

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

Andrew Johnson (ad.johnson@ntlworld.com) – 1 June 2010

In a follow-up to the earlier posting, I felt I needed to add this, since being sent a link to another copy of Khalezov's video series.

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

On this page, there is a re-posting of Dimitri's analysis. In part 10 of the analysis we start getting to his rather detailed description of what happened when the supposed 150 kiloton nuclear device exploded. I have saved a couple of still shots below. Here we see his description of the nuke explosion being forced up into the tower.

Here, Dimitri describes the sequence of events during the first few milliseconds of the nuke explosion and how the rock around the exploding nuke becomes crushed or damaged. He posits that the damaged zone extended "up into the tower" to a height of 300 metres:

He claims that this caused the building to turn to dust (as shown in the above diagram). However, it is important to realize that this contradicts what he said in part 9, as shown below:

Here, in part 9, he says that a kind of "nuclear furnace" was created and the building kind of "melted down" into it – this is my own interpretation of what he shows in the diagram above – please watch his presentation to make sure I am not misquoting him. So, the contradiction is – how can the building "melt down" into the furnace, yet also turn to dust?

Additionally, the idea that the heat and melting would solely be confined to

the structure of the WTC is rather difficult to swallow – such intense heat would radiate out into the surroundings

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

See: <http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/DEW/StarWarsBeam6.html>

Figure 4 1 - GZ

workers descend into the subbasements below WTC2. While there is extensive damage, there is little building debris at the bottom of the hole. There is no sign of molten metal. A worker in the distance walks along a massive core column. (photofiled 9/18/01) Source

Figure 4 2 This photo was taken inside the mall. The store sign "innovation" is visible on the left.

(photo filed 9/19/01) Source

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

More E-mail Flim-Flam

I was contacted again by Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez, who also had an exchange with Dimitri Khalezov – some of this exchange is posted below.

Mr Rodriguez notes:

Within this recent reply, there are MAJOR contradictions in what he says.

For example, in one part of his reply, he says “I could explain the undamaged Bath Tub satisfactorily, but I will save us both time

by not explaining it to you since you would not believe me anyway”.

Then, later in the message, he writes, “I am an eye-witness, not an expert, and to be honest, I don’t even know what is the ‘BathTub””.

So, we have him contradicting himself in the same letter, saying that “he can explain the BathTub just fine, but won’t explain it to me because he thinks I have closed my mind off to him”, and then a few paragraphs later, he admits that he doesn’t even know what the BathTub is, even though he says he can explain why it wasn’t damaged!

Also of note here is Mr Khalezov’s statement from his e-mail of Thurs 20th May:

The point is that yesterday Andrew Johnson opened a new Internet page here:

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/Cognoscence/message/4555>

where he attempted to criticize me and my work (which was especially strange due to the fact that after long hesitation he admitted that I was right and actually surrounded his former position on alleged DEW).

This is a lie. So now we see the “object of the exercise” more clearly – to use up our time, muddle things up and go round and round in exchanges like this. The problem is that if we are seen to completely ignore flawed analyses like these, we are accused of not telling the truth.

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

From: Dimitri A. Khalezov [mailto:dkhalezov@gmail.com]

Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 9:09 AM

To: Abrahm@Mindoutpsyde.com

Subject: from Dimitri attached one more

Hi, Abe.

I would like to send you one more attached letter of mine.

It was addressed to not unknown Andrew Johnson, another follower of Dr Judy Wood. I already explained about him to you. The point is that yesterday Andrew Johnson opened a new Internet page here:

<http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/Cognoscence/message/4555>

where he attempted to criticize me and my work (which was especially strange due to the fact that after long hesitation he admitted that I was right and actually surrounded his former position on alleged DEW).

I was obliged to send him some clarification letter which I would like you to have a copy of. Hope you find it interesting. It is attached.

Please, confirm if you received it. Sometimes my e-mails disappear and I always want to know if they were able to pass through or not.

This is my second e-mail with attached Word file (the first one was yesterday).

Dimitri.

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

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

Sent: Saturday, May 29, 2010 8:46 PM

To: 'Dimitri A. Khalezov'

Subject: RE: from Dimitri attached one more

Hey Dimitri,

Unfortunately after watching these many hours of video, my mind is still confused as to how you draw the conclusions you do. You shared very little

evidence with us in the movie which supports your theory of nuclear demolition. Yes, you provided lots of video testimonies and evidence about various things, like why planes did not hit the buildings, and that the definition of 'ground zero' used to be related to nuclear devices, and other such things, but in terms of hard evidence which suggests that precisely placed underground nuclear weapons were used to turn the towers into dust, there was very little if any presented in the film series.

