

The New “9/11 Hijackers”?

[Andrew Johnson](#), Feb 2007

9/11 – It Controls Our Lives

After 5 years, many many aspects of domestic and foreign policy in both the USA and UK are based on a false premise – that the 9/11 attacks were committed by Islamic fundamentalist hijackers in a plot to “attack the freedom” enjoyed by people living in Western Democratic Societies. 9/11 Truth Campaigners, like me, now know that this story is false and that we must, as quickly as possible, make as many people as possible aware of the depth of this falsehood, and its implications.

We know that WTC Towers 1, 2 and 7 were *not* destroyed by jet fuel and jet impacts. More and more people are beginning to realise the official story is a gigantic lie. We are now battling to get the truth out to people who need to understand that they are being spoon-fed a diet of fear and misinformation. Mainstream media will not treat the issue seriously, and the language they use to describe our efforts to expose the truth is usually tainted with ridicule and/or disbelief, though recently, in the USA, things have begun to take a slightly different direction.

For those of us engaged in this battle, it is sometimes easy to think that we now know enough about the realities of what happened on 9/11 to campaign and we should focus on that and keep our momentum going. However, perhaps we should remember, too, that the 9/11 perpetrators (“perps”) are still at work – they didn’t just “disappear” or “go underground” when the 9/11 Truth Campaign began to get some traction (more so in the USA than the UK). We should realise that the perps’ tactics are to infiltrate, decoy, distract, trash and ridicule and those tactics will be applied to 9/11 Truth Campaign groups in exactly the same way as they are applied to other protest groups such as Amnesty International and Stop The War. (These groups, for example have not, to my knowledge, yet made any public statements about the proof that 9/11 was an Inside Job.)

When we join a campaign such as the one for 9/11 Truth, perhaps there is an expectation that all fellow campaigners – especially those who become prominent – are involved for the same reasons we are. Also, because of the particularly fundamental nature of 9/11 truth, we possibly assume fellow campaigners will be open-minded enough to dispassionately evaluate pertinent evidence regarding the events of 9/11 in an effort to determine what really happened. This expectation is perhaps brought about by our change in attitude from “believing what the media spoon-feeds us” to an attitude of looking more critically at evidence, from different sources, and deciding why and how this evidence is being brought to our attention, and what its meaning is. One of the key phrases that we come across is “Cui Bono?” – “Who Benefits?”. Additionally, we learn to “follow the money” - i.e. an unfolding agenda can often be seen to be orchestrated by bodies with a large amount of cash.

(<http://www.ae911truth.org/>) has not discussed or mentioned in any detail Prof Wood’s extensive study – even though Prof Wood herself has degrees in engineering subjects.

Ancillary to the study of the WTC photographic evidence that Dr Wood has studied, it has been found that a number of companies that NIST contracted to contribute to the NCSTAR 1 report have links to Directed Energy research or products. One example is ARA (Applied Research Associates – www.ara.com) who produced the plane crash animations. They also are a defence contractor and Silver Level Founding Sponsors of the Directed Energy Professional Society (DEPS) - see <http://www.deps.org/DEPSpages/sponsors.html>

As a note to this area of study, former transport secretary, Norman Mineta, is frequently quoted as someone who tried to highlight anomalies in the story of VP Cheney’s account of what happened with the supposed plane which hit the Pentagon. (Mineta stated to Lee Hamilton, of the 9/11 Commission, that Mineta was in a bunker when Cheney apparently *declined* to give a shoot down order for a plane that was about to crash into the Pentagon – see <http://911research.wtc7.net/disinfo/alibis/chenev.html>) Note that *if* the events went as Mineta described, the fellow coming and going from the room wouldn’t have had time to leave the room and return. If the “plane” were actually travelling at 550 mph, 10 miles is covered in about 1 minute. Part of that time would be spent in the dialog, “do the orders still stand?” So, it would seem unlikely that this fellow would have time to even leave the room and return for the next dialog. It turns out that Mineta himself was former Vice President of Lockheed Martin (see <http://www.whitehouse.gov/government/mineta-bio.html>) – one of the world’s biggest defence contractors and also one the primary contractors in the Airborne Laser Project which is described as “America’s first directed energy weapon system”

(see http://www.boeing.com/news/releases/2000/news_release_000408a.html.)

