you explain why they are differnt
>
> this was stated in frustration and doesn't help your case at all./

I have taken this out then and have re-worded the following paragraph thus:

> I then pointed out to Singer that the evidence was so compelling – and conclusive – a proportion of it had been submitted to the court (as mentioned above). He then replied:

> *[23/09/2010 21:13:20] Robert Singer: don't care about the court case only care if this is a correct statement: my observation that Judy can prove conclusively that a dew was used to make the impact holes and destroyed building 7, but she cannot prove conclusively that a dew brought down 1 and 2 (you have already admitted the collapses are different)*

I encouraged Singer to re-examine the court documents – and other evidence on Dr Judy Wood's website regarding the destruction of the WTC towers. I had already spent considerable time in reviewing his articles and sending him comments to make corrections. I had also spent time reading and commenting on earlier articles he had written.

Re:

your biggest issue with me as that you claim I have muddled the evidence when I have not. Pakalert and everyone else did. I don't believe it was a mini nuke so why not concentrate on the others who have muddled. I am not interested in the muddling issue.
I am only interested in whether you can prove a dew was responsible for both "collapses"
My position is 7 was first controlled demolition to keep you from finding out it was metaphysical and now 7 is a Dew to keep you from finding about it was metaphysical.
In one case the controlled demo theory was false the other (dew) is true, but both keep you from finding out what really caused the twin towers to collapse.
Regardless of what proof you have that the dew caused both, you would it seems to me to have reconcile why now they would be considering Judy wood (she is mentioned in one of the articles) where before she was an outcast and a kook. This to me appears to be consistent with a plan to cover up something.

No, you did muddle it up - I asked you to separate DEW and Mininukes - because they are opposing and mutually exclusive theories - your explanation was that Judy was being "exposed" - my explanation, which is based on more evidence (as I wrote at the end) was that it was yet more muddle up - not cover up - and you did not make this distinction in your own article about PakAlert. So what I have said is correct - all the stuff about Dr Judy being a kook has been repeated ad nauseam anyway and has nothing to do with what you wrote about. In any case, even Jones mentioned DEWs last year - so it's all a big muddle up or an attempt to take ownership of the research and steer it in a certain direction (the wrong one).

Re:

> and needs to be revised:
>
> Robert originally contacted me because he considered that the way the World Trade Centre was destroyed on 9/11 was related to what some people have called "The War on Terra" – the idea that some group is actually at war with the Planet Earth itself.

Robert explained to me that he had been in touch with a woman who told him that the destruction of the WTC was an indication that those who have been engaged in the War on Planet earth had *lost* the battle. This, he explained, was due to the energy "released by the earth" which caused the towers to turn to dust. This was because those that perpetrated the attack on 9/11 were *testing* how strong the earth was at that point.

I never said that. When I contacted you in the beginning it was because you disputed controlled demolition as a theory and I agreed with you.

You have the term war on terra, I never heard about it.

So one more time, 9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings collapsed was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping

4th Paragraph now reads:

Robert originally contacted me because I disagreed with the idea that Controlled Demolition was the method by which the WTC was destroyed. Robert contended that "9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings' "collapse" was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping!"

Re:

I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though when the initial draft of the article came back from Robert, I was uncomfortable that he wanted to try and get Dr Judy to talk about Astrology! The reason for this seemed to be that Robert had perviously posted another article about the Astrological Significance of 9/11 – entitled "The Planetary Archetypal Situation on 9/11/2001". This article, whilst interesting – and perhaps very significant, was certainly *not* what Dr Judy Wood had ever discussed on her website – or anywhere else for that matter.

I was in a draft mode and didn't even think about the implcations of who to interview, I removed her name immediately. This is superfulous information. There was no intent on my part to link her to astrology whatsoever. If you detected any issues it was the fact that I was

> killing myself to write 7000 words in 4 days to have it done for 9/10/

I will remove that section then. I have re-worded the following paragraph

In September 2010, Robert came up with an idea for a hypothetical Grand Jury hearing in which TPTB ("The Powers That Be") - as Robert and others call them - heard evidence from, among others, Nikola Tesla and Dr Judy Wood. This article was called "Breaking News: Nikola Tesla Testifies at NY Grand Jury on 9/11". I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though later, and he used some of the quotes I suggested for his hypothetical scenario. He also included my own statements in this interesting article and these were quoted accurately.

