

Robert Singer E-mails

-----Original Message-----

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

Sent: 05 September 2010 17:20

To: Robert Singer

Subject: Interim Judy wood v3 (2).doc

I have refunded your PayPal thing as I don't want to do it that way.

Please don't have Dr Judy talking about astrology - even if your scenario is 100% fictional. It's been really tough to get people to see what has been said - this was illustrated plainly with the Leuren Moret and Webre episode when someone who phoned in thought Moret was actually Judy!

I appreciate what you are trying to do, but it really will not help us if you depart much from the changes I have put in...

-----Original Message-----

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

Sent: 05 September 2010 21:30

To: Robert Singer

Subject: Part 3 Mike Rivero v1 (2).doc / Tesla

I have just added 1 short paragraph to make it more accurate.

Interesting about Mike Rivero - I never realised that!

For the other article, to link to Tesla you could add:

"Dr Wood, I understand that in your research you have referenced experiments of Nikola Tesla in the Late 19th Century which apparently shook a building so much as to make people think it was an earthquake."

<http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/erinAppendix3.html>

Wood: Yes, that is correct

Do you think Tesla was manipulating or tapping into the earth's energy with his experiments?

Wood: I don't know.

Were John Hutchison's early experiments based on some of the work of Nikola Tesla?

Wood: Yes, but not specifically to shake buildings, though Hutchison reported that sometimes, effects from his experiments were felt 1 or 2 blocks away from his apartment, where objects would move or be affected some how.

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]

Sent: 14 September 2010 15:50

To: Andrew Check the evidence

Subject: Building 7

I am about to write Building 7 was a dew.
Send me the best links

Thanks

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wed, September 15, 2010 5:09:24 AM
Subject: RE: Building 7

There is NIST's page of WTC 7

<http://wtc.nist.gov/comments08/>

You've already seen Judy's Study I think?

A 115MB version of her document is posted, in black and white on that page above.

here are the links form Judy's site, which we may have discussed before:

<http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/dirt/WTC7.html#dirt>

Here are these comments all in a PDF file:

http://www.drjudywood.com/pdf/080915_NIST_comments.pdf

I really haven't had much time to discuss WTC 7 with Judy, as we have more focused on all the other stuff - but in summary, it seems the building was "dissolved" over several hours and then "dropped" at the appropriate point. This is partly why I don't think it's a "line of sight" effect - i.e. the weapon can be "tuned" or "focused" to operate within a particular region - perhaps similar to how they use ultrasound to remove kidney or glal stones without surgery.

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]
Sent: 15 September 2010 15:20
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: Building 7

then what could be the explanation of the other buildings, especially the one that was sliced

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]
Sent: 22 September 2010 21:17
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

when were you going to tell me about this CIA site?

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wed, September 22, 2010 1:33:20 PM
Subject: RE: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

Yes - more muddles - that site, I understand, was created by Dave "Blimp" - I forget his 2nd name - but he created 911blimp.net as well (I think).

He talks about molecular dissociation - but I believe from hot nukes of some kind - more "muddle flavours".

It's one of many sites that claims to offer explanation - but it is largely anonymous and has not resulted in legal submissions, to my knowledge.

I have some responses from this guy somewhere in my archive - I think.

<http://www.whois.net/whois/911u.org>

<http://911blimp.net/>

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]
Sent: 22 September 2010 21:39
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

it's pretty slick and he is arguing DEWs unless I missed something.

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wed, September 22, 2010 2:02:43 PM
Subject: RE: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

Hot DEWs are fine to talk about - conventional physics - ABL, MTHEL etc

Cold DEWs are what Dr Judy talks about (and me). That's not fine.

Surprised either I hadn't explained this yet or you hadn't got it.

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]
Sent: 22 September 2010 22:55
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

wait are you saying the layman will care about cold or how dews?

NOt a chance.

A dew is a dew period. When this thing hits and I am sure it will very soon, Judy will be crowned queen of the dews and everyone will bow down to her.

And then you should get really worried.

From: Andrew Johnson [<mailto:info@checktheevidence.co.uk>]
Sent: 23 September 2010 10:06
To: 'Robert Singer'
Subject: RE: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

No public don't care about temperature of DEW - however, my "bag" is explaining the evidence I am aware of - which means describing these details.

Don't worry, I will - next decent chance I get - mention the idea of a metaphysical catechism and its main proponent...

However, the public may not be interested in that either - because they may not know the meaning of either word - so I hope you can explain it to them...

Andrew

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]
Sent: 22 September 2010 22:50
To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com
Subject: Re: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

there is no way in the world that site or either site was done by an amateur.

From: Andrew Johnson [<mailto:info@checktheevidence.co.uk>]
Sent: 23 September 2010 10:16
To: 'Robert Singer'
Subject: RE: <http://911U.org/welcome.html>

Agree ... it's a professional job - which doesn't mention

- 1) Hurricane Erin
- 2) Hutchison Effect

so it's a muddle-up coverup - as I keep saying....

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Johnson [<mailto:info@checktheevidence.co.uk>]
Sent: 25 September 2010 23:39
To: Robert Singer
Subject: R Singer - comments. Pictures of Mini Nukes at PakAlert Prove 9.doc

Here are the comments, which I will keep a record of for now.

From where I am standing, I really don't see how this whole article helps your "metaphysical catechism" idea - in theory, it does not matter how the buildings were destroyed - if their destruction was caused by the earth's "reaction" to the PTB's "attack".

I agree with the general idea of "A War on Terra" and I think, at some level, this forms part of the occult agenda - and this is how the astrological and other numerological significance of the date and symbolism seems to tie in.

I tend to "split" the science and physical evidence study from the occult side of things.

The "muddle up" explanation, as far as I can tell, fits the data better - as there has been a 2-3 year history of this - which forms a large part of the documentation in my book <http://tinyurl.com/911ftb>

Thanks for sending it to me anyway.

Andrew

Comments are included in this PDF file: <http://www.checktheevidence.com/pdf/R%20Singer%20-%20comments%20%20Pictures%20of%20Mini%20Nukes%20at%20PakAlert%20Prove%209.pdf>

From: Andrew Johnson <info@checktheevidence.co.uk>
To: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tue, September 28, 2010 10:31:05 AM
Subject: RE: Reaction from 9/11 truth movement

I read most of this thread... there is no doubt in my mind that there is a BIG metaphysical and occult aspect to 9/11 - but I don't think it is necessary, or even correct to "muddle together" the nuke and DEW explanations to explore this issue.

And your recent posting has several needless inaccuracies in it which I sent you comments to correct.

I will re-highlight them later - as I am still busy with student report work for the next 2 or 3 days (been away working again today).

You also skyped a comment to say "these words will come back to haunt you". Well, that is predicting the future - and in any case, those particular words were not my own (about DEW having an uphill battle).

My trust in Fetzer came back to haunt me - my trust in Jones came back to haunt me. The question now is... will my trust in Bob Singer come back to haunt me? Well, at the moment, I seem to be hearing a few "ghostly" noises, so who knows?

I will try to write about your theory that DEW is a "cover" for the metaphysical catechism - and I will post it on my website at some point soon. I will try not to paint you in a bad light...

From: Robert Singer [<mailto:rds2301@yahoo.com>]
Sent: 28 September 2010 18:44
To: Andrew Check the evidence
Subject: Re: Reaction from 9/11 truth movement

didn't I remove many of them?

I wouldn't worry about it, no one is posting it. daily.pk isn't releasing it.

disnfo took it down after 15 min and Opednews is doing some really strange things about not posting it. Like they are trying to keep anyone else in the queue from reading it.

I am not sure what you mean by trusting bob singer.

I spent my own time and money to make sure I quoted you exactly.

I even killed myself after it was published to fix what I considered to be nit picking on your part.

I claim we are not at odds here, you think it was a dew for 1 and 2, I don't.

I can't prove it was metaphysical because it is unproveable.

To most people in the world you have not proven a dew was used on 1 and 2.

What you fail to understand is that if you are right you accomplish nothing. An economy in rigor mortis isn't coming back so we don't need free energy.

If I am right there is a chance to change the world, because if it was a test then it means I am right about positive energy and have come up with some simple exercises anyone can do to really make a difference.

<http://www.themicroeffect.com/BobSinger.htm>

if you are short of time listen to hour 2 last 20 minutes

And if you need more proof, raelan (whose site is controlled) will not respond to this email:

From: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>

To: Raelon <raelon@att.net.readnotify.com>

Sent: Tue, September 21, 2010 3:57:13 PM

Subject: Todays Show, Epilogue

I don't know if I told you about the incident in 2009 when my Modern State of Israel series shut down a number of websites.

End of Email

Sent: Tue, September 21, 2010 3:57:13 PM

Subject: Todays Show, Epilogue

From: Robert Singer <rds2301@yahoo.com>

To: Raelon <raelon@att.net.readnotify.com>

Sent: Tue, September 21, 2010 3:57:13 PM

Subject: Todays Show, Epilogue

I don't know if you I told you about the incident in 2009 when my Modern State of Israel series shut down a number of websites.

When I heard about it I really could not believe it.

Everyone around me told me I should be worried...that I was in danger.

My response was to send out an email with the series attached to everyone on my list.

I reasoned... why bother killing me now everyone knows.

The same thing happened with the Matt Simmons and the Gulf Oil. When people read my initial reaction to the "catastrophe" they said I should be watching my back.

Attached was the insurance policy I sent out when it happened. It isn't necessary to read it unless you are interested in how I came up with the plan to stop Matt Simmons and his plan to put a mini nuke into Mother Earth. Here are the important three paragraphs:

I apologize but I am feeling a little paranoid today.

I don't need you to review the material in this email. I am asking you to save it...just in case.

I did this in March of 2009 when my Modern State of Israel article shut down several websites. It worked then maybe it will work now. This is sort of an email insurance policy.

I am working on an expose about the BP Oil Spill that appears not to be an Oil Spill after all. I am not finished with my investigation but it appears that the situation in the Gulf is an illusion. Something is definitely wrong with the picture in the Gulf AND there are way too many things that have happened in the last two weeks to me personally that could not be a chance occurrence.

When finished I will connect the BP Oil Spill, Perpetual Check and The ANWR DOTS.

The following is my research that just about anyone could finish and write the same expose. I claim this is following the same pattern as in September 2008 when the American people against all logic agreed to drill for oil in the Anwr (where there hardly is any oil in the first place, Drilling offshore & in the ANWR, what's wrong with this Picture?) because they couldn't take 4.50 a gallon gasoline.

When our frustration with their inability to stop a leak (that isn't there from the deep horizon rig) reaches a high enough level, we will demand they do something, like nukeing the well, even though it has no chance of success because in this the well in question isn't even leaking oil. See expose below.

Please send me an email that you received this. I will send this twice.

Let me know if you get one or two. Thanks

Later I finished the expose we talked about today:

Matt Simmons "Apparently" Drowned At His Home Sunday Night

So you are probably asking yourself what has this got to do with todays show.

Before the show it occurred to me if there was anything I knew that was a threat to TPTB it was my knowledge of positive energy and how it could be used to defeat them.

I've told story about my dining room table and the dogs to a few people. My feeling was if I could tell a lot of people the story I might have a real opportunity to make change in the world.

Imagine if we start a movement where people stop all that negative ranting (the poofer truther and casper nonsense) about what they aren't getting that they deserve and put in practice the simple exercises we talked about on the show.

I recall a story, the essence was that people engage in unproductive harmful behavior because that's all they have, i.e., no alternative.

Thanks to you and your show we gave them an alternative.

I think we might have a real chance to make a real difference in the world: for Gaea and for the humans who live here.

Today was a milestone, you and gave the humans here on this earth a real, concrete, viable alternative to their constant state of self pity and negativity, that will benefit themselves as well as the Earth.

What are your thoughts?

Robert Singer Skype Chat

can I get a link to read about the mud in building 7 and the fact that it made no noise?

[14/09/2010 16:13:23] Robert Singer: were wtc 5 and 6 damaged because they didn't have a clear shot at 7? was anyone killed in those buildings, Is that why they fired the shot at the 90th floor unobstructed? How do you explain the delay again (the hour or so) before it collapsed and in the case of 7 the collapse was immediate

[14/09/2010 16:16:07] Robert Singer: Vertical round holes were cut into buildings 4, 5 and 6, plus a cylindrical arc into Bankers Trust and into Liberty street in front of Bankers Trust.

