

911 Evidence and Theory – Is Andrew Johnson A ‘Truth Fascist’?

Andrew Johnson,

ad.johnson@ntlworld.com(Corrections and/or Polite Comments etc Welcomed)06 Jun 2013

Video version of this article is included at the bottomAudio

Version{mp3remote}http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/2013-06-07--08-%20911%20Evidence%20and%20Theory%20-

%20Is%20Andrew%20Johnson%20A%20Truth%20Fascist.mp3{/mp3remote}

This is a response to a Red Ice posting, which is itself a response to my article entitled

Red Ice Radio joins the 911 Disinformation Promotion Brigade. Let me say at the outset that I am upset at the way this has turned out and I agree with what Henrik says in

his audio segment that this amounts to more “infighting” [or, that is how it appears to most observers] and this is not a good thing. My original posting (and many like it) is/are born out of frustration in relation to the 9/11 cover up. Before responding to Henrik’s “deposition” in more specific terms, I will state that: 1) It is true I did not contact Henrik before posting my article (because I was so upset with the Harrit interview and other interviews) – but neither did he contact me before posting his deposition. 2) I do not consider that Red Ice, as a whole, is spreading disinformation. The

title of my article was “Red Ice Radio joins the 9/11

Disinformation Promotion Brigade” (notice the 9/11 in there?) 3) My article is specifically about 9/11 – and what we know – Henrik

does not seem to like me stating that certain things are known (and yes, there are other areas of 9/11 research – and other topics that shows such as Red Ice cover - where things are not known). 4) It is dishonest to characterise evidence as theory (and vice versa). This is what Henrik did in his interview with Harrit. He could have kept everything else the same – done almost everything else the same – but my main objection is that he did this. And, in relation to the crime of 9/11 – and its investigation this, to me, is the most important thing. If this upset Henrik, or anyone, then I am sorry, but that is how things are for me. Further Points. 5) Henrik’s overall thrust in his deposition is inline with the email I

received from Red Ice Radio a day or 2 ago (please see bottom). They did not respond to the 9-11 related questions I then asked in my follow up email (or at least, not yet). 6) The Red Ice posting does not link to

my original article. My website is not mentioned (fair enough, folks can use Google – but I deliberately linked to ALL the important sources of information when I am writing articles like this). 7) In his deposition, Henrik does not read out my article in full – he does not read out the opening complimentary and explanatory remarks about the nature of his programmes (which Henrik repeatedly states “I do not understand”). 8) Henrik discusses that I mentioned we went to some trouble to get him a

copy of the book. At the time, a PDF version was prepared specially for Henrik’s interview. It is a 500-page book with 800 images (he does not mention this). We thought he had the same philosophy about knowing the truth as we do – so he would need the evidence to decide what the truth was. Henrik, however, apparently wants to remain “neutral” about what the 9/11 evidence shows (at least, on his programme). In doing this, in the Niels Harrit interview, he characterised evidence as theory and analysis as “ideas” or “opinion”. Hence, it seems we were mistaken about “how his programme would work,” in this case. 9) The title of my article is referenced quite a few times – and perhaps it

is an inflammatory title – but, it is inline with what I have written up, in detail in “9/11

Finding the Truth” – where I have used similar titles for a number of the articles. 10) Again, my specific reaction to the Harrit programme was because it was about 911. I am also interested in many of the topics that Red Ice covers and for many, we cannot know as much of the truth as we can about what happened to the WTC. (This basically boils down to the amount of available

evidence which can be studied carefully.) I do, by the way, understand Henrik's philosophy about the programme, but I don't agree that is appropriate to apply this same philosophy to the study of what happened at the WTC. 11) 9/11 was a huge crime - using black technology. It has affected the world more than probably any other topic discussed on Red Ice. Dr Wood has investigated a large part of this a crime (at the WTC site), worked out what happened and she has taken action