Re:

I don't know that I am absolutely right about it, all I have said is that I have a complete coherent picture of the day including why only 3000 people died, why one building collapse first, why the invasion was called off and why bush said to go shopping. I can't be absolutely right because all I have is a prima facie case. I can't prove it was metaphysical because it isn't proveable.

My whole point is that you have gone too far in muddling together 2 different aspects of 9/11 research when it was completely unnecessary. You have therefore added another few clouds to the already cloudy picture when this could have been completely avoided. You posted your article before I had time to finish commenting on it and thereby added another "muddle up factor" from my stand point.

And yes, I did take time to listen to you and try and understand what you are saying - even when I don't agree with the relative significance you place on things.

Re:

> this is what bothers me the most. You have put me on the defense for no useful purpose.
> My position is that if it was metaphysical test it leads one to make a difference in the world by living sustainably and creating positive energy.

Exactly - if you had changed it to remove the muddling of DEW and Nukes, it would have been a largely pointless article - because what was happening at Makow and PakAlert was had happened several times in the last 3 years - for example with Webre and Moret - i.e. "same shit different day" Your mention of thermite in that capacity was novel, but to me, not useful, nor something I would NOT do myself - because it has the potential to add more confusion - which is what I personally work hard to avoid (otherwise I wouldn't be here now).

> Even if I were to be proven wrong in another life what was the harm?
>
> On the other hand if you are correct and they were flaunting free energy in our face on 9/11 and keeping us addicted to fossil fuels (which in the current collapse it is not longer an issue)what purpose did your theory serve?
>
> This is just like the impact holes that I said were thermite when I knew they were not.
> If in telling a lie you cause something positive to happen (in this case the reader kept reading because he was convinced there was thermite somewhere on 911) is that a wrong thing to do?
>
> You wanted me to change it and had I done that would it had served any useful purpose.
> If I were writing this article I would present Singer's prima facie case and the implications: live sustainably and give up negative energy, followed by Judys scientific case that a dew was used to turn both buildings to dust on 9/11 and the implications of TPTB using a dew.
> At the same time if you have an explanation for why one tower collapsed before the other or why only 3000 people died or why the invasion of Iraq was called off you can offer it.

I've already explained why the position about free energy having been weaponised is important - and I have

written my own version of what you said in "World of Abundance or Scarcity". I have already given you an explanation for "why" - as part of the war on human consciousness, not planet earth itself.

It's about clarity rather than muddling of lines of research - about keeping facts clear so that conclusions can be firmly drawn. That's why I felt the need for me to respond your article(s) here.

At the end of the article I have added one thing:

> However, Singer and I agree on at least one thing that we should "live sustainably and give out positive energy."

I have attached the final version and I will post this - and yes, I do have other things to do, you are right.

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 14 October 2010 21:10
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: Turn to dust

i am still reading but I did try to explain to you the muddled issue:
destruction of the WTC. So, why I have taken Singer to task here is because he has seemingly, in writing this article, joined the "muddle up" of 9/11 research and evidence. His reason for doing this seems to be because he is convinced he is correct about his "metaphysical catechism" explanation for why 9/11 was

No it is because everyone else has it muddled.
And BTW my explanation of the towers is they collapsed and largely turned to dust.
I will check my past articles but I like the idea they turned to dust so I am not sure you have that correct.

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

Here:

CIA, to tell the common man the "truth" about what really happened: that is, it was mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) instead of controlled demolition that caused the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11. **Unlikely**. Click here to read a 9-point refutation of the idea that nuclear devices were used to destroy the WTC buildings.

I am referring to the Pakalert article and using the word collapse generically.

Here I quote you

Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Thermite cannot have been responsible for turning towers to dust. Let's see this nanothermite in action please!

and

Dr. Judy Wood, former professor of mechanical engineering, with expertise in material science concludes the buildings were destroyed using some type of "field effect technology" related to the Hutchison Effect and the presence of Hurricane Erin. [6]

Jones, sweet and innocent, looks like he belongs in the Bush administration not in the counter culture community.

Wood, marginalized and tossed out of the 9/11-truth movement happens to look like a hippie.

Dr. Wood raises important questions about the so-called collapse and the dip of the Earth's magnetic field at the precise moment of the supposed first plane "impact" [7] but the 9/11 Truthers refuse to acknowledge her research and her work has been intentionally left out in their search for the Truth.