For example, you did not provide documents which reveal that the WTC buildings were prepared with nuclear demolition in mind. These documents should be easy for someone with your credentials to acquire, because they would be part of the normal building plans. Instead, you expect the reader to simply 'take your word' for it because of your military experience.

Another great example of the lack of hard evidence you provide, is the lack of evidence that Controlled Demolition, Inc. has done any such "underground nuclear demolitions" of any buildings, nor have you provided any proof that any building has ever been demolished in the history of controlled demolitions using 'underground nuclear explosions'. If other buildings, military or not, have been brought down do to controlled demolition with underground nuclear weapons, surely you could at least provide some videos, photos, and documents, which show enormous steel and concrete buildings being turned into fine, microscopic dust, using underground nuclear weapons as you describe.

Furthermore, in your video series, you fail to explain things like why steel and concrete were turned to dust, while aluminum was only bent or bunt, and paper was completely unharmed. Certainly, a nuclear blast would have turned all these building materials to dust, not just some of them. You fail to even mention this important piece of evidence. You also fail to explain other large portions of evidence, such as the intact PATH trains and the WTC bathtubs, the presence and lack of reporting of Hurricane Erin, the Alaskan Magnometer readings at all 5 stations which indicate a huge disturbance in the magnetosphere just as the /11 attacks happened, and more. I have only listed a small portion of the evidence which you have failed to explain, while also bringing up the very concerning lack of evidence which you have provided us viewers.

In conclusion, not only does your theory fail at explaining a large amount of evidence observed at Ground Zero, but you have failed to share an enormous amount of technical information and proof, such as building plans, nuclear demolition videos, etc., with us as well. So, not only is your theory less-than-optimal in comparison to Dr. Wood's conclusions, but furthermore, your theory is far less evidence-based than hers. I see no reason to support your work and your criticism of Dr. Wood considering the extreme lack of evidence you have shared with me.

Sorry, but I respectfully disagree with your conclusions.

Thanks anyway for your time.

-Abe

Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez

M2 Medical Student

B.S. Biology / Neurobiology

FROM: '911thology'

SUBJECT: 'your final
answer'

DATE: May 29th,
2010

Dear Abe.

As you could probably understand I am quite a busy person and I spent so much time on trying to convince you simply because after reading your multiple posts on various forums regarding Dr Judy Wood I felt a kind of pity for you, because you appeared to me a sincere person cheated by some crooks. Trust me, I have more than enough people who believed my presentation at once and they would not accept anything else, and this number includes such prominent 9/11 scholar as Jeff King, for example. So, it does not actually change anything in principle if this number will be more or less by one person only. Still, it is a pity for me that you so stubbornly refuse to believe the obvious. I will not write to you anything more, because I do not engage in discussions -- it is useless in any case, according to my experience: people either believe this presentation of mine at once, or they disbelieve it at once and there is no way to convince them even if you answer all their questions. I think it has something to do with brainwashing these people had undergone prior to watching my movie and damages became irreparable. So, it is just to explain why I usually do not argue with them. It is only a loss of precious time. However, not to leave your letter without answer, I will answer all your points mentioned below -- I am pretty sure that it will not change your mind anyway and it is a loss of my time and yours, but still, you will get your answers which are below:

Unfortunately after watching these many hours of video, my mind is still

confused as to how you draw the conclusions you do. ----- this I can't help, unfortunately.

You shared very little evidence with us in the movie which supports your theory of nuclear demolition. ----- you must be laughing at me. If an eye-witness steps forward and testifies (even under oath if necessary) that he knew about existence of an emergency nuclear demolition even back in the 80s from his former service in the Soviet nuclear intelligence and you still claim that this is a 'little evidence', I have nothing to comment. It is just a mockery of justice from your side. A testimony of an eye-witness (especially of a cool-blooded professional, not of a lay passer-by) is the first and foremost evidence in a list of all evidences possible. Besides, you can not treat an eye-witness in the manner you attempted. As you probably know, an eye-witness technically can not be 'right or wrong'. He could only be a truthful witness or a false witness. If he is a truthful witness then you have no choice -- you have to believe him, because he saw something which you did not see. If he is a false witness -- he is a criminal then. He must be placed behind bars for his false testimony. To re-phrase it, I could put it this way: if Dr Judy Wood could be technically 'right or wrong' in her bizarre presumptions, I can't be 'right or wrong'. I could only say truth or lie intentionally and maliciously. By claiming such a thing you simply call me a false eye-witness and therefore you call me a criminal. Thanks for it.