Conclusion

We therefore seem to have a range of evidence that a directed energy weapon was used as the primary method of destruction a number of the WTC buildings. We have also seen the links between certain people who would seem to support “9/11 truth” and directed energy contracts or projects.

We have seen a number of statements suggesting that a large-scale or nuclear attack on the USA by Al Qaida is imminent. Within certain quarters of the 9/11 truth movement, we have seen the suggestion that “mini-nukes” were used in the destruction on the WTC and that US cities already have them “pre-wired”.

If we posit that the mini-nuke idea is another “cover story” for what happened on 9/11, and we consider that the Directed Energy Weapon might be orbital, it would potentially allow the 9/11 perpetrators to fake a nuke attack on a target of their choice. The main point here is that any *real* nukes being moved by land, air or sea would probably be, at some point, detected if any of the current security systems actually function in any useful way.

Kevin Barrett and others beginning to speak out. The fact that Jim Fetzer and Steve Jones seemed to be bringing these people together seemed to be a super development – giving real hope. [I was prompted to write to my own University](#) to ask for permission to give a presentation at the Main Campus in Milton Keynes (the request was denied).

At around the same time, Prof Jones had discovered (or been advised of) some unusual footage from the [Camera Planet Archive \(posted on Google Video\) which apparently showed Molten Metal](#) flowing from the South Tower prior to its collapse. He had asked for help in extracting this from Google Video format to one that could be used on a Web Page or PowerPoint presentation ([so it could be shown side-by-side with a staged thermite experiment as a comparison](#)). I had the software to make this a relatively simple task, so I was happy to help out. I was pleased to see that Steve Jones originally referenced this in his paper ([“Why Indeed did the World Trade Center Towers Collapse?”](#)).

And so, at the time, it seemed that thermite played a role in the destruction of the WTC towers – we seemed to have an answer to *part* of the mystery – the use of thermite was enough to prove it was an Inside Job. Even at that time, though, it seemed clear that the thermite could only have been used to cut the steel beams and that *something else* must have been used as an explosive (as seen in the squibs, for example). Indeed, Prof Jones does mention the use of “other explosives” in the destruction of WTC 1 & 2. He also mentions the Controlled Demolition of WTC 7 – again enough to show that 9/11 was an Inside Job.

However, more than a year after the publication of Steve Jones paper, we are still (apparently) no further forward in engaging other members of the academic community with the evidence.

During the discussion of Steve Jones’ paper, I learned of [Prof Judy Wood’s “Billiard Ball” example paper](#) – much shorter and simpler than Steve Jones paper, which focused on the freefall aspect of the collapse of the towers (the same evidence I had focused on in my “physics forum challenge”, but using a more basic and less complete analysis). Later I learned from Judy that Steve Jones had disclosed her name in a lecture he gave when she had requested that he did not do this. This seemed an unfortunate oversight – perhaps a simple slip of the tongue?

Sometime later, I read the article by Morgan Reynolds and Rick Rajter [“We Have Some Holes in the Plane Stories”](#) which, in an evidence-based manner, raises serious questions about what really hit the WTC buildings. I had already read the heated debates on our UK forum about the so-called “No-planes” issue and I hadn’t really studied the evidence before reading the Reynolds/Rajter article, therefore hadn’t come to any conclusions other than “well, I find it really hard to believe that big jets *didn’t* hit the WTC!!” I couldn’t ignore Morgan Reynolds highly significant credentials, nor those of Rick Rajter – a Materials Science graduate. Also, there were many posts on various forums that were characteristically dismissive, rude and included remarks about the poster’s intelligence when the ideas that there were indeed some serious problems with the video evidence for

- The Bath tub was not sufficiently damaged by the enormous amount of debris which should’ve fallen into it – we know that Lower Manhattan was never flooded.
- “Toasted Cars” – over ½ a mile from the WTC.

You can see all the evidence laid out at <http://www.drjudywood.com>.

Following a number of stories that have recently appeared in the Press and on the Web, and following discussions with a mutual friend of Dr Wood and myself, Frank Ferguson, we had developed a concern that this weapon (because we accept it exists) could be used again in the next False Flag operation - perhaps to “fake” the “threatened” Al Qaida Nuclear attack - on US soil in, shall we say, a very significant place – such as Washington DC.