You reviewed this text and did not tell me to add turn to dust or I would have.

Why don't we skype on this?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 12:58:29 PM
Subject: "Was 911 a Metaphysical Catechism.doc"

Comments and corrections welcome - but I will likely post this in the next day or 2 on http://www.checktheevidence.com/

I haven't mentioned it in this article, but how many people know you're Katherine Smith and are you bothered?

Andrew Johnson

From: Robert Singer [rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 15 October 2010 00:47
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: I am sorry but this just isn't right

It isn't me that muddled it. And I didn't add any clouds, I wrote about the clouds that are there.

And no it was not because I posted it before you had time. You raised the muddling issue and I rejected because my article was about the Pakalert revelation not about muddling.

You say it happened before, I say it didn't and I have proof that the impact of the Pakalert article, also at ATS, GODLIKE and David Icke is like nothing we have ever experienced.

And to be honest my article could have separated them. I don't agree (and another person I consulted agrees with me) with you that I muddled the issue. I wrote about the collective belief of the population that muddled the issue. My lumping them together for my message which it was a metaphysical event they are trying to cover up with the new mininuke/dew story is correct.

I am sorry you are offended.

Do I understand your explanation of why the collapses were different is because you don't know for sure how the weapon works?

My whole point is that you have gone too far in muddling together 2 different aspects of 9/11 research when it was completely unnecessary. You have therefore added another few clouds to the already cloudy picture when this could have been completely avoided. You posted your article before I had time to finish commenting on it and thereby added another "muddle up

factor" from my stand point.

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 3:42:24 PM
Subject: RE: Your comments

One e-mail would work best....

I have added this:

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

where I am explaining your theory near the beginning

Re: Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Yes elsewhere, you state they collapse - however, I will add that you got it right sometimes (this in of itself proves muddled statements have been used by you).

Re:

> I don't really care if you publish this but to be fair
>
> [23/09/2010 21:27:46] Robert Singer: i am entitled to get from you what proves 1 and 2 is dew and how you explain why they are differnt
>
> this was stated in frustration and doesn't help your case at all./

I have taken this out then and have re-worded the following paragraph thus:

> I then pointed out to Singer that the evidence was so compelling – and conclusive – a proportion of it had been submitted to the court (as mentioned above). He then replied:
>
> > *[23/09/2010 21:13:20] Robert Singer: don't care about the court case only care if this is a correct statement: my observation that Judy can prove conclusively that a dew was used to make the impact holes and destroyed building 7, but she cannot prove conclusively that a dew brought down 1 and 2 (you have already admitted the collapses are different)*
>
> I encouraged Singer to re-examine the court documents – and other evidence on Dr Judy Wood's website regarding the destruction of the WTC towers. I had already spent considerable time in reviewing his articles and sending him comments to make corrections. I had also spent time reading and commenting on earlier articles he had written.

Re:
your biggest issue with me as that you claim I have

muddled the evidence when I have not. Pakalert and everyone else did. I don't believe it was a mini nuke so why not concentrate on the others who have muddled. I am not interested in the muddling issue.
I am only interested in whether you can prove a dew was responsible for both "collapses"
My position is 7 was first controlled demolition to keep you from finding out it was metaphysical and now 7 is a Dew to keep you from finding about it was metaphysical. In one case the controlled demo theory was false the other (dew) is true, but both keep you from finding out what really caused the twin towers to collapse.
Regardless of what proof you have that the dew caused both, you would it seems to me to have reconcile why now they would be considering Judy wood (she is mentioned in one of the articles) where before she was an outcast and a kook. This to me appears to be consistent with a plan to cover up something.

No, you did muddle it up - I asked you to separate DEW and Mininukes - because they are opposing and mutually exclusive theories - your explanation was that Judy was being "exposed" - my explanation, which is based on more evidence (as I wrote at the end) was that it was yet more muddle up - not cover up - and you did not make this distinction in your own article about PakAlert. So what I have said is correct - all the stuff about Dr Judy being a kook has been repeated ad nauseam anyway and has nothing to do with what you wrote about. In any case, even Jones mentioned DEWs last year - so it's all a big muddle up or an attempt to take ownership of the research and steer it in a certain direction (the wrong one).