So the weapon was aimed at 7 but had to go through 4,5,6? Again did anyone die?

Twin Tower control without damaging neighboring buildings, in fact all seriously damaged or destroyed buildings had a WTC prefix, and no others.

The north wing of WTC 4 was left standing, neatly sliced from the main body which virtually disappeared.

[14/09/2010 17:08:23] Robert Singer: anyone there

[14/09/2010 17:09:44] Andrew Johnson: hi - only just got back from work - about 50 e-mails to check...

[14/09/2010 17:10:05] Robert Singer: take your time, sent Judy a check yesterday

[14/09/2010 17:33:37] Robert Singer: looks like no one died in any other building but 1 and 2, is that correct?

[14/09/2010 17:40:05] Andrew Johnson: I believe so -

[14/09/2010 17:40:37] Robert Singer: do you like my theory, 7 was only 55 stories, so they had to fire through the other buildings to hit it

[14/09/2010 17:41:24] Robert Singer: why the other buildings were evacuated but 1 and 2 people were told to go back in is very interesting

[14/09/2010 17:41:27] Andrew Johnson: hmmm dunno - I think the direction issue is weird because Hutchison effect seems to be regional more tiidirectional

[14/09/2010 17:42:01] Robert Singer: regional as in they could hit only 7?

[14/09/2010 17:42:17] Robert Singer: then you have no explanation for the other damage

[14/09/2010 17:43:08] Andrew Johnson: it's partly regional - but there may be more than one component to the weapon

[14/09/2010 17:43:46] Robert Singer: does the damage in the other buildings support my theory

[14/09/2010 17:44:43] Andrew Johnson: I would have to look at all the building layout - you need to ask Judy these questions really

[14/09/2010 17:45:01] Robert Singer: I will wait to email her until after she gets the money

[14/09/2010 17:45:18] Andrew Johnson: I have not had time to read everything - have seen 3 sutdents today who "outpoured" their problems onto me

[14/09/2010 17:45:40] Andrew Johnson: one had lost one leg above the knee and nearly lost the other

[14/09/2010 17:45:44] Robert Singer: sure, i need to find out the timing of the evacuations

[14/09/2010 17:45:53] Robert Singer: sorry to bother you

[14/09/2010 17:45:53] Andrew Johnson: I am tired out

[14/09/2010 17:46:09] Andrew Johnson: it's no bother - just tired

[14/09/2010 17:46:37] Robert Singer: i know the feeling. You have no idea what it took to get my tesla article out by 9/10 it was 10,000 words with the exhibits, took three editors

[14/09/2010 17:46:44] Andrew Johnson: right...

[14/09/2010 17:46:53] Robert Singer: to proof it, I spent about 400.00 to get it ready in time

[14/09/2010 17:49:06] Andrew Johnson: yikes...

[14/09/2010 17:49:54] Robert Singer: i didn't change clothes or bath for 5 days

[14/09/2010 17:50:13] Andrew Johnson: poooooh!

[14/09/2010 17:50:16] Robert Singer: barely ate one meal because there was no food left in the house and I didn't want to go out

[14/09/2010 17:51:31] Robert Singer: the pressure was intense because tpv agreed to put it up and leave it on the main page starting 9/10

[14/09/2010 17:51:39] Robert Singer: you don't get a chance like that very often

[14/09/2010 17:51:44] Andrew Johnson: right...

[14/09/2010 17:51:54] Robert Singer: we finished at 1PM on 9/12

[14/09/2010 17:52:28] Robert Singer: didi you see the photo of tesla in front of the burning towers? He photoshopped it for me

[14/09/2010 17:53:27] Robert Singer: <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2010/09/10/breaking-news-nikola-tesla-testifies-at--11>

[14/09/2010 17:54:36] Andrew Johnson: Soz - not had chance to look - been stacked with work and also been asked to do various things and what not

[18/09/2010 18:29:04] *** Call from Robert Singer, duration 07:25. ***

[18/09/2010 18:29:27] Robert Singer: <http://www.pakalertpress.com/2010/09/18/pictures-prove-mini-nukes-caused-9-11-devastation/?utm>

[18/09/2010 18:36:08] Andrew Johnson: http://www.henrymakow.com/911_-_nukes_caused_this_devast.html

[18/09/2010 18:36:29] *** Call ended ***

[18/09/2010 18:55:52] Robert Singer: <http://www.unfilteredhistory.com/blog/uncategorized/uh-oh-now-what/>

[18/09/2010 18:56:12] *** Call from Robert Singer, duration 05:20. ***

[18/09/2010 19:07:19] Robert Singer: just made a change you will like <http://www.unfilteredhistory.com/blog/uncategorized/uh-oh-now-what/>

[18/09/2010 19:32:23] *** Missed call from Robert Singer. ***

[18/09/2010 19:43:31] Robert Singer: need to talk to you - i might have the smoking gun

[18/09/2010 20:31:46] Andrew Johnson: OK I can talk but I am going downstairs with the wireless headset

[18/09/2010 20:56:43] Andrew Johnson: soz someone else has called me

[18/09/2010 20:56:43] *** Missed call from Robert Singer. ***

[18/09/2010 21:34:07] Andrew Johnson: ok done now

[18/09/2010 21:34:13] Andrew Johnson: if you still want to talk

[18/09/2010 21:34:39] Robert Singer: yes urgent

[18/09/2010 21:34:50] *** Call from Robert Singer, duration 33:49. ***

[18/09/2010 21:41:35] Andrew Johnson: [20:59:52] Andrew Johnson: CNN does Zionism etc features Hufschmid and Chris Bollyn <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=963z9DwAyao>

[18/09/2010 21:45:41] *** Andrew Johnson sent server.php.png ***

[18/09/2010 22:08:39] *** Call ended ***

[19/09/2010 16:18:37] Robert Singer: did they check or collaborate with judy about these first? by "Dennis"

All research provided by: www.drjudywood.com and <http://911u.org/>, notice the makow article does not mention judy, http://www.henrymakow.com/mini-nukes_were_used_on_9-11.html

[19/09/2010 16:19:57] Andrew Johnson: neither - no one contacted Judy Wood about these postings

[19/09/2010 16:20:45] Robert Singer: interesting, did you know pakalert has two similar sites

[19/09/2010 16:21:11] Andrew Johnson: no I didn't know...

[19/09/2010 16:21:40] Robert Singer: i updated unfilteredhistory quite a bit since yesterday. you might want to review it

[19/09/2010 16:27:45] Robert Singer: the old pakalert has jones and bollyn, the new one is conspicuously missing them

[19/09/2010 16:32:29] Andrew Johnson: OK - I will have a look in a while...

[19/09/2010 16:33:39] Andrew Johnson: I got invited on an RBN show tonight (Ralph WInterrowd if you know of him) and I also got invited onto Rollye James which I am likely doing (starting at 3am for me) on Thurs morning (Weds night for you). Just waiting for confirmation

[19/09/2010 16:33:58] Robert Singer: good for you

[19/09/2010 16:34:15] Andrew Johnson: Thanks - I just think people are wondering what the hell is going on...

[19/09/2010 16:35:39] Robert Singer: if i am right you are about to be in the spotlight and be invited to speak at 911 truth events instead of steven jones. The consensus is that the same perps used dews for the same neocon conspiracty. You will be used to cover now.

[19/09/2010 16:47:38] Andrew Johnson: Ah - in terms of NOT speaking about the Metaphysical Catechism? i.e. the assumption is that Judy (or me) will speak about DEW but not the MC?

[19/09/2010 16:47:52] Andrew Johnson: so DEW is the "cover" for MC?

[19/09/2010 16:49:26] Robert Singer: no, that statement was only the observation that mini nukes and dew replaced controlled demo, want me to rephrase it?

[19/09/2010 16:49:59] Andrew Johnson: not read it yet - doing disks and stuff here (UFO conf next sun where I am speaking)

[19/09/2010 16:51:01] Robert Singer: oh, i thought you got that from the post. you were talking about what you thought I said about what you would say when speaking to the press

[19/09/2010 16:52:09] Andrew Johnson: ummm - something like that - I will re-read your post in a few mins!!

[19/09/2010 16:54:18] Andrew Johnson: In the meantime, you may find this post about me amusing... in the box is the oroginal post <http://tpuc.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=4&t=21630&p=154092#p154092>

[19/09/2010 16:59:56] Robert Singer: as you and everyone else is LOL You have no theory that can be subjected to scientific scrutiny. You have no scientific method, no scientific background. You sound more like Mystic Meg than a genuine 911 researcher. Are these seriously the main issues you want to raise about 911?

[19/09/2010 17:01:01] Robert Singer: is this true? If you are talking about Hurricane Erin, she peaked on September 9th and her closest approach was about 200km Northeast of Bermuda. By 911 she was on her way to Newfoundland. So, no, is the answer to your completely irrelevant question!

[19/09/2010 17:02:56] Robert Singer: actually this could be true: The potential energy released when 500,000 tonnes of concrete and steel hit the Manhattan Schist bedrock is estimated to be the equivalent of 0.6kt of T.N.T. IF 500,000 tonnes of concrete and steel COULD hit the Manhattan Schist bedrock IN 10 SECONDS!

[19/09/2010 17:05:32] Robert Singer: YOU ARE NOT GOING TO BELIEVE THIS ONE, CALL WHEN YOU CAN

[19/09/2010 17:08:31] Robert Singer: I have been looking for this: And this isn't mere HPM (high-powered microwave). It's scalar wave electromagnetics, out-of-phase radio frequencies that actually create -- extract -- energy from a vacuum and send that "energy dump" down the microwave targeting path to the target. The towers emit a constant radar sweep; the lasers are used in the targeting beacons picked up by the radar that's part of the cell tower weapon configuration. Or GPS (cellphones, GPS-equipped video surveillance) can be used in the targeting. That's how it works.

[19/09/2010 17:10:01] Andrew Johnson: I will re-read your latest then call

[19/09/2010 17:16:06] Andrew Johnson: OK - I' ve read it more or less...

[19/09/2010 17:16:15] *** Call to Robert Singer, duration 26:21. ***

[19/09/2010 17:26:04] Robert Singer: We Are CHANGE LA Commemorative Event Saturday, September 11th

Jerry Leapart will be joining Jeremy Rothe-Kushel at the Immanuel Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Leapart is the attorney for Dr. Judy Wood and Dr. Morgan Reynolds, the plaintiff/Relators in the Qui Tam lawsuit: [1]

Applied Research Associates, Inc., et al.,Defendants,: Supreme Court Docket Number: 09-548, a writ of certiorari October 14, 2009

The action alleges that the final reports on the investigation into the collapse of the World Trade Center Towers 1, 2, 7 from the National Construction Safety team (NIST NCSTAR 1), can be challenged because the investigators treated the three collapses as the same, however:

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)

Dr. Judy Wood , who is a professor of mechanical engineering with expertise in material science and points out the obvious: you don't need a degree in physics to see that WTC 7 is implosion as opposed to WTC 1 and 2, which were explosion.

"A picture is worth a 1000 words," therefore here are 3,000 words in three pictures:

Controlled Demolition of a hotel North Tower Hiroshima

Professor Steven Jones whose background is in "Cold Fusion" has only proven what even a child would understand, that 110 stories of steel and concrete cannot collapse into a pile of rubble from a kerosene fire. Mr. Leapart will be discussing Dr. Wood's research, that concludes the buildings were destroyed using some type of "field effect technology," related to the Hutchison Effect. An "Effect" that can explain the 1,400 cars that were toasted in inexplicable patterns and why the Twin Towers turned largely into dust. Dr. Wood raises important questions about the so-called collapse and the dip of the Earth's magnetic field at 8:46 a.m but the NIST investigation did not take her research into consideration when they released their final report.

Mr. Leapart's presentation will include the astrological implications of 9/11, that is:

"The events of 9/11 are immensely complex, beyond words really, with so many causes, consequences, and dimensions. But the planetary archetypal situation was dramatically clear. In the last few weeks the planetary alignment that represents the heaviest—the darkest, most weighty, mortally serious, historically grave—of all archetypal combinations, the Saturn-Pluto alignment, reached exactitude, an opposition."