Our concerns were amplified in recent days, as we have heard more and more “terror talk” from the likes of Michael Chertoff e.g. <http://www.newsday.com/news/printedition/nation/chi-070710chertoff.0.6464324.print.story> in which he is quoted as saying:

“I believe we are entering a period this summer of increased risk...Summertime seems to be appealing to them,” he said of al-Qaeda. “We do worry that they are rebuilding their activities.”

Also, Air Force Gen. Victor “Gene” Renuart has said:

http://infowars.com/articles/terror/dhs_general_attack_could_happen_any_day.htm

...that while the terrorism threat within the nation's boundaries has increased in the past year. He added, “Am I concerned that this will happen this summer, I have to be concerned that it could happen any day.”

Additionally, on 19th July Paul Craig Roberts -- a former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury under Reagan was quoted as saying: http://rawstory.com/news/2007/Oldline_Republican_warns_somethings_in_works_0719.html

“The administration figures themselves and prominent Republican propagandists ... are preparing us for another 9/11 event or series of events,” he said. “You have to count on the fact that if al Qaeda is not going to do it, it is going to be orchestrated.”

Added to these ominous statements, one of the main items we wished to discuss was an article that appeared in the Washington Post on 10 May 2007, entitled “Bush Changes Continuity Plan” (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/09/AR2007050902719.html>)

As I was learning more about “little things” Jones had said, I became involved in an ongoing e-mail exchange between Morgan Reynolds, Judy Wood, Gerard Holmgren, Nico Haupt, Jim Fetzer, Thomas Mattingly and several others. Quite a few unpleasant and heated remarks were exchanged between some of these people, but I tried to filter out the important information and viewpoints presented. This was all around the time that the schism in ST911 was developing, and criticisms seemed to be being targeted at both Fetzer and Jones.

I became more suspicious when Jones refused Fetzer’s invitations to discuss aspects of the thermite hypothesis in public forums. His actions seemed to be characteristic of someone who had something to hide – and was afraid his evidence and arguments may be deconstructed with close scrutiny. However, I tried to remain “neutral” in case there was information I wasn’t aware of.

We later then learned, [from a year 2000 documentary of Steve Jones links to the energy cover up](#), which involved him publishing a paper around the time Pons and Fleischman published their pivotal Cold Fusion research. We learned that Steve Jones had connections to Los Alamos National Laboratories (where some of the development for the Atomic Bomb took place) and the Department of Energy. This wasn’t looking good at all – we seemed to be seeing some kind of infiltration of the campaign by a person or people who were adopting a “limited hangout” position regarding what happened on 9/11. They were happy to say 9/11 was an Inside Job, but stopped short of analysing all the evidence available to them, to then try and determine the answers to the “who” and “how” questions.

Alex Floum

Then, another person, Alex Floum, came into the picture – seemingly in defence of Steve Jones. I had previously corresponded with Alex when I was posting more regularly on the ST911 forum. He had written an [article summarising the Law Suits which had been started in relation to 9/11 evidence](#). I found this to be a good summary and, I had presumed, a useful basis on which to initiate further legal cases. I was later to realise there was a low likelihood of Alex Floum being involved in any such initiations.

A long debate then ensued which was based around the assumption that Jim Fetzer, by supporting the research of Prof Judy Wood, Morgan Reynolds and others, was damaging the reputation of Scholars for 9/11 Truth. It was implied that it was clear to everyone else that Steve Jones’ paper “was the most widely accepted” and any discussions considering the anomalous evidence of what happened to the planes at the WTC was divisive and probably “disinformation”. I had already studied enough of the evidence (mentioned above) to know that this was a sweeping generalisation and it seemed like a tactic being used to discourage or prevent analysis of this evidence.

J	Thank you – good talking
D	I really think that if this is positive it just adds another layer it does not disprove the thermate/thermite 100% agree that and there’s no directed energy weapons or any other exotic type of thing that could’ve done it.
J	Alright. Good. We’re in quite good agreement – yes thank you.
D	Yeah – you’re welcome – take care
J	You too.

Truth” and pointed out that all he did was register the domain name on Jim Fetzer’s behalf. But Jim Fetzer has advised me that he, Carl Weis, and Steve Jones were members of the original “steering committee” advising him in the conduct of the society from early on.