Re:

> and needs to be revised:
>
> Robert originally contacted me because he considered that the way the World Trade Centre was destroyed on 9/11 was related to what some people have called “The War on Terra” – the idea that some group is actually at war with the Planet Earth itself.
>
> Robert explained to me that he had been in touch with a woman who told him that the destruction of the WTC was an indication that those who have been engaged in the War on Planet earth had *lost* the battle. This, he explained, was due to the energy “released by the earth” which caused the towers to turn to dust. This was because those that perpetrated the attack on 9/11 were *testing* how strong the earth was at that point.

I never said that. When I contacted you in the beginning it was because you disputed controlled

> demolition as a theory and I agreed with you.
>
> You have the term war on terra, I never heard about it.
>
> So one more time, 9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings collapsed was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping

4th Paragraph now reads:

> Robert originally contacted me because I disagreed with the idea that Controlled Demolition was the method by which the WTC was destroyed. Robert contended that "9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings' "collapse" was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping!"

Re:

> I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though when the initial draft of the article came back from Robert, I was uncomfortable that he wanted to try and get Dr Judy to talk about Astrology! The reason for this seemed to be that Robert had perviously posted another article about the Astrological Significance of 9/11 – entitled "The Planetary Archetypal Situation on 9/11/2001". This article, whilst interesting – and perhaps very significant, was certainly *not* what Dr Judy Wood had ever discussed on her website – or anywhere else for that matter.
>
> I was in a draft mode and didn't even think about the implcations of who to interview, I removed her name immediately. This is superfulous information. There was no intent on my part to link her to astrology whatsoever. If you detected any issues it was the fact that I was killing myself to write 7000 words in 4 days to have it done for 9/10/

I will remove that section then. I have re-worded the following paragraph

In September 2010, Robert came up with an idea for a hypothetical Grand Jury hearing in which TPTB ("The Powers That Be") - as Robert and others call them - heard evidence from, among others, Nikola Tesla and Dr Judy Wood. This article was called "Breaking News: Nikola Tesla Testifies at NY Grand Jury on 9/11". I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though later, and he used some of the quotes I suggested for his hypothetical scenario. He also included my own statements in this interesting article and these were quoted accurately.

Re:

I don't know that I am absolutely right about it, all I have said is that I have a complete coherent picture of the day including why only 3000 people died, why one building collapse first, why the invasion was called off and why bush said to go shopping. I can't be absolutely right because all I have is a prima facie case. I can't prove it was metaphysical because it isn't proveable.

My whole point is that you have gone too far in muddling together 2 different aspects of 9/11 research when it was completely unnecessary. You have therefore added another few clouds to the already cloudy picture when this could have been completely avoided. You posted your article before I had time to finish commenting on it and thereby added another "muddle up factor" from my stand point.

And yes, I did take time to listen to you and try and understand what you are saying - even when I don't agree with the relative significance you place on things.

Re:

> this is what bothers me the most. You have put me on the defense for no useful purpose.
> My position is that if it was metaphysical test it leads one to make a difference in the world by living sustainably and creating positive energy.

Exactly - if you had changed it to remove the muddling of DEW and Nukes, it would have been a largely pointless article - because what was happening at Makow and PakAlert was had happened several times in the last 3 years - for example with Webre and Moret - i.e. "same shit different day" Your mention of thermite in that capacity was novel, but to me, not useful, nor something I would NOT do myself - because it has the potential to add more confusion - which is what I personally work hard to avoid (otherwise I wouldn't be here now).

> Even if I were to be proven wrong in another life what was the harm?
>
> On the other hand if you are correct and they were flaunting free energy in our face on 9/11 and keeping us addicted to fossil fuels (which in the current collapse it is not longer an issue)what purpose did your theory serve?
>
> This is just like the impact holes that I said were thermite when I knew they were not.
> If in telling a lie you cause something positive to happen (in this case the reader kept reading because he was convinced there was thermite somewhere on 911) is that a wrong thing to do?
>
> You wanted me to change it and had I done that would it had served any useful purpose.
> If I were writing this article I would present Singer's prima facie case and the implications: live sustainably and give up negative energy, followed by Judys scientific case that a dew was used to turn both buildings to dust on 9/11 and the implications of TPTB using a dew.
> At the same time if you have an explanation for why one tower collapsed before the other or why only 3000 people died or why the invasion of Iraq was called off you can offer it.