Yes, you provided lots of video testimonies and evidence about various things, like why planes did not hit the buildings, and that the definition of 'ground zero' used to be related to nuclear devices, and other such things, but in terms of hard evidence which suggests that precisely placed underground nuclear weapons were used to turn the towers into dust, there was very little if any presented in the film series. ----- again, you must be laughing at me. I spent like an hour explaining physical properties of deep underground nuclear explosions and the way a nuclear explosion's energy is transformed into a 'crushing wave' directed upwards and you would still call it 'very little' and even 'if any'? Just to let you know, that while the movie was still on YouTube I had feedbacks from many professionals in technical field -- like structural engineers, architects and even doctors of physics - who expressed their gratitude for my explanation because I made it so clear for them. Therefore what you say about 'very little' and 'if any' sounds nothing less than a mockery for me. But it is OK for me, I have quite a few critics anyway, so it will not change anything if one more person joined their ranks.

For example, you did not provide documents which reveal that the WTC buildings were prepared with nuclear demolition in mind. ----- this is a ridiculous demand. I have no way to obtain this kind of document and definitely I have no obligation whatsoever to show it to you. And even if by any chance (perhaps by a miracle of The Most High only) I would have such a document in my hands you and your kind would not believe me anyway: now you accuse me of being a false eye-witness, but if I would have such a document you would accuse me further - of being a document forger. It is clear to me.

These documents should be easy for someone with your credentials to acquire, because they would be part of the normal building plans. ----- I have no 'credentials' to obtain any thing like this. I am a Russian, not an American, I live in Thailand, not in America, and so I am not covered by your 'Freedom of Information Act'. You could (perhaps) demand such a thing from the US authorities as being a citizen, but I could not. But in any case you must be insane if you believe that

such a thing would be given to you (or to me) simply because you want it. The US government did not even want to release the Pentagon strike videos and list of alleged 'passengers' of concerned flights and now you sincerely believe that they would give you a nuclear demolition plan of the WTC? You must be insane, man. I begin to fear you.

Instead, you expect the reader to simply 'take your word' for it because of your military experience. ----- I do not expect anything at all. I provided my eye-witness testimony which you MUST believe ('take my word') because this is a property of eye-witnesses in general -- to be believed. If an eye witness (like janitor Rodriguez who claim to hear and see explosions in the WTC basement, for example) says something you don't have doubt whether to believe him or not -- you simply believe him. Why then you doubt what I say? I repeat it one more time -- I am not an expert in this capacity, I am an EYE-WITNESS who MUST be believed, because otherwise I must be arrested for the false testimony. Do you realize this, at last, that you accuse me of being a criminal now?

Another great example of the lack of hard evidence you provide, is the lack of evidence that Controlled Demolition, Inc. has done any such "underground nuclear demolitions" of any buildings, ----- I provided more than hard evidence, because I put forward a testimony of an eye-witness who testified (and is ready to testify under oath in front of judges) that there was the in-built nuclear demolition scheme of the WTC prior to the 9/11. This is the hardest of the hardest -- first degree evidence -- a testimony of a live eye-witness who is ready to swear by the Name of The Most High that what he says is truth, the only truth and nothing but the truth. What evidence could be harder than this?

nor have you provided any proof that any building has ever been demolished in the history of controlled demolitions using 'underground nuclear explosions'. ----- I can't provide such evidence you demanded simply because no building has ever been demolished prior to the 9/11 by underground nuclear explosion. The WTC South Tower was the very first in history to be demolished in such a manner, and the WTC-7 was the last (really the last, because you could be certain that they would never demolish any other building by nuclear explosion after the realized how awful their miscalculation was). Therefore you demand is ridiculous.