An agreement about what to do with the www.st911.org web page was never reached, in spite of discussion that it might include an agreed statement explaining the schism. Fred Burks, however, had now frozen the site for the second time and, after conducting a second “vote”, put up the [the existing page \(archived here\)](#) which neatly embodies the (apparently engineered) schism in www.st911.org.

(Jim, who was forced by the freeze to move the scholars’ web site to 911scholars.org, has now submitted the issue for a formal resolution and expects that the domain names will be turned over to him as the outcome.)

One sensed “mission accomplished”, as all the e-mail exchanges dropped off and, soon after, <http://stj911.org/> (“Scholars for 9/11 Truth and Justice” belonging to Steve Jones’ et al.) received an expensive-looking website make over. Further background on these issues can be found in the statements on the www.911scholars.org website [1] and [2].

Of Molten Metals

One of the key issues of evidence that Steve Jones was being criticised for were statements he made about molten aluminium. He essentially stated that, in the pictures and videos of the South Tower which showed a flowing orange metal, that metal could only be molten iron, because aluminium is silvery when molten. This statement is only partly true. Judy Wood and her student [Michael Zebuhr had set up a demonstration showing that aluminium can glow orange if heated to approximately the same temperature as molten iron](#). This therefore negated one of the basic assertions Steve Jones had made and represented a basic flaw in his thermite hypothesis. Shockingly, at around this time, [Michael Zebuhr was murdered](#) and another of Judy Wood’s students had a fire in their apartment. Since that time, some people have tried to suggest that Judy Wood and even Jim Fetzer might be somehow linked to these terrible events. [However, there is no evidence that I am aware of which gives credence to these views](#). It basically seems like a smear campaign against Wood and Fetzer. Sometime after this, Judy received personal threats around the time she published [the highly controversial “Beam Weapon” paper](#). (This paper, however, is founded on basic photographic evidence, seismic data and visual observations of the actual event, as well as an analysis of the profound level destruction observed. The scale of this destruction was not really portrayed well on TV. With the scale of destruction, one would have expected to see some kind of conventional “nuclear” or large volume of visible “hot” explosions. None of these things were seen.)

	if the test is negative from the heavy isotopes that we’re testing it gives absolute support ⁵⁹ to the thermate theory of Doctor Jones – if it’s negative. If it’s positive it means in addition to thermate which is already proven - that they used layers of other explosives – including nukes – they could only be sourced from the US Government or the military... ⁶⁰
Person	Just to clarify you did have a paper and several studies that said that they already tested for these?
J:	That’s right. My paper ⁶¹ – my letter in the Journal of 9/11 Studies cites other studies that have already been done looking for iodine 131 and then alpha, beta, gamma emitters and finding things in the World Trade Centre...
^{40:10} D:	Most of those alpha beta gamma emitters are just due to the neutron activation are – in things like calcium and phosphate – in other words those disappear pretty quickly – so what I’m looking for...
J	But some are long lifes...
D	...harder to find out – again - what we’re going to find out here shortly is if the tests show positive and again is there less than say 10% of the material could even be acceptable and may even carry it because if there isn’t sufficient mixing with the areas where these “hypothetical” micronukes might have gone off ⁶² . But here’s the good thing about it - if the test is done from the neutron activation isotopes and let’s say all 3 samples are negative it means absolute support that the thermate – which I agree is there – is even more supported and then it buttresses what Dr Jones has said even more - OK? And it means that super thermate was sufficient to do ALL of the damage ⁶³ rather than some of it and we don’t have to hypothesize... so it’s not – it’s actually – because it’s science – science moves forwards rather than ye know, sideways it means that it adds additional support rather than taking away from it. ⁶⁴
Person	One less theory to consider....
D	Well it’s also very serious - it means that super thermate had to be put in there and it actually supports what Dr Jones said.
J	Can I mention one thing just for the record here... [sure thing] which I - There is a form of thermate TH3 that’s used by the military in grenades –

⁵⁹ Absolute? Or there may be another hypothesis that a negative result supports – such as the large-scale use of DEW?

⁶⁰ So that’s who – perhaps the military needs to be questioned, then?