Professor Richard Tarnas

Mr. Leapart will be discussing several of the September 11 anomalies:

That Hani Hanjour, the pilot of Flight 77, was so incompetent he could not fly a Cessna in August, but in September managed to fly a 767 at excessive speed into a spiraling, 270-degree descent and a level impact of the first floor of the Pentagon, could only mean one thing to Pilots for 9/11 Truth; it was an Inside Job. Why else would the CIA pick Hani Honjour to hijack Flight 77?

[19/09/2010 17:33:02] Robert Singer:

Ending the Threat of World War III Starts Here

President Barack Obama, we need you to honor the commitment made you made during the 2007 Democratic debate:

First Name*

Email*

Zip/Postal Code*

We will deliver this petition to every Democratic Congressman and Senator.

The US and its allies are preparing to launch a nuclear war directed against Iran with devastating consequences and this military adventure in the real sense of the word threatens the future of humanity.

The international community has endorsed nuclear war in the name of World Peace. "Making the World safer" is the justification for launching a military operation which could potentially result in a nuclear holocaust.

Iran, a country with a non-existent nuclear weapons capability and an air force that belongs in a museum, is not a threat to either nuclear power with a presence in the Middle East, the United States or Israel. [2]

E-mail President of the United States, (202) 456-1414 Phone, (202) 456-2461 Fax
E-mail The Secretary of State, (202) 647-6575 press 1 to leave a comment

Sign up now. Ending the threat WORLD WAR III Starts with this action.

We can do this, we did it in 2006, 2008 and we can do it in 2010. [3]
"In nuclear war all men are cremated equal" Dexter Gordon

Thanks for all you do,
Markos Moulitsas, Founder, Daily Kos

[1] Those "take action"- campaigns that appeal to our selfish and divisive nature don't work. These are going around the Internet:

Subject: Sign the letter to Google. Tell them to stop being evil and protect the free and open Internet.

Subject: Hi -- this is Jason Rosenbaum, a new campaigner at the PCCC. I've got some urgent news. Can you sign our promise to oppose cuts in Social Security and then ask your representatives to sign on as well?

All they accomplish is to reinforce our feelings of helpless and isolation. They create negative energy, consider a typical rant:

"These people have been robbing us for years. I don't for the life of me know why we keep sending the same people that keep doing the same things over and over again. We need to empty Washington! Send them home in wholesale fashion. Take the profit out, of public service and put the public service, back in!"

[1] Since becoming president, Mr. Obama has pursued diplomacy, but his stance has become steadily more confrontational. Iran's Nuclear Program, The New York Times

[2] Who's Telling the Truth About Iran's Nuclear Program? by Muhammad Sahimi

Since February 2003, Iran's nuclear program has undergone what the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) itself admits to be the most intrusive inspection in its entire history. After thousands of hours of inspections by some of the most experienced IAEA experts, the Agency has verified time and again that (1) there is no evidence of a nuclear weapons program in Iran, and (2) all the declared nuclear materials have been accounted for; there has been no diversion of such materials to non-peaceful purposes. Iran has a clean bill of health, as far as its nuclear program is concerned.

[3] On Aug 16, 2010 Daily Kos launched their new Action Alerts Campaign three days after they got the idea from a Kog diary written by ww2history2010), The Power of Community (<http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2010/8/13/892832/-The-Power-of-Community>).

We (the Daily Kos staff) had the infrastructure in place a long time ago but waited for the right time to "jump in" with the resources and expertise from Chris Bowers (of Open Left). <http://www.dailykos.com/storyonly/2010/8/16/893521/-Kicking-up-our-action-efforts>
Email activism is a key weapon in a modern activist organization's

A nuclear confrontation with Iran was avoided in 2006 because a small number of people with the power of community were enough to convince our Government not to take the world to the point of no return. The community of grassroots Iranian-American, Jewish-American, peace, and church groups have proven over and over, when we cooperate with each other we can make a difference. Those groups are sponsoring the event tonight. [4]

Netroots Nation, LA Media Reform group, LA Progressive and Alliance Hollywood, are joining Daily Kos in their latest action email campaign TO STOP WORLD WAR III

Markos Moulitsas at the Immanuel Presbyterian Church, September 22

Netroots Nation amplifies progressive voices by providing an online and in-person campus for exchanging ideas and learning how to be more effective in using technology to influence the public debate. Within that campus, we strengthen community, inspire action and serve as an incubator for progressive ideas that challenge the status quo and ultimately affect change in the public sphere. [1]

[4] Our un-elected officials got the message, that the perils of a nuclear confrontation with Iran could mean the end of life for everyone here on earth. Congress refused to go along with the Bush Administration's plans for military action against Iran.

Just two years later, the power of community stopped congress from attacking Iran.

[19/09/2010 17:38:42] Robert Singer: Waxman, Waters and Iran at the Sheraton Universal Hotel

Professor Katherine Smith will be speaking tonight about the following recent headlines (schedule permitting):

- July 25 - WikiLeaks of tens of thousands of Army documents related to the war in Afghanistan
- Jul 28 - An out of character vote, by Henry Waxman, an apologist for Bush's wars against the 2010 emergency funding for the Afghanistan

• August 2 - the House Ethics Committee formally brought a case against Congresswoman Maxine Waters, one of America's most enduring liberal and fierce Anti War politicians

Speculation by bloggers, including John Young of Cryptome.com, and an expose at The Intel Hub that the WikiLeaks is part of a disinformation operation and that the documents themselves could even be fake, should put every left leaning American on Yellow Alert.

Fox News wasted no time exploiting the WikiLeaks documents to further vilify Iran, pointing out that the documents indicate the U.S. belief that Iran is arming the Taliban insurgency. This adds another layer to Fox's steady stream of propaganda that has flowed over the years, advocating for an attack on the country and stands as a reason why some believe the leak was staged. WikiLeaks documents-- disinformation or not-- are being used for anti-Iran propaganda, OpEdNews

An investigation marginalizing the most virulent anti-war Democrat in Congress at a time when the U.S. is openly considering a raid on Iranian's (non-existent) nuclear weapons program, could be the most dangerous move towards nuclear war the world has seen since the 1962 Cuba Missile crisis.

Congresswoman Waters responded immediately to the baseless charges and asked the committee for an immediate adjudicatory hearing.

"The record will show that in advocating on behalf of minority banks, neither my office nor I benefited in any way, engaged in improper action or influenced anyone."

The committee, which apparently is dragging its feet on the investigation of the alleged impropriety that took place 18 months ago, recently announced it could not determine a date for the hearing.

On August 4, 2010, Congresswoman Waters waived her right to confidentiality and directed the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to release to the public all documents related to the investigation.

The failure to release the allegations against Congresswoman Waters has resulted in a media circus of speculation based only on a report prepared by the controversial Office of Congressional Ethics.

Recall that public opinion was deeply divided on Bush's 1990 Gulf policy, and the decision to invade Iraq was made by the US Senate via a narrow five-vote margin.

An investigation of any kind (especially one that dates back to events that took place in 2008) during a congressional debate over a preemptive strike on Iran will marginalize the most outspoken voice of reason on the issue of U.S. aggression in the Middle East.

At the same time Waxman, considered an expert on Middle East policy, with his irrelevant vote against the 2010 emergency funding for the Afghanistan war (it passed 308-114), will be the new voice of reason in the debate.

The idea that a nuclear strike on Iran to guarantee Israel's security and survival will somehow guarantee world peace, should put everyone at the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Dinner on Red Alert.

And if you want more proof of a concerted effort to paint Iran, a country with a non-existent nuclear weapons capability and an air force that belongs in museums read on. [2]

On August 3, 2010, the U.S. State Department rebuffed a call from Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for direct talks with President Barack Obama. In the same week of the anniversary of the unnecessary bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, Hillary Clinton proposed the ultimate hypocrisy by suggesting that Tehran pay more attention to the international concerns over its nuclear program. [3]

Just two days later, the U.S. State Department released their latest report on terrorism and claimed that Iran remained the, "most active" state sponsor of terrorism, and its support for terrorist and militant groups throughout the Middle East and Central Asia had a "direct impact" on international efforts for peace and stability.

This report on terrorism should be questioned because in 2001 the senior director for Middle East affairs in the National Security Council is quoted as saying:

"The State Department and NSC officials met secretly with Iranian diplomats in October, 2001 to discuss "how to effectively unseat the Taliban and once the Taliban was gone, how to stand up an Afghan government." [4]

Normally I don't recommend those "take action"- campaigns: the ones that tell us, "it's not too late, click-here" to importune our "elected"- representatives with emails and faxes.

However, the perils of a nuclear confrontation with Iran could mean there won't be a Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Dinner next year.

Let's harness the energy of our grassroots activists and volunteers here tonight.

Contact Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton and demand she honor the commitment made by President Obama during the 2007 Democratic debate when he said that he would:

"As president, be willing to meet without preconditions with Iran's leaders, and that the notion of not talking to one's foes was ridiculous." [5]

Call President Obama (202) 456-1414 and Hillary Clinton (202) 647-6575 press 1

"In nuclear war all democrats including grassroots activists, community leaders, special friends, volunteers are cremated equal" Quote by Dexter Gordon modified

For the embedded links and footnotes: http://www.laprogressive.com/defense/maxine-waters-investigation/Katherine-Smith,PhD_mandrell2010@gmail.com

[19/09/2010 17:39:23] Andrew Johnson: Just got an urgent call from someone in canada

[19/09/2010 17:39:36] Robert Singer: no problem

[19/09/2010 17:42:36] *** Call ended ***

[20/09/2010 16:36:12] Robert Singer: its everywhere today, all the cia sites: Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation , page 1

Sep 17, 2010 ... So a mini nuke can now be targetted just to remove engine blocks.... is that only for front engined cars? What about mid engined cars, ...

www.abovetopsecret.com/forum/thread611936/pg1 - Cached

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation | Pakalert Press

Sep 18, 2010 ... On the morning of September 11th, 2001, we were told a fairy tale. That wide body jets flew into the twin towers and completely destroyed ...

www.pakalertpress.com/.../pictures-prove-mini-nukes-caused-9-11-devastation/ - Cached

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation - David Icke Website

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation. Friday, 17 September 2010 10: 49. Share. There are only two events known to cause ground-hugging ...

www.davidicke.com/.../38618-pictures-prove-mini-nukes-caused-9-11-devastation- - Cached

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation | The Total Collapse

Sep 18, 2010 ... There are only two events known to cause ground-hugging pyroclastic flows (pictured above). A volcanic eruption A thermo nuclear detonation ...

www.thetotalcollapse.com/?p=4000&preview=true - Cached

New Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation : Terror & 9/11

10 posts - 7 authors - Last post: 2 days ago

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation There are only two events known to cause ground-hugging pyroclastic flows (pictured above) ...

www.disclose.tv/.../new-pictures-prove-mini-nukes-caused-9-11-devastation-t31820.html - Cached

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation | Before It's News

Sep 17, 2010 ... Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation. Microsoft Google Yahoo! Google News. photo. Contributed by BARRACUDA (Reporter) ...

beforeitsnews.com/.../Pictures_Prove_Mini_Nukes_Caused_9-11_Devastation .html - Cached

Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation

1 post - 1 author - Last post: 2 days ago

Discussion about Pictures Prove Mini Nukes Caused 9-11 Devastation at the GodlikeProductions Conspiracy Forum. Our topics include Conspiracy ...

[20/09/2010 16:43:49] Andrew Johnson: yup - to be expected... muddle up/cover up...

[20/09/2010 16:44:22] Robert Singer: would you say we now have proof positive the cia is behind the leak

[20/09/2010 16:45:30] Andrew Johnson: Well, I dunno because I know next to nothing about the CIA really - but it must be someone managing this whole thing...

[20/09/2010 16:45:44] Robert Singer: tptb

[20/09/2010 16:46:05] Andrew Johnson: It should be called the the CEA or the CDA - Central Evil Agency or Central Dumbness Agency

[20/09/2010 16:46:21] Robert Singer: ha ha

[20/09/2010 16:46:45] Andrew Johnson: i.e. the Ops are depriving themselves of use of the technology as well = dumb

[20/09/2010 16:46:49] Robert Singer: i am updating the unfiltered history post as we speak, it is quite different

[20/09/2010 16:47:32] Robert Singer: i am lost, what did they miss in technology

[20/09/2010 16:48:33] Andrew Johnson: free energy - zero cost travel across the solar system - the ops are too dumb or mind controlled to realise what it means.