I've already explained why the position about free energy having been weaponised is important - and I have written my own version of what you said in "World of Abundance or Scarcity". I have already given you an explanation for "why" - as part of the war on human consciousness, not planet earth itself.

It's about clarity rather than muddling of lines of research - about keeping facts clear so that conclusions can be firmly drawn. That's why I felt the need for me to respond your article(s) here.

At the end of the article I have added one thing:

> However, Singer and I agree on at least one thing that we should “live sustainably and give out positive energy.”

I have attached the final version and I will post this - and yes, I do have other things to do, you are right.

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 14 October 2010 21:10
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: Turn to dust

i am still reading but I did try to explain to you the muddled issue:
destruction of the WTC. So, why I have taken Singer to task here is because he has seemingly, in writing this article, joined the “muddle up” of 9/11 research and evidence. His reason for doing this seems to be because he is convinced he is correct about his “metaphysical catechism” explanation for why 9/11 was

No it is because everyone else has it muddled.
And BTW my explanation of the towers is they collapsed and largely turned to dust.
I will check my past articles but I like the idea they turned to dust so I am not sure you have that correct.

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

Here:

CIA, to tell the common man the "truth" about what really happened: that is, it was mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) instead of controlled demolition that caused the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11. **Unlikely**. Click here to read a 9-point refutation of the idea that nuclear devices were used to destroy the WTC buildings.

I am referring to the Pakalert article and using the word collapse generically.

Here I quote you

Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Thermite cannot have been responsible for turning towers to dust. Let's see this nanothermite in action please!

and

Dr. Judy Wood, former professor of mechanical engineering, with expertise in material science concludes the buildings were destroyed using some type of “field effect technology” related to the Hutchison Effect and the presence of Hurricane Erin. [6]

Jones, sweet and innocent, looks like he belongs in the Bush administration not in the counter culture community.

Wood, marginalized and tossed out of the 9/11-truth movement happens to look like a hippie.

Dr. Wood raises important questions about the so-called collapse and the dip of the Earth's magnetic field at the precise moment of the supposed first plane "impact" [7] but the 9/11

Truthers refuse to acknowledge her research and her work has been intentionally left out in their search for the Truth.

You reviewed this text and did not tell me to add turn to dust or I would have.

Why don't we skype on this?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 12:58:29 PM
Subject: "Was 911 a Metaphysical Catechism.doc"

Comments and corrections welcome - but I will likely post this in the next day or 2 on http://www.checktheevidence.com/

I haven't mentioned it in this article, but how many people know you're Katherine Smith and are you bothered?

Andrew Johnson

From: Robert Singer [rds2301@gmail.com]

Sent: 15 October 2010 02:20

To: Andrew Check the evidence

Subject: Alexa traffic rank and last line

I can only answer the question posed in the title of this article thus – “I do not know – perhaps you’d like to discuss it further with Robert Singer – he thinks he has some answers for you!” However, Singer and I agree on at least one thing that we should “live sustainably and give out positive energy.”

I wish you would have made your closing line that my explanation of the collapse into dust of the twin towers being a metaphysical event, leads one to live sustainably and create positive energy.

1 month0.00036+30%3 month0.00031+110% Alexa for judy's website

---

Andrew Johnson

From: Robert Singer [rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 15 October 2010 03:25
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: This whole thing could have been avoided

i was never trying to muddle. I was under pressure to finish the piece and never considered you did not understand my statement dew/mininuke was not muddle up but a reflection of the collective belief of the pakalert.

If I had it to do over again I would remove it since it has nothing to do with my theory.

my theory was simple and I made a few changes so that you can see there was never an intention to muddle:

However, before getting on the mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) bridge-to-nowhere [from pakalert], ask yourself this question:

If ***PakAlert*** is suddenly promoting the mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) story featuring [including] Judy Wood (previously marginalized and isolated from the 9/11 Truth Movement and considered a Kook [2]), there can only be two possibilities:

Option 1. Mini Nukes and/or Judy Wood are the truth. The ***CIA now***, after years of promoting 9/11 Truth (mis/disinformation) admit:

- Alex Jones is the "Minister of Truth" over a flock of "Truthers," whose church is the "9/11 Truth Movement." Pastor Jones is none other than a member of Project Mockingbird, Jesuit Temporal Coadjutor and alternative Media Gatekeeper for the Vatican: Alex Jones Jesuit Temporal Coadjutor CIA Disinformation Agent.