⁶¹ Is it a paper or a letter? Being a letter, it is less likely to have been peer-reviewed. Why write a letter to his own journal?

⁶² So, still no evidence, in this evidence-based discussion, of micronukes?

⁶³ But Jones suggests use of C4 or RDX and Deagle says (see 35 “a whole bunch of layers”) which therefore contradicts the notion of Superthermate doing ALL the damage.

⁶⁴ It very much sounds like Deagle wants to support the thermite hypothesis – which he already regards as proven – and this really says nothing – “science moves forwards?” “sideways”? This says nothing!

[Webcast](#), especially as she had been contacted by an attorney, Jerry Leaphart, who had seen Judy’s analysis of the WTC destruction and what to make a deposition to the Conference Group. As part of his deposition, Jerry wanted to make comments to the NIST/NCST panel about the destruction of the WTC. Public depositions were limited to 5 minutes duration.

This day was significant for the reason that no representation was made to the NCST/NIST panel by either Steve Jones or anyone directly associated with “his group”. Indeed, Alex Floum would seem to have been a prime candidate for making such a representation, if not Steve Jones himself (as he refers to the NIST studies repeatedly in his own paper). So, the question remains, why did Steve Jones not bother to participate or in the event, or even comment on it? This, to me, seemed like another strong indicator that the parameters under which Steve Jones was working had either been “preset”, or he had decided not to venture beyond a certain point in his quest to uncover how 9/11 was perpetrated. Ironically, Steve’s group is called “9/11 Scholars for Truth and Justice”, and yet there was no mention of this event, or a representation made by any member of that group (as far as I am aware). Was this just incompetence? (Maybe – but where have we heard this idea before?)

Hustler Article and The Thermite theory

In January 2007, [US Hustler magazine published an article “Was 9/11 An Inside Job?”](#). Apparently Judy Wood was initially contacted by the author, who later contacted Steve Jones. The article exaggerated the qualifications of Gordon Ross (who has an article posted on the Journal of 9/11 Studies) whilst diminishing those of Prof Judy Wood. It also quoted that Jim Hoffman was a physicist when he is not. Though I was glad that more exposure was being given to 9/11 being an Inside Job, it was interesting to see the thermite theory being presented in a mainstream publication, and that some basic errors and omissions were evident. I decided to [compile a short rebuttal article](#) with the comments supplied by Profs Wood and Reynolds, Jeff Strahl and Veronica Chapman.

Rick Siegel and the 9/11 Mysteries film

Recently, it has been brought to my attention by Rick Siegel how subtle changes have been made to his footage from *9/11 Eyewitness* when it was used in the film *9/11 Mysteries*.

For example, Rick has discovered these problems with the film:

33:50 - Shows the first of Rick Siegel’s footage of the North tower

"This video was shot from New Jersey. Smoke rises from the base of the building as an explosion is heard" (Basically this is OK and with original sound from DVD)

34:08 - Second time around the same footage but the sound is replaced! Just after the dark filter effect we see the north tower collapse but the sound has

	me explaining because of my background as a chemist before I went into medicine I was a biochemist ⁵¹ – and so I understood and I said – you gotta explain this to me because he’s a frantic munitions guy and he’s told me there were layers in these buildings – like a work of art. My thesis as I mentioned before is that I think that they literally blew out the building, with the thermate in the floors ⁵² and so on but that they took out the core of the building with these micro-nuclear devices. Now that could be wrong if they used thermate there too – but if they did use it to bring out the core of building using – thermate - and there may have been with micronukes they may have started from upper floors and done it so many floors apart – that changes the thesis of what they might do when they do their next operation ⁵³ – because it’s a kind of controlled demolition if they take out 16 or 20 blocks of say Los Angeles – and like the top 3 cities – LA is one of the top 3 cities that’s likely to be hit, OK? And so...
Person	[inaudible] radiation... if you’re using nuclear bombs...
D:	It depends if it’s a fourth generation or they have...
Person	... would have a lot of contamination that would spread evenly.
D:	Well, remember - they’re not dirty bombs – remember these bombs now, the new fourth generation nukes and I was told this by people in the NSA – the bombs that they have now - since the 1950’s they - have types of nuclear bombs that generate mostly gamma rays – mostly neutrons like a neutron bomb from battlefield weapons mostly electromagnetic pulse – so they can have weapons that give very little blast but give a massive electromagnetic pulse so they can be very selective in the energy distribution patterns of the type of weapons they have now - and I was told and this again is stuff that’s not conventional - and that they can detonate these without having to use a nuclear fission/fusion type ye know triggering thing ⁵⁴ – but use these ultra-powerful magnetic pulses that have lasers in order to actually generate nuclear explosions.
J:	If they really have that, we have an energy solution so... these guys are...
D:	Well they’re sitting on...they don’t want to have...
J:	They’re sitting on it...?
D:	Course they are...
J:	I don’t think [inaudible] had a chance to ask your question did you? ⁵⁵
^{37:17} Person:	Well I guess my biggest point here – questions to both of you – looks like