I have been catching up with myself all day - 2 people have sent me documents to read and I worked most of the weekend to finish student reports - then I have another 4 or 5 student reports this week...

[20/09/2010 16:49:42] Robert Singer: no problem, will let you know when I release it

[20/09/2010 21:16:46] Robert Singer: this is enough to make you puke

[20/09/2010 21:17:16] Robert Singer: I have spoken to three truthers so far about the mini nuke story, guess what they say now about controlled demolition?

[20/09/2010 21:17:59] Robert Singer: oh, we know all along it was a combination of controlled demolition and mini nukes/aka Judy wood. One of them now insists she knew it was metaphysical

[20/09/2010 21:19:55] Andrew Johnson: there ya go...

[21/09/2010 00:06:15] Robert Singer: interesting, none of the truthers that I have emailed are getting back to me... I wonder what that is about?

[21/09/2010 00:08:27] Andrew Johnson: you're too hot!! off to bed now though - up earlyish tomorrow - night night

[21/09/2010 00:15:21] Robert Singer: hot as in ??

[21/09/2010 00:15:38] Robert Singer: too hot to talk to?

[21/09/2010 13:58:17] Robert Singer: did you have time to read my analysis of matt simmon death?

[21/09/2010 13:59:07] Robert Singer: FYI: September 18, 2010, forty days after the two articles, Matt Simmons "Apparently" Drowned At His Home Sunday Night and The Maxine Waters Investigation: What is Iran Doing in this Picture? were released, the articles are still the 2nd and 7th Most Read articles at The Peoples Voice. [5]

[21/09/2010 13:59:45] Robert Singer: <http://www.thepeoplesvoice.org/TPV3/Voices.php/2010/08/09/matt-simmons-apparently-drowned-at-his-h>

[21/09/2010 14:00:00] Robert Singer: it's long but you only need to read the first 2 pages

[21/09/2010 14:00:05] Robert Singer: let me know when you read it

[21/09/2010 14:39:26] Robert Singer: had you seen this Dr. Steven Jones, Dr. Judy Wood, 9/11, & Free Energy - Australian ...

Mar 15, 2010 ... Have you heard of Dr. Judy Wood? Did you know she has been researching 9/11 since 2001 and has already filed several law suits against NIST ...

www.911oz.com/vbulletin/showthread.php?t=7107 - Cached

[21/09/2010 14:57:35] Robert Singer: you better look at that forum post i just sent it will blow you away

[21/09/2010 15:03:16] Robert Singer: it wasn't me that got pak alert to change it was <http://www.examiner.com/exopolitics-in-seattle/scientist-directed-energy-weapons-turned-world-trade-center-into-nanoparticles-on-9-11>

[21/09/2010 15:03:25] Robert Singer: this was planned before march

[21/09/2010 16:46:03] Robert Singer: defnitley was not me

[21/09/2010 16:49:50] Robert Singer: i revised the post at unfiltered history

[21/09/2010 17:54:25] Andrew Johnson: been out all day - wife switched on computer for a bit earlier on to print

[21/09/2010 17:55:08] Andrew Johnson: I have written about Webre quite extensively (examiner article) and he said what I'd written was libellous (1 year after linking it to his blog)

[21/09/2010 17:55:39] Robert Singer: i am on the radio in 1 hour want to check with about something

[21/09/2010 17:55:44] Robert Singer: do you have time

[21/09/2010 17:55:59] Andrew Johnson: ok sure

[21/09/2010 17:56:34] Robert Singer: call when you have this In the past the Truthers who did their homework thought the whole mini-nuke/DEW line itself was COINTEL. They claimed Alex Jones was behind the "space beam" line (he was not) and it was used to berate anyone questioning the authorized (official) and "safe" Jones' controlled demolition theory of the collapse of the Twin Towers."

People hear 'space beam' and shrug it off because it sounds too sci-fi and Star Wars. So there's a reason Alex Jones says that, because he doesn't want people going there and instead wants them getting behind government operatives like Stephen Jones, who is a total fraud." [Condensed from a forum post by MDJ] <http://www.911oz.com/vbulletin/showthread.php?t=7107&page=3>

The last paragraph will be rewritten to read:

People hear 'metaphysical' and shrug it off because it sounds too ethereal and cannot be perceived with the five physical human senses. So there's a reason TPTB (and PakAlert) says that, because they don't want people going there and instead wants them getting behind government operatives who now promote Judy Wood (who is not a government operative) and is not a fraud, but when asked what would be the motive of the U.S. government to have tested/used an energy directed weapon on 9/11?

Wood: My research does not try to determine what the source of this energy is - whether it is within matter itself or whether it is, perhaps, a part of the "Radiant Energy" which Tesla discovered.

What is clear is that the experiments that John Hutchison has been doing do not seem to be identical to any that are recorded as having being done by Tesla, though John Hutchison has used Tesla coils as an electrostatic source in some of his past experiments.

Some might say the 9/11 perpetrators knew of a way to exploit "Earth energy" or "universal energy" as part of a weapons system - and that this formed part of a "larger exercise." The source of the energy is open to debate - as is the motive behind why this type of weapon was used on that site at that time.

My position is that use of the weapon was a demonstration of "free energy" technology - and that we (or some group of people) have a choice as to how we use this energy source.

I am a scientist and don't speculate as to why they did it. I am convinced they did use an energy weapon on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers. [14]

[21/09/2010 17:59:45] Robert Singer: you reading?

[21/09/2010 18:00:03] Andrew Johnson: can't read right now - call if you want - or will read and talk 2 u in a bit

[21/09/2010 18:00:23] *** Call from Robert Singer, duration 38:48. ***

[22/09/2010 14:38:41] Robert Singer: where can I read a debunking of this? <http://www.journalof911studies.com/letters/a/Hard-Evidence-Rebudiates-the-Hypothesis-that-Mini-Nukes-were-used-on-the-wtc-towers-by-steven-jones.pdf>

[22/09/2010 14:57:11] Robert Singer: just wached abes video and added it to my post, There is no way Abe is not disinfo. That should bother you/ March 15, 2010 Australian 9/11 Truth Movement posts Dr. Steven Jones, Dr. Judy Wood, 9/11; Free Energy

by PookztA who exhibited classic troll behavior by joining the forum just 10 days earlier. Consider his opening statement:

<blockquote>Dear Fellow 9/11 Truth Supporter,

My name is Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez, and I am a medical student. Throughout my rigorous undergraduate science and medical science coursework, I have had the privilege of receiving extensive training in the process of scientific analysis and evidence-based thinking.

I am writing to you today not only as a medical student, but also as a concerned American citizen, to ask for your help with something very important.</blockquote>

Even the most naive member of the 9/11 Truth movement will recognize this is not the work of some random researcher who came across the work of Judy Wood and now wants to wake the world up to the lies of Steven Jones.

Abe, who contacted Judy Wood through Andrew Johnson, is laying the groundwork for the future mini-nukes/DEW disclosure at PakAlert Press.

March 28, 2010 he posts <http://www.youtube.com/user/pookzta>, watch it note this isn't the first time a "college" student produced a professionally produced video (loose change).

[22/09/2010 15:07:34] Robert Singer: the interview with ambrose was that Jan 2008?

[22/09/2010 15:16:44] Robert Singer: there is a problem here, ambrose begins by saying it was a neocon conspiracy. The inference is that you and Judy agree with that motivation. And in fact you do not.

[22/09/2010 15:30:11] Robert Singer: btw did she get the check?

[22/09/2010 17:08:43] Andrew Johnson: Judy sometimes doesn't open her mail for some time

[22/09/2010 17:09:15] Robert Singer: ok, did you look at my other chats

[22/09/2010 17:09:24] Andrew Johnson: Sounds like you're trying to convince me all our friends (i.e. Abe and Ambrose) are not freinds

[22/09/2010 17:09:32] Andrew Johnson: just go tback

[22/09/2010 17:09:49] Andrew Johnson: been out all day and have driven over 100 miles seeing students so am tired

[22/09/2010 17:10:30] Robert Singer: sure, we can talk later, unless it is easy to give me something to read that tries to debunk Judy space beam etc

[22/09/2010 17:11:12] Robert Singer: btw ambrose was in jan 2008 therefore I wasn't saying that, I was just pointing out you didn't contradict him on the show

[22/09/2010 17:11:43] Andrew Johnson: Well, it's something you can argue

[22/09/2010 17:12:08] Andrew Johnson: you could argue the cover up is a neocon conspiracy (but actually it encompasses all high level officials)

[22/09/2010 17:12:40] Andrew Johnson: If we spent time on those points, we would have no time to discuss the physical evidence

[22/09/2010 17:15:52] Robert Singer: sure, I agree, what my concern is that I don't want to be in a position to have argue you are wrong about your theory, is there some way we can find to get on the same side, you will have to admit they have painted you in a bad corner with their "new" disclosure of what was obvious from the beginning, that is Implosion could never be explosion

[22/09/2010 17:17:01] Andrew Johnson: I don't see it the same way as you

[22/09/2010 17:17:21] Robert Singer: which part, you don't think they are using you?

[22/09/2010 17:17:27] Andrew Johnson: Judy has had several emails saying "it wasn't nukes"

[22/09/2010 17:17:34] Andrew Johnson: i.e. they think Judy is promoting nukes

[22/09/2010 17:17:41] Robert Singer: which she is not

[22/09/2010 17:17:43] Andrew Johnson: so I think that is the strategy

[22/09/2010 17:17:47] Andrew Johnson: correct

[22/09/2010 17:18:02] Andrew Johnson: so people simple go down the nuke alley and they think Judy is down there too

[22/09/2010 17:18:31] Robert Singer: no the strategy is now they are agreeing it was explosion and when they eliminate nukes which they will, it will default to you

[22/09/2010 17:18:48] Robert Singer: abe promotes Judy

[22/09/2010 17:18:56] Andrew Johnson: most people will always either try to twist the evidence or not check the details if it sounds plausiible

[22/09/2010 17:19:05] Andrew Johnson: abe does - but he does so mainly accurately
[22/09/2010 17:19:15] Andrew Johnson: He has consulted us directly
[22/09/2010 17:19:36] Andrew Johnson: that's the difference between Abe and whomever posted that recent article
[22/09/2010 17:19:37] Robert Singer: pakalert will soon say oh it wasn't nukes after all and startt promoting judy, I now he consulted you and that is what should worry you, a college student, I can hadly stop laughing
[22/09/2010 17:19:48] Andrew Johnson: webre is worse because he INTERVIEWED judy
[22/09/2010 17:19:55] Andrew Johnson: all this is in my e-book!!
[22/09/2010 17:20:24] Robert Singer: there are lots of them out there getting reading to put on the bridge of space beam, i.e. an alternate to controlled demolition
[22/09/2010 17:20:51] Robert Singer: actually the biggest proof I am right about this is they are contacting you in a methodical organized manner
[22/09/2010 17:21:17] Andrew Johnson: Don't agree - sorry
[22/09/2010 17:21:19] Robert Singer: you can't argue pakalert didn't know these last two years can you?
[22/09/2010 17:21:29] Andrew Johnson: Abe is one guy....
[22/09/2010 17:21:34] Andrew Johnson: he's been contacting us since March
[22/09/2010 17:21:36] Andrew Johnson: or before
[22/09/2010 17:21:43] Andrew Johnson: he got some things wrong initially
[22/09/2010 17:21:45] Robert Singer: I got it, march is correct
[22/09/2010 17:21:54] Andrew Johnson: he was "told off" by his Uni
[22/09/2010 17:22:00] Andrew Johnson: for using their name
[22/09/2010 17:22:27] Andrew Johnson: The plan is simple - to keep free energy covered up
[22/09/2010 17:22:40] Andrew Johnson: muddle in nukes and your most of the way there.
[22/09/2010 17:22:52] Andrew Johnson: Abe is the only one mentioning Hutchison Effect specifcally
[22/09/2010 17:23:13] Andrew Johnson: the Pakalery article mentioned it in passing
[22/09/2010 17:23:29] Robert Singer: andrew no one is concerned about free energy, they wern't in 1910 and they aren't now. Energy has been so cheap it was almost free. Edison said it all, it will be so cheap only thre rich can afford to burn candles
[22/09/2010 17:23:32] Andrew Johnson: and gave no reasons why it was important (hence public think nukes are to do with Hitch)
[22/09/2010 17:23:48] Andrew Johnson: No one in the public, no
[22/09/2010 17:24:27] Robert Singer: public - again I can hardly stop laughing, Let's face it, without the massive CIA mis/disinformation campaign from the beginning no one would have listened to the Jones' and pointed out the obvious differences between implosion and explosion.