- 9/11 'Truth' was planned simultaneously with 9/11 itself. That is why you have so many conflicting stories, points of view, arguments and discussions, etc. The Trolls were pre-ordained and planned. So were the major websites (e.g., 911Truth.org, Infowars and Rense.com (Participation in Overinformation, Misinformation as Disinformation,

or Who is Jeff Rense?). “It is a known fact that any grouping of five or more will be infiltrated.” – Veronica Chapman, Truther

And on September 18, 2010, The Powers That Be (TPTB, a non-conspiracy acronym [3]) had a change of heart (or maybe grew a conscience) and directed their agents, in this case PakAlert and the CIA, to tell the common man the "truth" about what really happened: that is, it was mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) instead of controlled demolition that caused the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11. **Unlikely**. Click here to read a 9-point refutation of the idea that nuclear devices were used to destroy the WTC buildings. [I dismiss mini nukes here]

All you can say about a theory of Mini-nukes and/or Space Beam weapons is that it is a plausible explanation, but that doesn't mean it's true.[this was meant to be an observation] In fact, the recent disclosure from the CIA-controlled sites, who replaced an impossible explanation of the collapse with a possible explanation, should alert everyone the Mini-nukes and the Space Beam weapon story (for WTC 1 & 2) [I am clear here about 1 and 2] cannot be true.

Dr. Judy Wood's research confirms a DEW was used to make the impact holes in the Twin Towers and to demolish WTC 7 (without making a sound) but a DEW explanation cannot explain the collapse of the Twin Towers because:

> WTC 7 was a bottom-up a gravity-assisted collapse with a small debris field, while WTC 1 and 2 were primarily top-down, virtually unassisted by gravity and showered debris in a wide radius as their frames essentially "peeled" outward. FEMA: WTC Study, Ch. 5 (05/02) [4]

Option 2. The mini-nukes/DEW is the new story [from pakalert and the CIA] behind the story, behind the story of how the World Trade Center I and II collapsed (**highly probable**).

In other words:

- The unproven theory of controlled demolition was the story behind a jet fuel (kerosene) fire.
- The mini-nuke/DEW is the story [from Pakalert and the CIA] behind the theory of controlled demolition.
- The Metaphysical Catechism (Test) is the story behind the mini-nuke/DEW [from Pakalert and the CIA]. [Appendix A]

And finally the mini-nuke/DEW disclosure [from Pakalert and the CIA]really doesn't change anything: it's still an Inside Job, now it's an Inside mini-nuke/DEW Job. [5]

The limited disclosure of a new mini-nuke/DEW [from Pakalert and the CIA] *explanation from a CIA controlled site is a tacit admission that 9/11 was a Metaphysical Catechism (Test) of the Earth.* [Appendix B]

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 3:42:24 PM
Subject: RE: Your comments

One e-mail would work best....

I have added this:

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

where I am explaining your theory near the beginning

Re: Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Yes elsewhere, you state they collapse - however, I will add that you got it right sometimes (this in

of itself proves muddled statements have been used by you).

Re:

> I don't really care if you publish this but to be fair
>
> [23/09/2010 21:27:46] Robert Singer: i am entitled to get from you what proves 1 and 2 is dew and how you explain why they are differnt
>
> this was stated in frustration and doesn't help your case at all./

I have taken this out then and have re-worded the following paragraph thus:

> I then pointed out to Singer that the evidence was so compelling – and conclusive – a proportion of it had been submitted to the court (as mentioned above). He then replied:
>
> > *[23/09/2010 21:13:20] Robert Singer: don't care about the court case only care if this is a correct statement: my observation that Judy can prove conclusively that a dew was used to make the impact holes and destroyed building 7, but she cannot prove conclusively that a dew brought down 1 and 2 (you have already admitted the collapses are different)*
>
> I encouraged Singer to re-examine the court documents – and other evidence on Dr Judy Wood's website regarding the destruction of the WTC towers. I had already spent considerable time in reviewing his articles and sending him comments to make corrections. I had also spent time reading and commenting on earlier articles he had written.