by submitting the evidence in a fraud case. I tried to help. This is one key thing that Henrik did not really bring out in the deposition or posting (he mentions a phrase from my article about Wood's Qui Tam case, but no details). This is very important. 12) I was not attempting to discredit Red Ice Radio as a whole! I essentially said that in the opening paragraph of my article! (Also see point 2 above.) In my article I stated about him that it was dishonest to characterise evidence as theory etc. At the beginning, I stated "Henrik Palmgren is an informed researcher who is not afraid to explore the various 'rabbit holes' that present themselves to us." I hope people, as ever, will consider ALL the evidence available here. 13) Henrik suggests several times such things as "Red Ice Radio should be run the way Andrew Johnson says" (he doesn't say this exactly - I am paraphrasing). This is not what I am saying. In this area, I appreciate some of the points Henrik makes - and this is why I wrote, in my original article "I know I might sound too harsh or judgmental, but...". However, Henrik did not read out this sentence from my article. It is true that the Harrit interview page does link to my own interview and Dr Wood's. I did note he had interviewed myself and Dr Wood in 2010. 14) I also never asked him to represent Dr Judy Wood or me. I can appreciate that what I wrote in my original article can be interpreted as suggesting that - but it does not say that! What I wrote above states that we can know the truth and speak the truth - and we can challenge those who are lying - as I am challenging lies here! 15) Henrik makes comments about asking for my "stamp of approval". That is misrepresenting what I wrote - see point (13) above. 16) I never asked them to censor or remove people from the "debate" or "discussion" - where did I suggest that? I expected Henrik to state that thermite could not turn the towers to dust. (Anyone can know this from simple observation!) I see now that this was an unrealistic hope or expectation. Also, I did not suggest we should "not allow them a voice" I suggested he could use his own voice to challenge them when they are not telling the truth. Again, I am clearly expecting too much - and, as Henrik more or less says himself, this is where we disagree on our approach to things - and perhaps why I don't or couldn't do a regular series of podcasts like he does - because, I would quickly become unpopular (I didn't write and post this article to become popular, but to point out where people are not telling the truth about what happened to the WTC.) One observation is that it seems that many people turn to services like Red Ice Radio because they feel the mainstream media is not telling them the whole truth. Should it not be important to present the truth or refer to the truth when you can prove what it is? 17) Henrik talks about 911 Round Table debates - and how they would turn out.

I agree with him about that! One only has to look on internet forums to know about this! (And of course, Mr Harrit mentioned the 911 Consensus Website at the end, so let me wish him luck!) When the truth and lies are set against one another, there will be disagreements, right?!? 18) Henrik is somewhat mistaken about "the other side talking to us" - we have talked to them in the past, and some of these conversations are documented in my book. Indeed, I referred to one such conversation (with Neil's Harrit - in 2008). Sadly, Henrik does not reference this in his posting or his deposition. He does not say "I did not realise Andrew had contacted Niels Harrit in 2008". And Dr Wood has quite correctly said in the past "The truth does not have sides." 19) Henrik makes a number of more emotive remarks, trying to suggest I have said things I have not said. For example, he says "When I read Andrew's material it's like other people should not be allowed to express opinions." This is not true! What I asked for in my article was for people to understand the difference between opinion and evidence! Also, when I was referring to George Monbiot, I was specifically referring to what we now know about 9/11 (and climate change). We know that Monbiot is wrong about 9/11! (That is to say, it isn't just that Monbiot has "another view.") 20) Again, let me re-emphasise that in terms of 9/11, we're talking about a crime - a crime that Dr Judy Wood and myself have investigated - and Henrik has (by his own admission) not investigated - at least, not to the same extent. Harrit, Rys, Barrett, Gaffney - and many others who talk about 9/11 have