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

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

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

There is not a shadow of a doubt that the 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

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.

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 cause the Twin Towers to collapse on 9/11 (unlikely). [4]

2. The mini-nukes/DEW is the new story 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 behind the theory of controlled demolition.

The Metaphysical Catechism (Test) is the story behind the mini-nuke/DEW.

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

I have been writing about 9/11 since December of 2008.

[22/09/2010 17:25:18] Andrew Johnson: I've been writing about 9/11 since Aug 2004

[22/09/2010 17:25:57] Andrew Johnson: AS I've said before, I disagree with some of your conclusions/end point about what it all means - that doesn't mean you're "wrong" and I'm "right"

[22/09/2010 17:25:59] Robert Singer: The unproven theory of controlled demolition was the story behind a jet fuel (kerosene) fire.

The mini-nuke/DEW is the story behind the theory of controlled demolition.

The Metaphysical Catechism (Test) is the story behind the mini-nuke/DEW.

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

[22/09/2010 17:26:14] Andrew Johnson: so you keep saying

[22/09/2010 17:26:25] Andrew Johnson: I only accept you may be right, not that you are right

[22/09/2010 17:26:32] Andrew Johnson: that's where we diverge...

[22/09/2010 17:26:34] Robert Singer: maybe pakalert is saying you are right

[22/09/2010 17:26:44] Andrew Johnson: I don't honestly know

[22/09/2010 17:26:50] Robert Singer: wait

[22/09/2010 17:26:51] Andrew Johnson: it looks like a "muddle up" to me

[22/09/2010 17:26:59] Andrew Johnson: that's what's covered in my book

[22/09/2010 17:27:06] Robert Singer: wait

[22/09/2010 17:27:34] Robert Singer: I am saying this: you are now on the same side as the CIA and Pakalert, is that possible?

[22/09/2010 17:28:27] Robert Singer: abe is not muddled in any interpretation you chose to apply and BTW don't forget Henry, Jeff Renses right hand man

[22/09/2010 17:28:43] Robert Singer: his left hand man is John Wenckus, aka Mike Rivero

[22/09/2010 17:30:29] Robert Singer: we need to find a way to work together, what if I never came on the scene, are you saying you would not be suspicious

[22/09/2010 17:31:19] Robert Singer: the worst situation for you is that you are being used, how many emails are you getting these days

[22/09/2010 17:32:16] Robert Singer: i am getting zero, the truth there that I know will no longer talk to me

[22/09/2010 17:33:24] Robert Singer: the best indication I am right is that bob singer cannot be found on henry makow even though I have had extensive communication with him, he actually recommended me to rene, then rene told him something and I was out of the picture

[22/09/2010 17:34:09] Robert Singer: i will tell you this, if I was on pakalert I would have to admit I must be wrong.

[22/09/2010 17:34:24] Andrew Johnson: I am on my own side robert

[22/09/2010 17:34:33] Andrew Johnson: I talk about evidence of what happened at the WTC

[22/09/2010 17:34:43] Andrew Johnson: what the larger picture is I can only speculate about

[22/09/2010 17:34:58] Robert Singer: ok let me see the evidence of a space beam weapon and the debunking at the same time

[22/09/2010 17:35:00] Andrew Johnson: I don't accept (at the moment) that what you say is correct or proved

[22/09/2010 17:35:17] Robert Singer: which part you are on pakalert and I am not

[22/09/2010 17:35:20] Andrew Johnson: I have a different take (to do with the fear game and what not)

[22/09/2010 17:35:26] Andrew Johnson: I don't know!!

[22/09/2010 17:35:33] Andrew Johnson: I am still catching up with myself!!

[22/09/2010 17:35:35] Robert Singer: you are on pakalert are you not

[22/09/2010 17:35:44] Andrew Johnson: Not me personally am I???

[22/09/2010 17:35:52] Andrew Johnson: Judy Wood's site is linked yet?

[22/09/2010 17:35:56] Andrew Johnson: *yes?

[22/09/2010 17:35:57] Robert Singer: ok send me the evidence and the debunking

[22/09/2010 17:36:07] Andrew Johnson: later

[22/09/2010 17:36:13] Andrew Johnson: if I have time

[22/09/2010 17:36:26] Robert Singer: you don't have this on the top of your head

[22/09/2010 17:36:26] Andrew Johnson: I am on Rollye tonight 3am - 6am here

[22/09/2010 17:36:35] Andrew Johnson: so will retire early to rest

[22/09/2010 17:36:43] Andrew Johnson: much to do before then

[22/09/2010 17:36:59] Robert Singer: am i lookiong for dew theory or not

[22/09/2010 17:37:22] Robert Singer: i will find it myself, maybe I am wrong

[22/09/2010 17:38:34] Robert Singer: you say you have proven it, so now I will have to research your proof

[22/09/2010 17:39:11] Robert Singer: i will wade through check the evidence.com

[22/09/2010 17:42:47] Andrew Johnson: Look through RFC and legal docs - that was submitted as court evidence

[22/09/2010 17:42:54] Andrew Johnson: I think that proves it

[22/09/2010 17:43:09] Andrew Johnson: read JH affidavit if you haven't already

[22/09/2010 17:43:09] Robert Singer: i just read this on your site

[22/09/2010 17:43:25] Andrew Johnson: it doesn't prove the "bigger picture" and not one of us claims it does

[22/09/2010 17:43:35] Robert Singer: f there were any doubts that the United States is preparing for war in space and cyberspace, testimony before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee last week would have wiped them away.

According to Gen. Kevin P. Chilton, head of U.S. Strategic Command, "our adversaries understand our dependence upon space-based capabilities, and we must be ready to detect, track, characterize, attribute, predict and respond to any threat to our space infrastructure."

Although space threats have received much attention in the past, it was the possibility of cyberspace warfare that was given new emphasis at the hearing.

[22/09/2010 17:43:48] Robert Singer: you can't reconcile that statement with the free energy statement.

[22/09/2010 17:43:51] Andrew Johnson: it proves WHAT was done and some of the HOW it was done - not the WHY or the WHO.

[22/09/2010 17:44:11] Andrew Johnson: It implicates companies like SAIC, Boeing and ARA at some level

[22/09/2010 17:44:16] Andrew Johnson: that's about it in summary

[22/09/2010 17:44:20] Robert Singer: you can't have it both ways, either it was a demonstration of free energy or a demo of a dew

[22/09/2010 17:44:33] Robert Singer: which is it

[22/09/2010 17:44:48] Andrew Johnson: yes - because the energy came from a technology which liberates it from, say "the aether"

[22/09/2010 17:45:03] Andrew Johnson: so yes, we can have it both ways thanks

[22/09/2010 17:45:09] Robert Singer: so it was an offense use of an dew

[22/09/2010 17:45:19] Andrew Johnson: how about DFEW
[22/09/2010 17:45:27] Andrew Johnson: DIrected Free Energy Weapon?
[22/09/2010 17:45:28] Robert Singer: ok you win
[22/09/2010 17:45:37] Andrew Johnson: that's what I think it is better
[22/09/2010 17:45:47] Robert Singer: I will wait till it is even more obvious you are being used
[22/09/2010 17:46:03] Robert Singer: at some point it will be obvious
[22/09/2010 17:46:08] Andrew Johnson: OK - fine by me - I've been used before - but didn't know till 1 year later
[22/09/2010 17:46:19] Andrew Johnson: Sure we're being used - so are you
[22/09/2010 17:46:35] Robert Singer: believe me I have no interest in this, I am trying to help you
[22/09/2010 17:46:51] Andrew Johnson: I am disclosing info for them - because they can't
[22/09/2010 17:46:52] Robert Singer: no one is using me, what makes you think so, I am not on pakalert or makow
[22/09/2010 17:46:55] Andrew Johnson: so I am being used
[22/09/2010 17:47:04] Andrew Johnson: Neither am I
[22/09/2010 17:47:06] Robert Singer: you are the new story behind the story
[22/09/2010 17:47:14] Andrew Johnson: not me...
[22/09/2010 17:47:24] Andrew Johnson: you missed out the "middled" part
[22/09/2010 17:47:27] Robert Singer: judy wood is on pakalert and henry
[22/09/2010 17:47:27] Andrew Johnson: *muddled
[22/09/2010 17:47:37] Andrew Johnson: you ignored what I said earlier - here it is again
[22/09/2010 17:47:44] Robert Singer: forget it we are at the beginning of this charade
[22/09/2010 17:48:01] Robert Singer: muddle works for them it creates consusion and buys time
[22/09/2010 17:48:05] Andrew Johnson: Judy wood gets e-mails saying it wasn't nukes
[22/09/2010 17:48:12] Andrew Johnson: do you understand that now?
[22/09/2010 17:48:12] Robert Singer: so
[22/09/2010 17:48:21] Andrew Johnson: In other words its mis-direction
[22/09/2010 17:48:25] Robert Singer: who cares she is going to be the new poster child
[22/09/2010 17:48:29] Andrew Johnson: people think Judy is saying things she is not
[22/09/2010 17:48:40] Andrew Johnson: so they have swallowed the disinfo
[22/09/2010 17:48:42] Robert Singer: it doesn't matter , she is geting credible exposure
[22/09/2010 17:48:51] Andrew Johnson: No she is not, sorry
[22/09/2010 17:48:55] Andrew Johnson: I don't agree
[22/09/2010 17:49:07] Andrew Johnson: It is just very slightly different to 2 years ago
[22/09/2010 17:49:12] Robert Singer: ok we will see, I hope I am wrong
[22/09/2010 17:49:17] Andrew Johnson: as evidenced in my book - which you haven't read
[22/09/2010 17:49:23] Andrew Johnson: yes, I will see, in the fullness of time
[22/09/2010 17:49:33] Andrew Johnson: as I said, i do not currently agree with you on this
[22/09/2010 17:49:56] Andrew Johnson: I will wait to see if you are right
[22/09/2010 17:50:02] Robert Singer: in the spirit of cooperation from my side I will check with you before I publish anything
[22/09/2010 17:50:22] Robert Singer: I have no interest in being the one to prove Judy wood is wrong.
[22/09/2010 17:50:23] Andrew Johnson: OK - thank you
[22/09/2010 17:50:34] Andrew Johnson: OK
[22/09/2010 17:50:42] Robert Singer: get some sleep
[23/09/2010 14:41:30] *** Call from Robert Singer declined. ***
[23/09/2010 14:41:32] Robert Singer: got an idea
[23/09/2010 14:41:47] Andrew Johnson: on phone with a student
[23/09/2010 14:41:48] Robert Singer: it's pretty big, call me
[23/09/2010 14:42:03] Andrew Johnson: have to go out to get kids later
[23/09/2010 14:42:13] Andrew Johnson: out tutoring tonight so will be busy
[23/09/2010 14:42:39] Robert Singer: well it's pretty big, so call as soon as you can, won't take but 2 minutes

[23/09/2010 14:54:45] Robert Singer: wtf is this? <http://www.rumormillnews.com/cgi-bin/forum.cgi?read=183415>

[23/09/2010 15:12:33] Andrew Johnson: Finished with student - got to go out in about 20 mins though and need to do something first.

I wrote 2 articles about Khalezov - based on my correspondence with him - you mean to say you haven't read it?