If other buildings, military or not, have been brought down do to controlled demolition with underground nuclear weapons, surely you could at least provide some videos, photos, and documents, which show enormous steel and concrete buildings

being turned into fine, microscopic dust, using underground nuclear weapons as you describe. ----- see my answer above. No building has ever been demolished in this way prior to the 9/11 and I am sure it would never ever happen again.

Furthermore, in your video series, you fail to explain things like why steel and concrete were turned to dust, while aluminum was only bent or bunt, and paper was completely unharmed. ----- I have no obligation to explain any and every

minor detail First of all, I have no such an obligation because I am primarily an eye-witness, and my secondary capacity -- i.e. that of a technical expert - was nothing but my voluntarily self-assignment which I could withdraw in any moment together with all my alleged 'obligations' that might arise from such a position. I can easily retire as an expert leaving myself a position of an eye-witness only. Meaning if you don't like my version of nuclear demolition mechanics -- I retire and you are welcome to offer you own version of nuclear demolition mechanics, instead. Secondly, I can assure you that I could explain (or at least attempt to explain) even these minor details you have mentioned above, however, if I indulge in this addressing any and every minor details, my movie would not last 4+ hours, but would last like 30 hours. Hope you a reasonable enough to realize that this was not an option. Therefore I addressed only the major points, skipping minor details. But it does not mean that I have no explanations for these minor details. I have the explanations and you don't have to doubt it.

Certainly, a nuclear blast would have turned all these building materials to dust, not just some of them. You fail to even mention this important piece of evidence. ----- see my answer above. Moreover, I could easily explain why paper was not pulverized and indeed I explained it to many people who asked me this question after watching my video and they were satisfied with my answer. However, it is useless to spend my precious time to explain it to you, since even if I do so you would not believe me anyway; therefore I skip this explanation here.

You also fail to explain other large portions of evidence, such as the intact

PATH trains
----- I could easily explain it and indeed I explained it to many people.

and the WTC bathtubs, ----- again, I could easily explain it and I indeed explained it to many people.

the presence and lack of reporting of Hurricane Erin, ----- I believe that this is the most ridiculous piece of alleged 'evidence' absolutely irrelevant to the 9/11 (if true at all). I would not even bother spending my precious time trying to find any explanation to this most ridiculous argument. If you disagree with this I could also demand from Dr Judy Wood to find a satisfactorily explanation to the alleged fact that all crocodiles in Africa allegedly stop mating at the moment of the WTC collapses. Would she bother to address this 'most important' point of mine regarding the crocodiles? I seriously doubt it.

the Alaskan Magnometer readings at all 5 stations which indicate a huge disturbance in

the magnetosphere just as the /11 attacks happened, ----- this is not valid

evidence for me but merely a hearsay. I would not believe ANY official data that comes from the US Government controlled sources and the so-called 'Alaska Magnometer' and its alleged 'readings' have definitely something to do with the United States officials. This fact alone devaluates this alleged 'evidence'. I would prefer to ignore it completely as potential lie, and even if it were true it does not mean at all that these alleged 'readings' had anything to do with the WTC demolition. They (if only this is not lie) perhaps, could be relevant, as you say, to the 'attacks', but definitely not to demolitions. I could even try to think about it and try to find some explanation to these alleged 'readings' if these three conditions are met: 1) if I see the actual papers; 2) if I know for sure the time they were recorded; 3) if I know for sure that this is not bogus stuff, concocted to distract attention of researchers from real things dangerous to the US Government. However, because I have none of these three conditions met, I would not even bother to find any explanation to this definitely minor point.

and more.

I have only listed a small portion of the evidence which you have failed to explain, -----
I would like to repeat myself by stating as follows:

1) My being an eye-witness

who could testify under oath that he knew about existence of the WTC in-built nuclear demolition scheme is more than enough. I don't need to bother explaining technical details of actual nuclear demolition, and, moreover, I have no obligation to do so. An eye-witness definitely has no obligation to act as a technical expert, in addition. It is enough for him to act as an eye-witness. Therefore it is more than ingratitude to blame me for 'failing to explain' or 'failing to explain satisfactorily' anything at all. Be grateful that I attempted to explain to you at least something, while definitely having no obligation to do so. Don't like my explanation of nuclear demolition mechanics? Well. Offer your own explanation of nuclear demolition mechanics. You seem not to realize difference between me and Dr Judy Wood. In her case she has definite obligation to prove and to defend her bizarre claims about alleged 'directed energy weapons'. And you and I have our undeniable rights to demand from her to explain to us every minor technical detail -- which she is obliged to explain to us indeed in order to defend her theory. Unlike her I don't have such obligations whatsoever. It is enough to me to state that I am a former officer of the Soviet nuclear intelligence (don't even doubt that I could prove it without any problem) and that during time of my service there I got to know about existence of the in-built WTC nuclear demolition scheme, exact details of which I don't know. That's it. Period. You could ask me why the Towers were pulverized? My answer is: I don't know, I am not a demolition expert. And I will answer to any and every your question in the same manner: I am not a demolition expert and I don't know and don't want to know why the Towers were actually pulverized and why the bathtub's wall was not damaged. I don't even know what is the 'bathtub'. I only know that the WTC nuclear demolition scheme of the WTC existed and that is it. See the difference between me and Dr Judy Wood? While she can not refuse to provide technical explanations to defend her theory I definitely have all rights to refuse to provide technical explanations to defend my witness testimony. Because a witness testimony does not need to be defended.

2) Irrespectively of what

is said in Clause 1) I could say that I indeed could provide more than satisfactorily explanations to variety of minor details not addressed in my video presentation. Even though I have no obligation to provide these explanations due to the considerations

mentioned in Clause 1) I still could still explain many things. However, as I have said my presentation is now already more than 4 hours and I can't afford making it any longer by adding more and more explanations to multiple minor details. But it does not mean that I can't explain them. I definitely can do it. Despite of having no obligation of explaining due to my being a humble eye-witness, but not a self-proclaimed technical expert like Dr Judy Wood or Steven Jones.

while also bringing up the very concerning lack of evidence which you have provided us viewers. ----- as I have mentioned at least twice above a testimony of an eye-witness under oath is the hardest kind of evidence that ever existed in jurisprudence. I could provide THIS kind. While Dr Judy Wood can not testify under oath to her claims. And neither any other conspiracy theorist would ever dare to invoke the Name of The Most High to defend his particular conspiracy theory. Unlike them I could testify under oath that the WTC nuclear demolition scheme indeed existed. Is it not 'evidence' in your opinion? Therefore your demand concerning alleged 'lack of evidence' is ridiculous.

In conclusion, not only does your theory ----- mine is not a 'theory'. Dr Judy Wood's one -- is a 'theory'. Steven Jones' one -- is a theory. But mine is an eye-witness testimony. See the difference?

fail at explaining a large amount of evidence observed at Ground Zero, ----- as I have already mentioned that as an eye-witness (rather than a technical expert) I do not have any obligation to explain anything at all. An eye-witness' obligation is not to explain, but to testify.

but you have failed to share an enormous amount of technical information and proof, such as building plans, nuclear demolition videos, etc., with us as well. ----- I have never had them in my hands so I had nothing to share. And in any case if it would be definitely beneficial to a trial if an eye-witness would bring some written document in addition to his oral testimony, it can't be consider a 'failure' if an eye-witness does not possess such a document. It by no means devaluates his actual oral testimony. So your demand is totally wrongful.

So, not only is your theory less-than-optimal in comparison to Dr. Wood's conclusions, ----- I have no comment. Only laugh.

but furthermore, your theory is far less evidence-based than hers. ----- lol.

I see no reason to support

your work ----- I don't need your support and have never asked for it. I only thought you were a sincere person cheated by crooks and I attempted to bring you to the right path by explaining the very truth to you. I have never asked for any thing in return.

and your criticism of Dr. Wood considering the extreme lack of evidence you have shared with me. ----- I have never requested you to support me in criticizing Dr Wood either, because I don't even consider her theory worthy enough to criticize it myself, not to say to involve others into this process. I simply don't care about her theory and would not even bother to spend time criticizing it. Perhaps, you got me wrong.

Sorry, but I respectfully disagree with your conclusions. ----- Thanks for you respect (if it is only respectful to accuse a genuine eye-witness of being a false eye-witness). But thanks anyway, if you sincerely believe that you show any respect. And apparently you have no obligation to agree with my conclusions. It is entirely up to you, so you don't even need to apologize.

Thanks anyway for your time. ----- thank you too for your time.

You don't need to answer to this letter, but, please, confirm that you received it.

Dimitri. “

Abraham Hafiz Rodriguez

M2 Medical Student

B.S. Biology /
Neurobiology
See part 1 here