
Some Thoughts On The “9/11 Crash Test” Website

Andrew Johnson (based heavily on comments sent to me by an astute reader/observer)

ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

11 Sep 2012

It is ironic that I should find myself posting these “notes” on the 11th Anniversary of the event that changed the world we live in.

Quite recently, someone sent me a link to a new video which appeared entitled “Tired of War Without End” This was a well edited and well produced video which presented several key points which show that the plane crashes at the WTC were impossible. An associated website - <http://911crashtest.org/> has also come online.

[youtube:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VK_z1K3x1WI]

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VK_z1K3x1WI

An interesting proposal about a “crash test” idea is presented – funding an experiment to “prove” the official account of 911 is false. My first reaction was that just the video itself should give people a cause for re-thinking. It's a good, clear delivery etc so it will hopefully make people think about the issue more carefully. I therefore posted the following comment:

Excellent video - I do wonder if this video itself will have more effect than a crash test though!!

However, due to my experiences over the last 5 years, I suppose I am a little skeptical of people setting up projects and attempting to raise \$1000's for some cause like this. I can argue that it would be perhaps more effective if those dollars could be spent on equipping libraries with copies of Dr Judy Wood's book “Where Did The Towers Go?”.

On reviewing the comments on the above video, some interesting ones seem to have been posted by Yankee451 (any relation to "Fahrenheit 451"?) such as:

"I disagree, and it was my idea so please stop making this a Judy Wood book tour. She is vehemently against the project. Steve De'ak"

I thought that was an interesting statement partly because of how defensive he sounds, and also because of his assertion that Judy Wood is opposed to his project. Dr Judy Wood's stance on this that it is very clear what happened to the buildings, once the evidence is studied, so whether they were hit by "real" or "fake" planes is not as important as studying the evidence of what happened to the buildings. This is not "opposition" to the project – nor is it vehement. Oddly, Steve De'ak does not seem all that interested in what happened to the buildings.

"Stay focused please. This project is about the impact of the jets, not how the towers were destroyed."

Or perhaps I am being too harsh? Also, I note that he's claiming on the original home page:

"What was shown on 9/11 is physically impossible in the real world, therefore the only logical conclusion is that the videos of the plane "impacts" are fraudulent."

So why is he is apparently not that interested in the physical impossibility of what happened to the WTC buildings? Further, he says:

This is not speculation; all images and videos which depict a 9/11 plane crash have since been exposed as having been tampered-with, meaning the media were a critical part of the operation."

“All images and videos”? He doesn't offer any evidence for this statement and I would have thought it was impossible to make a convincing case for that now. Perhaps he has spent too much time reading Simon Shack's forum etc.

Could it be that he's alleging that there were no planes and nothing visible to an observer at the scene, in which case everyone who said they saw something must be lying? He does seem to imply in the video that people who said they saw planes are actors 'like extras in a movie', which will plant seeds of deep distrust in the minds of many people who are undecided - and this can also cause some people a lot of offence. And he's being rude to people who disagree with him, counter to the mild-mannered 'grandpa' demeanour he adopts in the video. When all the evidence is studied, the WTC plane stories do get rather convoluted and somewhat complicated.

It perhaps fits in with a “second-tier coverup”, because the people who still think the official version is true will see that some of his statements make no sense to them and so they will dismiss them entirely. Conversely, the people who question the official version will have the physical impossibility of the planes doing that damage to hang on to, and so support something that is still basically a lie. It's just going to stall the whole thing further in the manner we have all become accustomed to.

There's some interesting activity going on in the comments on the video - there are also users like justin39641, who apparently only uses YouTube to argue that the official story of 9/11 is entirely correct, judging from his activity feed on the channel. Is this an opportunity to watch the different tiers of the cover-up interacting with one another, perhaps? Again, we can perhaps observe the techniques of perception management in operation.

Steve De'Ak comments (backup version):

"AE911Truth
Wanted nothing to do with this test, the purpose of which is to raise awareness in the mainstream, making curious their refusal of an endorsement. I'll post their exact words on the Crash Test Website in the next few days. But this project isn't a pitch for Judy Wood either, far from it. It is what it is, and that's a Crash Test."