[23/09/2010 15:13:04] Robert Singer: no

[23/09/2010 15:13:26] Robert Singer: call when you get back I will be here, my idea is good

[23/09/2010 15:14:12] Andrew Johnson: OK - well, you know where the articles are if you want to read them... will call later if I get chance

[23/09/2010 15:56:58] Robert Singer: you need to make time for this,

[23/09/2010 18:09:07] Robert Singer: before we talk it would be helpful if you can comment on 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)

[23/09/2010 21:10:55] Andrew Johnson: sorry, don't want to talk now -I am completely biushed - this is not what I ever said - I said check the RFC's and court documents. The DEW was used on both - only the WTC 1 & 2 reports were legally challenged - the WTC 7 report was commented on, not RFC'd - yes - the destruction was different. For everything else, refer to the documentation and quote from that, not from me - if you want it to be valid

[23/09/2010 21:11:21] Andrew Johnson: sorry - that hardly makes sense - too tired to sort it out

[23/09/2010 21:12:20] Robert Singer: did you just write: sorry - that hardly makes sense to me also - I too tired to sort it out (two different dew effects)

[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)

[23/09/2010 21:25:33] Andrew Johnson: Yes 1 & 2 can be proved - I am surprised you don't see this

[23/09/2010 21:25:39] Andrew Johnson: that is what the court case was about

[23/09/2010 21:25:44] Andrew Johnson: I care about it even if you don't

[23/09/2010 21:26:22] Andrew Johnson: it is an indication of how the evidence proves it -i.e. it wouldn't have had money spent on if not provable

[23/09/2010 21:26:49] Robert Singer: give me the evidence that shows 1 and 2 is a dew and why they two are different.

[23/09/2010 21:27:07] Andrew Johnson: Work it out for yourself and send me what you think is correct

[23/09/2010 21:27:20] Andrew Johnson: I have 5 reports to write and a talk to give over the weekend

[23/09/2010 21:27:21] Robert Singer: this is a joke, do you want the money

[23/09/2010 21:27:24] Andrew Johnson: no

[23/09/2010 21:27:27] Andrew Johnson: see above

[23/09/2010 21:27:28] Robert Singer: i sent her 150

[23/09/2010 21:27:44] Andrew Johnson: she might even cash it in 3 months maybe!

[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

[23/09/2010 21:27:57] Andrew Johnson: You are entitled to nothing from me

[23/09/2010 21:27:58] Robert Singer: you would give that to anyone who asks

[23/09/2010 21:28:10] Andrew Johnson: not in the way you are asking I wouldn't

[23/09/2010 21:28:33] Robert Singer: this is not working, why can't you give me the link to prove what I asked

[23/09/2010 21:28:37] Andrew Johnson: You are entitled to read what I have posted

[23/09/2010 21:28:45] Robert Singer: you ahve posted thousands

[23/09/2010 21:28:50] Andrew Johnson: but you don't - then bring up people like Khalezov

[23/09/2010 21:28:52] Robert Singer: just give me two links to read

[23/09/2010 21:29:26] Robert Singer: that prove a dew was used on both and explains why the collapses are different

[23/09/2010 21:29:29] Robert Singer: I will pay for it

[23/09/2010 23:42:48] Robert Singer: klk

[24/09/2010 03:31:04] Robert Singer: These words may come back to haunt you:

So, the DEW theory has a huge uphill climb in order to be perceived for what it is; namely: A clear, direct, frontal confrontation on whether or not the USA is a free republic or an entity being run by secret forces having the general label of Military-Industrial-Complex? That is the underlying question that DEW theory presents and very few people want to deal with it. Small wonder the reaction to it is so visceral. So, challenges to DEW are primed to be successful based on an "anything but that" predilection among people of all persuasions, even among what might be called plain-vanilla truthers.

I hope 9/11 Truthers – and everyone else - will consider these thoughts, ideas and data in a fair and balanced manner.

[24/09/2010 03:31:33] Robert Singer: It isn't visceral any longer. Since mini nukes are about as dumb as ctl demo you are the new truth

[24/09/2010 03:32:26] Robert Singer: what do I know, maybe the CIA grew a conscience... heck why not.. of course the odds of that are about the same as the same person winning the lottery... three weeks in a row.

[24/09/2010 04:34:02] Robert Singer: and if you need even more proof there is always this.. WTC?" Judy Wood has been highly criticized (unfairly in my view), but she discovered the weapon. Whatever happens, in the future she will be known for solving 9/11. Give the website a try. This stuff is important. Thank you for your attention. View my profile and click my wishlist if you want to see a video of me in action, fighting the people who hate America. I'm really not kidding. They are bad people. Check out the video. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dN1AhpWOiu0>

View my complete profile

[24/09/2010 12:28:28] Robert Singer: dsfdsfs

[24/09/2010 15:36:42] Robert Singer: l;

[24/09/2010 18:53:17] Robert Singer: I see you read them. Do you want to review what I am about to publish or not.

[24/09/2010 19:54:27] Andrew Johnson: I would like to have look but have still got 3 reports to finish and other stuff to do, but I will try to read it today or tomorrow

[24/09/2010 19:56:13] Robert Singer: as a courtesy to you I will not publish it until you have had a chance to read it. I am still putting the finishing touches and will send it in about one hour

[24/09/2010 19:57:31] Andrew Johnson: ok

[24/09/2010 22:54:11] Robert Singer: you can review it now

[24/09/2010 23:31:58] Andrew Johnson: can you e-mail it if poss - no rush as I am going to bed now (it's 11:30pm)

[25/09/2010 04:34:49] Robert Singer: its on unfilteredhistory.com on the main page

[25/09/2010 11:57:09] Andrew Johnson: ok

[25/09/2010 12:07:01] Andrew Johnson: "PakAlert Appendix"? That's the correct one?

[25/09/2010 12:08:03] Robert Singer: you there

[25/09/2010 12:08:22] Andrew Johnson: I am here

[25/09/2010 12:08:35] Robert Singer: yes pakalert appendix is the one

[25/09/2010 12:09:00] Robert Singer: i have a word doc of the main article finally if you want it

[25/09/2010 12:09:21] Robert Singer: the appendix could still be sort of in disarray

[25/09/2010 12:09:46] Robert Singer: i was wrting this on the site and it got pretty hairy

[25/09/2010 12:12:13] Andrew Johnson: right - send the doc if it's any better/different than the website - otherwise I will read that later - still working on reports and am going out in about 1 hour or so

[25/09/2010 12:12:35] Robert Singer: no the site is accurate

[25/09/2010 12:12:42] Andrew Johnson: ok

[25/09/2010 12:12:54] Robert Singer: how does it look so far?

[25/09/2010 12:13:18] Robert Singer: they are giving me the front page tomorrow

[25/09/2010 12:13:59] Robert Singer: as you can see my theme is this, judy is write about a dew, but only in so far as 7 and the impact holes

[25/09/2010 12:14:25] Robert Singer: and that scenario is identical to the last one, in that they used 7 to extrapolate to 1 and 2

[25/09/2010 12:14:45] Robert Singer: the difference judy is not one of them and is not lying

[25/09/2010 22:47:56] Robert Singer: we are in the home stretch, <http://www.unfilteredhistory.com/blog/uncategorized/pictures-of-mini-nukes-at-pakalert-prove-9-11-was-a-metaphysical-catechism-test-draft-1-0/> is pretty accurate, I fixed up the appendices as well. I made every attempt to cast you and judy in a favorable light. Let me know if you want any changes,

[25/09/2010 22:52:08] Andrew Johnson: thanks - I will have a read now

[25/09/2010 22:55:55] Robert Singer: don't miss this, [6] As of September 25, 2010 the #10 Most Popular Content in the last sixty days (by page views) at OpedNews is The Maxine Waters Investigation: What is Iran Doing in this Picture? (released 8/9/2010).

The popularity of the article at TPV and OpedNews is undoubtedly related to World War 3 Came And Went - Citibank And Goldman Sachs Open Branches In Iran.

[25/09/2010 23:01:30] Andrew Johnson: OK - I am going to paste it into a document and send you comments. The largest error is that you are mixing to together DEW and Mininukes as both being some kind of disinfo - you have entirely failed to reference the documented "muddle up" tactics that have been going on for the last 2 years. You reference Abe's posting, but, for example, not the Webre/Moret HAARP episode from about Nov 2008 - this should be part of your time line if you want it to be accurate

[25/09/2010 23:01:46] Andrew Johnson: I will send other comments in a the document

[25/09/2010 23:02:38] Robert Singer: i can send you the word docs

[25/09/2010 23:02:52] Robert Singer: thanks

[25/09/2010 23:03:44] Robert Singer: i will email them in case that will help you'

[25/09/2010 23:42:27] Andrew Johnson: OK - I have sent you comments back - I hope I caught all the points ...

[25/09/2010 23:53:50] Robert Singer: we are going to have a problem with this mixing up of dew/mini nuke. My positionh in this paper is clear. A dew cannot be the explanation because you don't have a motive and you can't explain why the cia is now promoting your theory. Other than that I will make as many changes as will fit my theory, that is 7 is a dew, 1 and 2 are not.,

[25/09/2010 23:54:44] Robert Singer: and I am not mixing anyting incorrectly, disinfo is truth intended to confuse you, I will make that distinction at the beginning

[25/09/2010 23:55:00] Andrew Johnson: Well, if you want to make any revisions, it's up to you. When I post my response, I will try not to paint you in a bad light ;)

[25/09/2010 23:56:37] Robert Singer: attacking me will do you no good whatsoever. I assume you will wait till you see what changes I incorporate

[25/09/2010 23:57:22] Robert Singer: I assume you saw this: don't miss this, [6] As of September 25, 2010 the #10 Most Popular Content in the last sixty days (by page views) at OpedNews is The Maxine Waters Investigation: What is Iran Doing in this Picture? (released 8/9/2010).

The popularity of the article at TPV and OpedNews is undoubtedly related to World War 3 Came And Went - Citibank And Goldman Sachs Open Branches In Iran.

[26/09/2010 00:00:08] Robert Singer: i am going to the links you provided and I am sorry they don't prove anything other than some extraordiany event took place on 9/11.

[26/09/2010 00:01:46] Robert Singer: in fact the more I read your comments I can see that we should talk again. You did not get the thrust of my post. I am arguing that the limited disclosure proves my case.

[26/09/2010 00:03:28] Robert Singer: this is your opinion, he "mini—nuke" story does not change anything, as it does not explain the evidence.

The DEW "story" changes everything because it lays bear the reality of weaponised "fee energy" technology – a DEW which does not generate high heat – like Nukes or the other whiteworld weaponry such as MTHEL, ABL etc

I Don't happen to agree with you. Unless you can explain why they would test their free energy at wtc on the most dramatic day in history astrologically you don't have a viable motice, and BTW they never made money selling us energy all these years, they lost their ass

[26/09/2010 00:15:54] Robert Singer: you don;t understand the word disinfo, you are confusing it with misinfo

[26/09/2010 00:20:06] Robert Singer: you really should step back and realize if went out of my way to protect her reputation. I am lumping the two together because they are the current story from pakalert and therefore that is what I need to do. There is no game here for me to discredit you or judy, my game is simple, you got it right about 7 and the impact holes in general, you think you can explain 1 and 2 and that is because Judy is a scientist and therefore will force an explanation no matter what. I am not a scientist and my exolanation is primna facie. It may or may not be true but attacking me will hurt you in the end.

[26/09/2010 00:21:28] Andrew Johnson: I am not attacking you

[26/09/2010 00:21:41] Andrew Johnson: I am pointing out where your writing becomes a muddle up of evidence

[26/09/2010 00:21:51] Andrew Johnson: which I have documented

[26/09/2010 00:22:05] Andrew Johnson: I have clearly explained how and why I disagree with you

[26/09/2010 00:22:09] Robert Singer: you are trying to make a different point than me

[26/09/2010 00:22:23] Robert Singer: i am showing they are promoting you for a reason

[26/09/2010 00:22:29] Andrew Johnson: I have also suggested a general idea for why they destroyed the towers in this way

[26/09/2010 00:22:31] Robert Singer: you can arbue muddle

[26/09/2010 00:22:32] Andrew Johnson: I know they are!

[26/09/2010 00:22:44] Andrew Johnson: I know what your reasoning is!

[26/09/2010 00:22:54] Andrew Johnson: I DESCRIBED IT TO YOU THE OTHER DAY!!

[26/09/2010 00:23:00] Robert Singer: then you can see I have represented my case accurately

[26/09/2010 00:23:23] Robert Singer: either you are the truth and the cia wants everyone to know or you are the new cover

[26/09/2010 00:23:28] Robert Singer: its that simple

[26/09/2010 00:24:04] Andrew Johnson: You have, but I don't agree with you, or the way you have "used" certain details

[26/09/2010 00:24:07] Robert Singer: i don't know why you can't see that,, if they were promoting me at pakaler I would be sure I was wrong

[26/09/2010 00:24:35] Robert Singer: what exact details to you have issue and lets see if I can fix them

[26/09/2010 00:24:42] Andrew Johnson: My argument would be that you are being will be promoted because you have certain details incorrect

[26/09/2010 00:24:51] Andrew Johnson: I'VE PUT THEM IN THE COMMENTS

[26/09/2010 00:24:57] Andrew Johnson: in the document I e-mailed!