Re:

your biggest issue with me as that you claim I have muddled the evidence when I have not. Pakalert and everyone else did. I don't believe it was a mini nuke so why not concentrate on the others who have muddled. I am not interested in the muddling issue.
I am only interested in whether you can prove a dew was responsible for both "collapses"
My position is 7 was first controlled demolition to keep you from finding out it was metaphysical and now 7 is a Dew to keep you from finding about it was metaphysical.
In one case the controlled demo theory was false the other (dew) is true, but both keep you from finding out what really caused the twin towers to collapse.
Regardless of what proof you have that the dew caused both, you would it seems to me to have reconcile why now they would be considering Judy wood (she is mentioned in one of the articles) where before she was an outcast and a kook. This to me appears to be consistent with a plan to cover up something.

No, you did muddle it up - I asked you to separate DEW and Mininukes - because they are opposing and mutually exclusive theories - your explanation was that Judy was being "exposed" - my explanation, which is based on more evidence (as I wrote at the end) was that it was yet more muddle up - not cover up - and you

did not make this distinction in your own article about PakAlert. So what I have said is correct - all the stuff about Dr Judy being a kook has been repeated ad nauseam anyway and has nothing to do with what you wrote about. In any case, even Jones mentioned DEWs last year - so it's all a big muddle up or an attempt to take ownership of the research and steer it in a certain direction (the wrong one).

Re:

> and needs to be revised:
>
> Robert originally contacted me because he considered that the way the World Trade Centre was destroyed on 9/11 was related to what some people have called “The War on Terra” – the idea that some group is actually at war with the Planet Earth itself.
>
> Robert explained to me that he had been in touch with a woman who told him that the destruction of the WTC was an indication that those who have been engaged in the War on Planet earth had *lost* the battle. This, he explained, was due to the energy “released by the earth” which caused the towers to turn to dust. This was because those that perpetrated the attack on 9/11 were *testing* how strong the earth was at that point.
>
> I never said that. When I contacted you in the beginning it was because you disputed controlled demolition as a theory and I agreed with you.
>
> You have the term war on terra, I never heard about it.
>
> So one more time, 9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings collapsed was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping

4th Paragraph now reads:

> Robert originally contacted me because I disagreed with the idea that Controlled Demolition was the method by which the WTC was destroyed. Robert contended that “9/11 was a test to see if the earth was weakened enough to take over on 9/12 in a new world order. The buildings’ “collapse” was a result of the earth still being strong enough to resist their take over and therefore on 9/12 what did Bush tell us to do? Go shopping!”

Re:

> I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though when the initial draft of the article came back from Robert, I was uncomfortable that he wanted to try and get Dr Judy to talk about Astrology! The reason for this seemed to be that Robert had perviously posted another article about the Astrological Significance of 9/11 – entitled "The Planetary Archetypal Situation on 9/11/2001". This article, whilst interesting – and perhaps very significant, was certainly *not* what Dr Judy Wood had ever discussed on her website – or anywhere else for that matter.
>
> I was in a draft mode and didn't even think about the implcations of who to interview, I removed her name immediately. This is superfulous information. There was no intent on my part to link her to astrology whatsoever. If you detected any issues it was the fact that I was killing myself to write 7000 words in 4 days to have it done for 9/10/

I will remove that section then. I have re-worded the following paragraph

In September 2010, Robert came up with an idea for a hypothetical Grand Jury hearing in which TPTB ("The Powers That Be") - as Robert and others call them - heard evidence from, among others, Nikola Tesla and Dr Judy Wood. This article was called "Breaking News: Nikola Tesla Testifies at NY Grand Jury on 9/11". I helped Robert suggest some wording that *might* have been used by Dr Judy Wood, though later, and he used some of the quotes I suggested for his hypothetical scenario. He also included my own statements in this interesting article and these were quoted accurately.

Re:

I don't know that I am absolutely right about it, all I have said is that I have a complete coherent picture of the day including why only 3000 people died, why one building collapse first, why the invasion was called off and why bush said to go shopping. I can't be absolutely right because all I have is a prima facie case. I can't prove it was metaphysical because it isn't proveable.

My whole point is that you have gone too far in muddling together 2 different aspects of 9/11 research when it was completely unnecessary. You have therefore added another few clouds to the already cloudy picture when this could have been completely avoided. You posted your article before I had time to finish commenting on it and thereby added another "muddle up factor" from my stand point.

And yes, I did take time to listen to you and try and understand what you are saying - even when I don't agree with the relative significance you place on things.