On one hand he's taking an evidence-based approach, which is good, but then he's limiting that to one aspect of the whole thing that is largely insignificant given that it is apparent that those responsible for 911 never intended to hide their responsibility, but did intend to hide the means by which it was done. This video, focusing as it does on non-existent planes, only serves to demonstrate what so many people already know...that planes weren't responsible. It's immune from the criticisms that Richard Gage suffers from due to his "scientifically unsound" arguments, because the arguments presented here are scientifically sound...they're just massively lacking in scope, and this is perhaps suspicious - given the increasing awareness of Dr Judy Wood's research - which he admits he is aware of:

"I am well aware of Judy Wood, and despite the fact I disagree with much of her work, she is more than welcome to partake in this project. We don't need to agree on anything beyond the test."

It's extremely odd to encounter someone who is apparently so sensible finding little to agree with in Dr Wood's research - a rigorous, totally comprehensive evidence-based study which proves most of the claims of the so-called truth movement false and impossible, and presents some compelling new avenues for study. It's suspicious in the same way as Steven Jones making basic physics errors, or Richard Gage not considering himself qualified to evaluate the seismic data, yet ostensibly being a San Francisco architect...

What does Steve De'ak think happened to the WTC Towers? If he thinks the means was conventional explosives or nuclear devices, his judgement must be called into question in a big way. He doesn't appear to want to actually consider any explanation overtly:

"Nukes?
There are easier ways to explain it."

And he also comments:

"Such certitude! The lack of debris and dust can be explained without relying on top-secret weapons that cannot be verified. If you have a genuine interest in learning the truth, you'll continue researching beyond Judy Wood."

"Beyond Judy Wood" to...where, exactly? Back the way we've all come, to controlled demolition? As he himself says, you can't have it both ways...he can't be sensible about physics on one hand and totally wrong about physics on the other hand. Giving him the benefit of the doubt, it could just be too much for him to take in at this point...but if that's the case he is still quite wrong about the facts of the matter and can be used as to promote and promulgate disinformation - without his knowledge.

We also see hints of him wanting to embroil people in back and forth discussion – which achieves little or nothing. He comments:

"Once I get the crash test site forum up we can discuss it."

He is unwilling to be open and discuss this in an open forum. I wonder why? Could it be that, by making the discussion about the planes, it's about distracting people from the means by which 911 was achieved? He has indeed opened a forum.

It is usually interesting to find a bit of background about these folks, but on his Website, Steve De'ak reveals little. On his FAQ Page in the "who" section, he states:

9/11
Crash Test can be blamed on Steve De'ak who can be reached at steve@yankee451.info.

But there is no additional information apart from him being a grandpa. However, on his "comments" page, he writes:

"for many years I was incognito, but I realized a while back that the only people I have a beef with have known who I am and where I live for quite some time, so no harm done. As far as I'm concerned, it's safer in the daylight."

In summary, Steve De'Ak could be totally sincere, it's true. I certainly liked his video initially. However, to not want to talk much about the destruction of the buildings is odd. Other comments he has made give cause for concern about his attitude to some of the most compelling and important evidence about what happened at the WTC.

And Finally...

Let us suppose the crash test experiment is successfully carried out, will it silence critics? I have to suggest that this is unlikely. However the simulation is done, it will be criticised because it will not be a close enough reproduction of the original event. For example, a critic would say... "[Oh, you didn't use 30-year old steel in your reconstruction...? Well then..." or "Oh, your wing went in vertically? That's totally different." or "Well, your wing wasn't actually attached to a plane and the rocket sled's mass - and the distribution of that mass is not the same as the original plane, so your test is not realistic." In other words, with such a limited set of evidence that you are presenting to people, it becomes easier for it to be cast aside.

Addendum Steve De'Ak posted additional comments on the David Icke Forum in Oct 2012
<http://www.davidicke.com/forum/showthread.php?t=157823&page=79>

Archived at the links below:

Dr. Judy Wood's Book Where Did The Towers Go - Page 79 - David Icke's Official Forums.htm (219 KB) (Modified: Oct 26 2012 05:22:24 PM)Dr. Judy Wood's Book Where Did The Towers Go - Page 80 - David Icke's Official Forums.htm (152 KB) (Modified: Oct 26 2012 05:22:22 PM)