[26/09/2010 00:25:04] Andrew Johnson: Can you see them?

[26/09/2010 00:25:10] Robert Singer: no you argued I mixed nuke and dew is that one

[26/09/2010 00:25:41] Robert Singer: next you said you proved 1 and 2 were a dew with a bunch of pictures, i don't agree

[26/09/2010 00:25:53] Robert Singer: what other detail did I miss

[26/09/2010 00:26:24] Robert Singer: first of all I have never been promoted on a cia site, you have

[26/09/2010 00:26:34] Robert Singer: and if I am I will be sure I am wrong

[26/09/2010 00:26:53] Robert Singer: did you see the final footnote

[26/09/2010 00:27:23] Robert Singer: i have a personal experience with every cia controlled site on the net. I am not on their on purpose

[26/09/2010 00:27:42] Robert Singer: you and I shared that distinciton till pakalert

[26/09/2010 00:28:02] Robert Singer: no one has a fake website saying bob singer is an american hero, you do

[26/09/2010 00:28:05] Andrew Johnson: As i said, post what you like, but my comments will also be posted in some form

[26/09/2010 00:28:18] Andrew Johnson: I don't understand this last comment

[26/09/2010 00:28:37] Robert Singer: i can find you a fake website saying judy is an american hero, do you not know about it

[26/09/2010 00:28:59] Robert Singer: she is a lot of things but no one would call her an american hero

[26/09/2010 00:29:13] Robert Singer: i found (not I can find)

[26/09/2010 00:29:17] Andrew Johnson: I also have a record of you saying this:you can't have it both ways, either it was a demonstration of free energy or a demo of a dew

[22/09/2010 17:44:33] Robert Singer: which is it

[22/09/2010 17:44:48] Andrew Johnson: yes - because the energy came from a technology which liberates it from, say "the aether"

[22/09/2010 17:45:03] Andrew Johnson: so yes, we can have it both ways thanks

[22/09/2010 17:45:09] Robert Singer: so it was an offense use of an dew

[22/09/2010 17:45:19] Andrew Johnson: how about DFEW

[22/09/2010 17:45:27] Andrew Johnson: DIrected Free Energy Weapon?

[22/09/2010 17:45:28] Robert Singer: ok you win

[22/09/2010 17:45:37] Andrew Johnson: that's what I think it is better

[22/09/2010 17:45:47] Robert Singer: I will wait till it is even more obvious you are being used

[26/09/2010 00:29:26] Andrew Johnson: >she is a lot of things but no one would call her an american hero

[26/09/2010 00:29:51] Andrew Johnson: Umm - I don't know what this has got to do with DEW, Metaphysical Catechism's or CIA websites?

[26/09/2010 00:30:02] Andrew Johnson: Besides, I have e-mails describing her as a hero

[26/09/2010 00:30:08] Robert Singer: what was this last thing suppose to say

[26/09/2010 00:30:17] Robert Singer: if you do you should be supiciouus

[26/09/2010 00:30:19] Andrew Johnson: I beleive some callers have said it once or twice - so, looks like you're wrong there

[26/09/2010 00:30:35] Robert Singer: wrong where?

[26/09/2010 00:30:45] Andrew Johnson: >she is a lot of things but no one would call her an american hero

[26/09/2010 00:30:59] Andrew Johnson: Well I am off to bed now

[26/09/2010 00:31:03] Andrew Johnson: night night

[26/09/2010 00:31:37] Robert Singer: i hiope you did not interpret my you win as anything but sarcasm

[26/09/2010 00:35:02] Robert Singer: what a shame, you have an investment in this and don't see the big picture. I can hardly blame you. I guess if I did all the work you guys did I would not want to admit it was for nothing (when it comes to 1 and 2). You should be proud you uncovered 7 and the impact holes. That was quite a feat and as I have said over and over the proof that the energy was related to tesla was required for me to make my case. You should not be fighting with me it will hurt you in the end.

[26/09/2010 00:38:22] Robert Singer: one more thing, I should warn you not to use that lathering up argument to prove 1, 2 and 7 are the same. It took me two minutes to refute it. And that is before i consulted the one person in the world who knows about this stuff more than you... Steven Cold Fusion Jones.

[26/09/2010 08:59:19] Andrew Johnson: Well, fair enough if you say it was sarcasm. What i don't understand is why you seem to say "Judy being right helped you to your 'solution'" then you seem to say that the lathering process observed in the destruction of 1 2 & 7 doesn't prove anything. So, did the buildings burn down after all? If DEW didn't destroy one and 2, what did? Or, are you saying you don't know if it did? If so, I don't understand why you are bothering me with all this.

[26/09/2010 08:59:36] Andrew Johnson: I am out all today and still have 2 reports to finish tomorrow.

[26/09/2010 09:00:25] Andrew Johnson: I will probably post an article about my take on your conclusion about the metaphysical catechism -because regardless of our disagreements etc, I think it is interesting - as iI have said to you.

[26/09/2010 09:00:33] Andrew Johnson: I will send you a copy before I post it

[26/09/2010 19:54:56] Andrew Johnson: The mini nukes - the "story behind the story" from 2007.... and this was an "update" <http://www.rense.com/general76/wtc.htm>

[26/09/2010 19:55:09] Andrew Johnson: One to add to your timeline?

[26/09/2010 19:55:57] Robert Singer: i just shut down the peoples voice with it,

[26/09/2010 19:56:10] Robert Singer: see if you can get there, it was on the main page

[26/09/2010 19:56:44] Andrew Johnson: I will look later - just got back from Watford and need to do chores and what not

[26/09/2010 19:56:46] Robert Singer: 11:52 got An unexpected error has occured!
If this error persits, please report it to the administrator.
Go back to home page
Additional information about this error:
MySQL error!

Error establishing a database connection!

(User dbuser already has more than 'max_user_connections' active connections)

Are you sure you have typed the correct user/password?

Are you sure that you have typed the correct hostname?

Are you sure that the database server is running?

[26/09/2010 19:57:01] Robert Singer: no problem we are monitoring it

[26/09/2010 19:57:18] Robert Singer: got an interesting response from opednews, will show you when you get back

[26/09/2010 20:01:18] Andrew Johnson: The blog link you sent is "unofficial" and is run by Tracy Postert - she stirred up e-mail food fights with the trolls - apparently in support of Dr Judy - she posted some pictures on the blog which were shared privately. Am pdd cjaracter sje os////

[26/09/2010 20:03:36] Robert Singer: no problem, this is interesting tpv is a google news site, but my piece never got picked up by google news

[26/09/2010 20:04:18] Robert Singer: just checked they suppressed it, the first time they have done that to me

[26/09/2010 20:06:04] Robert Singer: no that's not it, none of his articles on tpv are picked up by google news today.

[26/09/2010 20:07:07] Robert Singer: opednews rejected it for the wierdest reason: This article covers a topic or news too old. It could be hours or weeks old. But it is no longer "fresh" enough for us to cover it.

You may NOT resubmit this or post it, even with modifications, as a diary, poll or comment. See our writers guidelines for more info.

Articles are evaluated by a team of 30+ volunteer editors. Please respect the decisions of our volunteer team. Questions on why articles have been rejected are fair. Angry responses are not appropriate or acceptable.

Thanks for your effort. We look forward to your next article submission.

P.S. Submitted a week after the critical date.

[26/09/2010 20:07:18] Andrew Johnson: It is very unfortunate you chose not to remove the false/misleading statement that I was DR Judy's representative

[26/09/2010 20:07:38] Robert Singer: that was a omission I will do it know if you like

[26/09/2010 20:07:51] Robert Singer: give me the sentence and we will fix it right now

[26/09/2010 20:08:07] Robert Singer: we had a number of last minute changes it was too hard to keep track

[26/09/2010 20:08:12] Andrew Johnson: Search for "representative" and you sshould find it

[26/09/2010 20:08:31] Robert Singer: no I can find it just give me what you want me to say

[26/09/2010 20:09:30] Andrew Johnson: Remove the paragraph completely or put what I gave you

[26/09/2010 20:09:31] Andrew Johnson: "Dr Judy Wood does not speculate about the motives for the use of the weapon to destroy WTC – she looks at the evidence that it was used.

Andrew Johnson speculates that the weapon was used because it may allow PTB to "practice" for a later event which may be made to look like an Alien Invatson (see 1996 film Independence day and compare destruction of Empire State Building to destruction of WTC)

Or just miss out this statement altogether

[26/09/2010 20:09:41] Andrew Johnson: This was in the document I sent you

[26/09/2010 20:09:52] Robert Singer: i apologize

[26/09/2010 20:12:31] Robert Singer: Dr. Judy Wood and Andrew Johnson, have inconsistent positions on what the motives would be for the use of a DEW on 9/11. replaced with "Dr Judy Wood does not speculate about the motives for the use of the weapon to destroy WTC – she looks at the evidence that it was used.

Andrew Johnson speculates that the weapon was used because it may allow PTB to “practice” for a later event which may be made to look like an Alien Invasion (see 1996 film Independence day and compare destruction of Empire State Building to destruction of WTC)

[26/09/2010 20:13:15] Robert Singer: is that ok?

[26/09/2010 20:13:33] Robert Singer: or just Dr. Judy Wood and Andrew Johnson, have inconsistent positions on what the motives would be for the use of a DEW on 9/11.

[26/09/2010 20:13:52] Andrew Johnson: No

[26/09/2010 20:13:54] Robert Singer: i will do either, we are ready to change it all right now

[26/09/2010 20:13:56] Andrew Johnson: that is not true

[26/09/2010 20:14:06] Andrew Johnson: Judy has NO POSITION as to the motive

[26/09/2010 20:14:12] Andrew Johnson: I SPECULATE

[26/09/2010 20:14:26] Robert Singer: yes she does, I quoted her already do you want me to show it to you

[26/09/2010 20:14:35] Robert Singer: you approved it

[26/09/2010 20:14:58] Andrew Johnson: Did she though? Well as long as you are quoting her directly from a broadcast or webpage, fine

[26/09/2010 20:15:12] Robert Singer: no you approved the following let me get it for you

[26/09/2010 20:15:18] Andrew Johnson: Make the quote and REFERENCE it

[26/09/2010 20:15:28] Robert Singer: My research does not try to determine what the source of this energy is – whether it is within matter itself or whether it is, perhaps, a part of the “Radiant Energy” which Tesla discovered.

My position is that use of the weapon was a demonstration of “free energy” technology – and that we (or some group of people) have a choice as to how we use this energy source.

I am a scientist and don’t speculate as to why they did it. I am convinced they did use an energy weapon on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers. www.drjudywood.com

[26/09/2010 20:15:41] Andrew Johnson: THAT’S NOT HER QUOTE

[26/09/2010 20:15:49] Robert Singer: ok I will fix it

[26/09/2010 20:15:54] Andrew Johnson: That was what you wrote for your tesla article

[26/09/2010 20:16:06] Robert Singer: i thought i made it clear that you were to approve it

[26/09/2010 20:16:16] Robert Singer: no problem I am happy to correct it

[26/09/2010 20:16:20] Andrew Johnson: I am a scientist and don’t speculate as to why they did it. I am convinced they did use an energy weapon on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers. www.drjudywood.com

[26/09/2010 20:16:36] Andrew Johnson: That is the quote! "I am a scientist and don’t speculate as to why they did it. "

[26/09/2010 20:16:53] Robert Singer: who said free energy

[26/09/2010 20:17:17] Andrew Johnson: She has said that sort of thing - but you need a referenced quote

[26/09/2010 20:17:35] Robert Singer: are you not spitting hairs on me here

[26/09/2010 20:17:53] Andrew Johnson: NO!

[26/09/2010 20:18:07] Andrew Johnson: Getting accurate quotes is vital as far as Dr Judy is concerned

[26/09/2010 20:18:18] Andrew Johnson: god knows how many times she is misquoted!