Re:

> this is what bothers me the most. You have put me on the defense for no useful purpose.
> My position is that if it was metaphysical test it leads one to make a difference in the world by living sustainably and creating positive energy.

Exactly - if you had changed it to remove the muddling of DEW and Nukes, it would have been a largely pointless article - because what was happening at Makow and PakAlert was had happened several times in the last 3 years - for example with Webre and Moret - i.e. "same shit different day" Your mention of thermite in that capacity was novel, but to me, not useful, nor something I would NOT do myself - because it has the potential to add more confusion - which is what I personally work hard to avoid (otherwise I wouldn't be here now).

> Even if I were to be proven wrong in another life what was the harm?

> On the other hand if you are correct and they were flaunting free energy in our face on 9/11 and keeping us addicted to fossil fuels (which in the current collapse it is not longer an issue)what purpose did your theory serve?
>
> This is just like the impact holes that I said were thermite when I knew they were not.
> If in telling a lie you cause something positive to happen (in this case the reader kept reading because he was convinced there was thermite somewhere on 911) is that a wrong thing to do?
>
> You wanted me to change it and had I done that would it had served any useful purpose.
> If I were writing this article I would present Singer's prima facie case and the implications: live sustainably and give up negative energy, followed by Judys scientific case that a dew was used to turn both buildings to dust on 9/11 and the implications of TPTB using a dew.
> At the same time if you have an explanation for why one tower collapsed before the other or why only 3000 people died or why the invasion of Iraq was called off you can offer it.

I've already explained why the position about free energy having been weaponised is important - and I have written my own version of what you said in "World of Abundance or Scarcity". I have already given you an explanation for "why" - as part of the war on human consciousness, not planet earth itself.

It's about clarity rather than muddling of lines of research - about keeping facts clear so that conclusions can be firmly drawn. That's why I felt the need for me to respond your article(s) here.

At the end of the article I have added one thing:

> However, Singer and I agree on at least one thing that we should “live sustainably and give out positive energy.”

I have attached the final version and I will post this - and yes, I do have other things to do, you are right.

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com]
Sent: 14 October 2010 21:10
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: Turn to dust

i am still reading but I did try to explain to you the muddled issue:
destruction of the WTC. So, why I have taken Singer to task here is because he has seemingly, in writing this article, joined the “muddle up” of 9/11 research and evidence. His reason for doing this seems to be because he is convinced he is correct about his “metaphysical catechism” explanation for why 9/11 was

No it is because everyone else has it muddled.
And BTW my explanation of the towers is they collapsed and largely turned to dust.
I will check my past articles but I like the idea they turned to dust so I am not sure you have that correct.

The Earth, despite decades of unprecedented environmental damage and pollution, still had sufficient energy to resist the takeover and, in resisting, was the source of the energy that caused the Twin Towers to collapse and turn largely into dust.

Here:

CIA, to tell the common man the "truth" about what really happened: that is, it was mini-nuke/Directed Energy Weapon (DEW) instead of controlled demolition that caused the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11. **Unlikely**. Click here to read a 9-point refutation of the idea that nuclear devices were used to destroy the WTC buildings.

I am referring to the Pakalert article and using the word collapse generically.

Here I quote you

Q) What happened to the towers? Answer: They turned largely to dust.

Thermite cannot have been responsible for turning towers to dust. Let's see this nanothermite in action please!

and

Dr. Judy Wood, former professor of mechanical engineering, with expertise in material science concludes the buildings were destroyed using some type of "field effect technology" related to the Hutchison Effect and the presence of Hurricane Erin. [6]

Jones, sweet and innocent, looks like he belongs in the Bush administration not in the counter culture community.

Wood, marginalized and tossed out of the 9/11-truth movement happens to look like a hippie.

Dr. Wood raises important questions about the so-called collapse and the dip of the Earth's magnetic field at the precise moment of the supposed first plane "impact" [7] but the 9/11 Truthers refuse to acknowledge her research and her work has been intentionally left out in their search for the Truth.

You reviewed this text and did not tell me to add turn to dust or I would have.

Why don't we skype on this?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thu, October 14, 2010 12:58:29 PM
Subject: "Was 911 a Metaphysical Catechism.doc"

Comments and corrections welcome - but I will likely post this in the next day or 2 on http://www.checktheevidence.com/

I haven't mentioned it in this article, but how many people know you're Katherine Smith and are you bothered?