not put their evidence up to legal scrutiny (and incurred the associated costs, as we did). Instead, for example, Jeremy Rys has mischaracterised the evidence that Wood has submitted to court (describing it as “space beams”). Dr Wood’s qualifications and experience are also overlooked. Out of all these people, in relation to 9/11, Dr Wood has the most appropriate expertise to determine what happened at the WTC! 21) Henrik swears a few times in the deposition and then, around the 30 minute mark, says I (Andrew Johnson) “toot this religiously?” Does Henrik think I should not tell people what I know is true? I should not tell them that the WTC turned mostly to dust? Instead, I should say “well, it might’ve been thermite, but if I don’t include the thermite in my discussion, I would be being religious.” What nonsense. 22) Henrik makes points about infighting – I agree with him on this, but why is he insulting me – isn’t this “more of the same”? So what are the options when we know liars are receiving promotion? To “keep quiet”? Heck, all I did was post an article on my website. And, according to Henrik’s philosophy about things, “it’s just my opinion”. Right? So why is Henrik so bothered about what I have written here? He should let people make their own minds up about it, according to his way of doing things? (Instead, he spends good portions of an hour attacking and insulting my character, whilst omitting important elements of my original posting.) Also, Henrik says that I do not know him as a person – and neither does he know me, yet he makes generalisations about how I must think. 23) Henrik later called me “childish” and then compares me to the Official Group that investigated 9/11. Wow – I must be powerful! He then later calls me a “truth fascist” – a very loaded term. But hey, maybe that’s accurate. I suppose I’d rather be called a “truth fascist” than a “lie fascist”! Perhaps I should even take this as a complement... as it means I am uncompromising when it comes to the truth...? 24) Henrik, thankfully, reads out the conclusion to my article – but then kind of implies that I am wrong to be confident that I/we do know these things. He then mentions Richard Andrew Grove! He is not mentioned in my article and I have not referenced Grove’s work anywhere on the site! I actually found Richard Andrew Grove’s interview very interesting – but couldn’t really make any useful comments about it, as I have not studied it in depth. I never said what I wrote about the WTC disqualified Grove’s work! Why did Henrik include this? In referencing the other speakers, I linked to specific information and evidence about what they said and why I considered it to be disinformation. Henrik does not specifically mention Rys defacing images of our books and using them in the videos. I don’t think he specifically mentions why I was so upset that thermite was being touted by Harrit as any kind of valid explanation for the WTC’s destruction. However, Henrik does make some mention of how myself and Dr Wood have been attacked. 25) I am not afraid my conclusions will be discredited – I post them because I consider these conclusions and these pieces of evidence are important to our future – all of us. Henrik clearly disagrees – as there aren’t any conclusions that he thinks are worth taking these sorts of actions over. 26) So, now, because I have posted these conclusions, I “am the enemy” – and Henrik has spent a whole hour responding to my article, attacking my character and my approach, whilst missing out important parts of what I actually wrote above (so I have had to invest more time in addressing these omissions here) – see point 22. 27) Once again, I am sorry if I have upset any Red Ice listeners or guests – or, basically, anyone. This was not my intent. My intent is to try and “keep the record straight” in terms of what happened at the WTC. In his discussion, Henrik does not make this his focus – but it is in mine. 28) In summary, my main criticism of Henrik, even if I wrote it “badly” in the article above, is this: It is dishonest to characterise evidence as theory (and vice versa). This is what Henrik did in his interview with Harrit. He could have kept everything else the same – done almost everything else the same – but my main objection is that he did this. And, because this is all in relation to the crime of 9/11 this is, to me, the most important thing. If this upset Henrik, or anyone, then I am sorry, but that is how things are for me. 29) Again, in this article, I am just expressing my opinion about the recent Red Ice 911-related Programmes – and I have not expressed opinions about other Red Ice Programmes. Other people can decide whether they agree with anything I write here! Please remember that the important thing here is not Andrew Johnson or Red Ice Radio – it is the evidence of what happened on 9/11 – and what it means to our future. In reviewing both Henrik’s response, and my own, please consider if I have said anything which is untrue. Also please consider if anything Henrik has said is untrue. Well, the response is longer than the article! I

do hope it was worth you spending the time reading this... Here is the email I received from Red Ice a few days ago. A note is below that, then my response to the email. (My questions to them about 911 evidence have not yet received a response.)