[26/09/2010 20:18:21] Robert Singer: then you should have told me when I released the tesla article

[26/09/2010 20:18:31] Robert Singer: i specifically made sure it was accurate

[26/09/2010 20:18:53] Robert Singer: the reference is that you said it was true

[26/09/2010 20:19:06] Robert Singer: and you are the expert on judy wood and her work

[26/09/2010 20:19:32] Robert Singer: lets figure out how to fix this and make you happy

[26/09/2010 20:19:44] Andrew Johnson: This is the quote:

[26/09/2010 20:20:02] Andrew Johnson: But we have a choice. And this choice is real. Live happily ever after or destroy the planet. This is why I have been pursuing the issues of 9/11. These issues are central to it all. 9/11 was a demonstration of free energy technology. It can be used for good, but we need to make that choice and help others to do as well.

-- Dr. Judy Wood

[26/09/2010 20:20:13]

Andrew

Johnson:

http://www.checktheevidence.co.uk/cms/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=206&Itemid=76

[26/09/2010 20:20:16] Robert Singer: fine

[26/09/2010 20:20:21] Andrew Johnson: It's on her website somewhere

[26/09/2010 20:20:40] Robert Singer: i paraphrased it,

[26/09/2010 20:20:44] Robert Singer: i will change it

[26/09/2010 20:20:45] Andrew Johnson: A demonstration is not quite the same as a motive

[26/09/2010 20:20:57] Andrew Johnson: thank you

[26/09/2010 20:21:13] Robert Singer: wait before we go to all this work I want to make sure I have right

[26/09/2010 20:23:17] Robert Singer: Dr, Judy Wood on 9/11:

My research does not try to determine what the source of this energy is – whether it is within matter itself or whether it is, perhaps, a part of the “Radiant Energy” which Tesla discovered.

I am a scientist and don't speculate as to why they did it. I am convinced they did use an energy weapon on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers. www.drjudywood.com

But we have a choice. And this choice is real. Live happily ever after or destroy the planet. This is why I have been pursuing the issues of 9/11. These issues are central to it all. 9/11 was a demonstration of free energy technology. It can be used for good, but we need to make that choice and help others to as well. www.drjudywood.com

[26/09/2010 20:24:54] Robert Singer: Dr. Judy Wood and Andrew Johnson, have inconsistent positions on what the motives would be for the use of a DEW on 9/11.

[26/09/2010 20:28:59] Robert Singer: here this should make you happy o there's a reason TPTB (and PakAlert) says that, because they don't want people going there and instead wants them getting behind government operatives who now promote Judy Wood (who is not a government operative) and is not a fraud, but when asked what would be the motive of the U.S. government to have tested/used an energy directed weapon on 9/11 answers:

My research does not try to determine what the source of this energy is – whether it is within matter itself or whether it is, perhaps, a part of the “Radiant Energy” which Tesla discovered.

I am a scientist and don't speculate as to why they did it. I am convinced they did use an energy weapon on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers.

But we have a choice. And this choice is real. Live happily ever after or destroy the planet. This is why I have been pursuing the issues of 9/11. These issues are central to it all. 9/11 was a demonstration of free energy technology. It can be used for good, but we need to make that choice and help others to as well. www.drjudywood.com

See Appendix D for more about the use of DEWs on 9/11.

[26/09/2010 20:32:13] Robert Singer: My research does not try to determine what the source of this energy is – whether it is within matter itself or whether it is, perhaps, a part of the “Radiant Energy” which Tesla discovered.

I am a scientist and don't speculate as to why they did it. I am convinced they did use an energy weapon on 9/11 to bring down the Twin Towers.

But we have a choice. And this choice is real. Live happily ever after or destroy the planet. This is why I have been pursuing the issues of 9/11. These issues are central to it all. 9/11 was a demonstration of free energy technology. It can be used for good, but we need to make that choice and help others to as well. www.drjudywood.com

[26/09/2010 20:37:14] Robert Singer: wait I will send two new documents

[26/09/2010 21:00:49] Robert Singer: ok it's fixed everywhere to your specifications.

[26/09/2010 21:34:11] Robert Singer: thanks

[26/09/2010 21:36:11] Andrew Johnson: Not quite there....

[26/09/2010 21:36:31] Andrew Johnson: [20:32:13] Robert Singer: My research does not try to determine what the source of this energy is – whether it is within matter itself or whether it is, perhaps, a part of the “Radiant Energy” which Tesla discovered.

[26/09/2010 21:36:43] Andrew Johnson: This was a hypothetical statement in your fictional article

[26/09/2010 21:36:55] Andrew Johnson: it is basically correct, but she never said this

[26/09/2010 21:37:17] Andrew Johnson: It was my version of what she may have said in your FICTIONAL SCENARIO

[26/09/2010 21:37:26] Andrew Johnson: please keep track of the real versus the made up

[26/09/2010 21:37:28] Robert Singer: i skyped you that i wanted you help you did n't answer we fixed what you said

[26/09/2010 21:37:41] Andrew Johnson: I've been making my wife something to eat!
[26/09/2010 21:37:42] Robert Singer: it was not fictionhal
[26/09/2010 21:37:47] Andrew Johnson: she has been working all day!
[26/09/2010 21:37:57] Robert Singer: the teslan was not fictional as to judy
[26/09/2010 21:38:02] Andrew Johnson: the GRAND JURY WAS FICTIONAL!
[26/09/2010 21:38:16] Andrew Johnson: that was what I gave you that statement for!!
[26/09/2010 21:38:27] Andrew Johnson: it was NOT a DIRECT QUOTE!
[26/09/2010 21:38:30] Robert Singer: her statements were suppose to be real I thought you understood that
[26/09/2010 21:38:41] Andrew Johnson: NO!!!
[26/09/2010 21:38:57] Andrew Johnson: IT WAS BASED ON THE TYPE OF THING SHE HAS SAID
[26/09/2010 21:39:02] Andrew Johnson: IT WAS NOT AN ACTUAL QUOTE
[26/09/2010 21:39:09] Robert Singer: why did you think i went to all the trouble to get it right
[26/09/2010 21:39:10] Andrew Johnson: What are you doing?
[26/09/2010 21:39:14] Andrew Johnson: What is your goal?
[26/09/2010 21:39:23] Andrew Johnson: Is it the truth?
[26/09/2010 21:39:36] Robert Singer: what are you doing
[26/09/2010 21:40:11] Robert Singer: the tesla artcile said it was her words only the others were made up
[26/09/2010 21:40:23] Robert Singer: i don't even need her statements
[26/09/2010 21:41:18] Robert Singer: i wanted it to e accurate
[26/09/2010 21:42:00] Robert Singer: all right you win
[26/09/2010 21:42:02] Andrew Johnson: Sorry Boib, I can't keep up... all these twists and turns are too much for me - change this, add that, quote this, make up that
[26/09/2010 21:42:03] Robert Singer: this is the last time
[26/09/2010 21:42:07] Robert Singer: what do want to change
[26/09/2010 21:42:09] Andrew Johnson: It's too hard for me
[26/09/2010 21:42:11] Andrew Johnson: Sorry
[26/09/2010 21:42:31] Robert Singer: you are mistaken I was clear from the beginning
[26/09/2010 21:42:35] Andrew Johnson: It's a moving changing target - I can't keep up - it's too hard for me
[26/09/2010 21:42:37] Robert Singer: what do you want to change
[26/09/2010 21:42:44] Andrew Johnson: Most of it
[26/09/2010 21:42:52] Robert Singer: nope
[26/09/2010 21:42:58] Andrew Johnson: Anyway
[26/09/2010 21:43:06] Andrew Johnson: I need to read your latest version
[26/09/2010 21:43:13] Andrew Johnson: I have been IN WATFORD
[26/09/2010 21:43:13] Robert Singer: tpv has it
[26/09/2010 21:43:19] Andrew Johnson: ALL DAY
[26/09/2010 21:43:31] Andrew Johnson: GAVE A TALK DROVE 240 miles
[26/09/2010 21:43:34] Andrew Johnson: takes time
[26/09/2010 21:43:42] Andrew Johnson: tired, you know these things?
[26/09/2010 21:43:58] Robert Singer: that is why from the beginning frm the first time I contacted you I wanted it to be correct
[26/09/2010 21:44:02] Robert Singer: so this would not happen
[26/09/2010 21:44:17] Andrew Johnson: Well, it didn't work did it?
[26/09/2010 21:44:28] Robert Singer: but allright I have killed my eyesight making the changes and I will make more to make you happy
[26/09/2010 21:44:30] Robert Singer: what do you want
[26/09/2010 21:50:03] Robert Singer: for the record for the last time, i never never never made up anything from Judy or you.
[26/09/2010 21:50:15] Robert Singer: why would i? that would be really stupid
[26/09/2010 21:52:22] Andrew Johnson: Oops - you called me her representative - you made that up. I sent you a comment to remove that - you didn't. This is what annoys me
[26/09/2010 21:52:38] Robert Singer: i did remove it where
[26/09/2010 21:52:42] Robert Singer: where is it now

[26/09/2010 21:52:42] Andrew Johnson: You used a fictional quote as if it was real. Need I go on?
[26/09/2010 21:52:52] Robert Singer: now or in the past
[26/09/2010 21:53:09] Robert Singer: for the last time I thought you were her representative, you act as if you are
[26/09/2010 21:53:19] Andrew Johnson: However, I will read your current article and comment further- I HAVE NOT HAD THE TIME TO READ THE LATEST VERSION.
[26/09/2010 21:53:35] Andrew Johnson: I may act as if I am many things
[26/09/2010 21:53:50] Andrew Johnson: but to make an article accurate YOU SHOULD HAVE SAID THAT
[26/09/2010 21:54:03] Robert Singer: I did at least 1000 times.
[26/09/2010 21:54:12] Robert Singer: what was I paying you for, fiction
[26/09/2010 21:54:18] Andrew Johnson: i.e. "Andrew Johnson, it could be argued, acts like Dr Judy's represeantaive"
[26/09/2010 21:54:29] Robert Singer: i removed represetative
[26/09/2010 21:54:33] Andrew Johnson: I refunded your money
[26/09/2010 21:54:45] Robert Singer: yes but you knew why i gave it
[26/09/2010 21:54:49] Robert Singer: that is the point
[26/09/2010 21:54:57] Andrew Johnson: Yes, so now oyu know why I refunded it
[26/09/2010 21:55:00] Robert Singer: i gave it to get your time to be accurate
[26/09/2010 21:55:07] Robert Singer: you never said that,
[26/09/2010 21:55:13] Andrew Johnson: no I didn't
[26/09/2010 21:55:29] Andrew Johnson: I am going to read your latest
[26/09/2010 21:55:35] Andrew Johnson: TOMORROW
[26/09/2010 21:55:39] Andrew Johnson: enough for now
[26/09/2010 21:55:42] Robert Singer: you are wasting my time and trying my patience, read it and tell me where it is in accurate and I will change it
[26/09/2010 21:56:11] Robert Singer: i removed all the ambiguiiteis from our earlier conversation
[26/09/2010 21:56:31] Robert Singer: be sure and update your casche
[26/09/2010 21:59:55] Robert Singer: wait
[26/09/2010 22:00:06] Robert Singer: you won't beleive this are you there
[26/09/2010 22:00:15] Robert Singer: this is pretty big let me verify it
[26/09/2010 22:01:14] Robert Singer: google removed it,
[26/09/2010 22:01:26] Robert Singer: can't find it if you search it
[29/09/2010 12:46:25] Robert Singer: Some very wierd stuff going on: Opednews allowed the pakalert post (original pakalert post) as a diary and have allowed me to submit my "Pakalert prove it's metaphysical" article 4 times without them banning me.
Pakistan Daily will not release it from the queue.

DailyKos has now banned all of my sockpuppets (even the ones that have not posted anything at all and the ones that have not posted anything controversial). Since I go to different wifi locations in Los Angeles to create them it is very strange they can find them especially when I have not used them yet.

Of the 75 sites that usually post Bob Singer, no one is posting "Pakalert prove it's metaphysical" but TPV Waronyou and Sitfu.

Am suppose to be on Trueott's show tonight, we'll see if he cancels.

Raelan refuses to respond to the follow up email on the two hour show where I ask her to help me create positive energy on her site.

The 911 truthers are simply ignoring the revelation they were used or claiming they knew it wasn't controlled demolition all along

[29/09/2010 12:51:02] Robert Singer: something wierd about the disinfo 404 error, search for pakalert prove and disinfo comes up first