From:
[mailto:----@redicecreations.com]

Sent: 03 June 2013 22:09

To: ad.johnson@ntlworld.com

Subject: Red Ice Radio joins the 911 Disinformation Promotion Brigade
Andrew, You should be ashamed of yourself for writing such garbage about Red Ice after all our years of hard work and dedication. And especially after we were nothing but kind and helpful to you. In turn you behave as a fearful worm, trashing us behind our back because you KNOW the truth about 911. Well how nice for you to be so certain. How enlightened you must be to determine what is theory and what is knowledge. Why are you so fearful to even listen to another person's point of view? Time and time again we have said just because we interview someone it does not mean we agree with them. In fact, we did Judy a favor by interviewing Niels. But you lack the capacity to even begin to understand that principle. You lack the capacity to understand what really occurred at the end of that interview. So what if we interview someone who you don't agree with. Next time, we will be sure to call you and ask first to see if it is ok with you Andrew since you know the truth. So what Henrik called Judy's work a theory because at the end of the day, it is to us. Have you seen the energy weapon with your own eyes? Yet you become high strung like a little neurotic puppy, peeing on the floor when something doesn't fit in line with your belief or threatens it. Most of life on this planet IS speculation, ideas, theories. You lack the ability to be a rational human being, let alone kind to your fellow truth seekers. Instead you are quick to judge and slander. That speaks volumes about who you are.

"I know I might sound too harsh or judgemental, but we do know what happened to the WTC now - so to characterise knowledge as "theory" is dishonest. Henrik should know better."

Oh so we all know what happened with all certainty now, hu? Wow, what arrogance. You do not even know Henrik, other than the kindness he showed you...not to mention years and years of his hard work making it possible to interview researchers. In fact, Henrik was the first to interview Judy! Yet you the enlightened one, trash a kind man you do not know personally telling him who is disinfo and who is not. You accuse Henrik of being disinfo. You are so far gone while you accuse us of not being able to reason.

"Perhaps, as far as Red Ice goes, this shows that being immersed in "conspiracy culture" affects your memory or your ability to reason and you can end up not knowing up from down...? When I posted this on my Facebook Page, people thought I was being unfair to Red Ice/Henrik."

Of course people thought that because you are being out of line completely but you cannot even see yourself! You say "immersed in conspiracy culture" (after years and years of programs on a variety of topics) yet you yourself behave like a religious zealot in your remarks, gone beyond the point of being able to see up from down.

Instead of being an arrogant truth fascist telling other people what they should do or what they should think, look at your own self Andrew. Learn to be a big man and let others make up their own minds and live their own lives. It is YOU who is spreading disinfo about a man (and others who help that man) who you do not know. Your words will have consequences by your own doing.

Note,
Henrik Palmgren was not the first person to interview Dr Judy Wood –

one of her earliest radio interviews was about her 9/11 Research was with
Ambrose Lane in September 2006.

Additionally, Mel Fabregas interviewed Dr Wood in Nov 2009... Henrik Palmgren's interview with Dr Wood took place in
January 2011.

From: Andrew Johnson [mailto:ad.johnson@ntlworld.com] Sent: 03 June 2013 22:23 To:
----@redicecreations.com] Subject: RE: Red Ice Radio joins the 911 Disinformation
Promotion Brigade Dear _____ Thank you for your message. I am not ashamed of myself.
Thank you for your past kindness. Can you please point out: 1) Where in my posting I was a "fearful worm"? 2) Where I
have "trashed" you? (I never mentioned you in
the article, I mentioned Henrik and Red Ice radio) I stated that it was
dishonest for Henrik to characterise evidence as theory. (Theory cannot be
submitted to court). 3) Anything I said about you or Henrik or 9/11 that is
untrue? 4) Where I am afraid of someone else's view? Do you know the difference between "a view" and "truth"? Is
it "a view" that your name is ---- and my name is Andrew? (Pick an example of
this sort of thing to see if it helps). On 9/11 did the towers turn to dust or did they not? (Watch
some of the videos) ----, has Niels Harrit submitted a court case based on
evidence he has collected? Do you care more about what I have written about what I
have written about Red Ice Radio than what happened on 9/11? Why have you
reacted this way to my knowledge of WHAT happened on 9/11? Do you care about the
cover up of what happened on 9/11 and those who are assisting in it? (It's
something I care about deeply, which is why I have gone through the painful task
of documenting it over the last 6-7 years or so.) To me, your message is extremely telling. Perhaps you will
consider what I have written above and in my article more carefully - or perhaps
you won't. Perhaps you will consider it arrogant of me to state that today is
Monday and tomorrow is Tuesday. Best Wishes Andrew Johnson