⁵¹ Deagle has a very impressive cv – Medical and Legal Doctor – chemist and Biochemist. Good for him!

⁵² In how many floors? All of them – half? ¾ etc?

⁵³ Again, who is doing the operation? Can’t they be traced and stopped or is the attack inevitable?

⁵⁴ Will the trigger be fusion or fission? How is fission achieved without critical mass?

⁵⁵ Why does Jones suddenly change the subject here, when it was getting so interesting...

after, I received a message from Steve Jones asking me which questions he couldn't answer, so [I pointed him at the list that Judy Wood had prepared](#). I expressed my unhappiness at what had happened with ST911 and my dislike of personal attacks.

He suggested that I get together with other researchers and write a paper about Directed Energy Weapons being used on 9/11 and submit it to his Journal of 9/11 Studies for peer review. He mentioned that "personalized attacks would not be allowed". I then replied to him saying that I was not a research scientist (and I had made this clear to him when I joined ST911) so even if I did write a paper, it would not have any real credibility. I also then pointed out that Judy's paper, though unfinished, would qualify as a Scientific paper and contained no personalised attacks on Steve Jones. I received no response from Steve Jones to these points.

Fetzer Jones Debate - Jan 17 2006

Following repeated requests, [Steve Jones finally agreed to talk with Jim Fetzer on Jim's "Dynamic Duo" show on GCN Live](#). Feelings were obviously strong and this seemed to have a significant impact on the quality of the discussion. Jim Fetzer talked unnecessarily over Steve Jones and voices were raised on many occasions.

However, on listening to the broadcast (linked above), I made the following notes, referenced by the elapsed times shown below.

43:38 – Steve Jones shouts there was "significant damage" (twice) to the bathtub (but lower Manhattan still didn't flood). He talks about quantifying data, but in this context what does "significant" mean? He didn't say what volume of water flowed – he merely listed a number of news reports which described some damage to the slurry wall (the bath tub). Such news reports didn't seem to me to constitute a sufficiently quantified rebuttal to what Judy had written – it seemed to me more like a set of statements intended to debunk the basic evidence.

45:58 - Steve Jones mentions [the paper about WTC dust particle sizes by Paul Liroy et al.](#) Though Steve talks about a table of dust particle sizes, his use of this data is rather misleading, in my opinion – he seems to be trying to say that the pulverisation and dustification which Judy had discussed did not really happen – only large particle sizes resulted. However, a look at the abstract (my emphasis) of the paper above seems to indicate this paper, alone, would not be a good basis on which to judge the level of pulverisation:

Abstract

The explosion and collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) was a catastrophic event that produced an **aerosol plume** impacting many workers, residents, and commuters during the first few days after 11

	thinking about – such another 9/11 they'd better think twice because 9/11 truthers are out there – we're watching. We will get samples – we know what to do – evidence-based studies – we can do very quickly and we can put an end to lies - on the next 9/11 if it [inaudible] ... which I hope we'll avoid... is what I'm trying to say...
D:	Well we've already probably stopped them – a lot of the work that you've done – many other 9/11 truthers...
J:	And Alex Jones...
D:	And Alex Jones and all the great leaders. I think what we've done we probably don't know how many 9/11 type events we've already stopped.
J:	It could well be – good point.
Person	How shall people retain continuity of evidence and get that to you?
D:	Chain of custody...
J:	Chain of custody it's very important...right
31:50 D:	I could tell because I'm a medical legal expert on this. What you want to do is you want to bring it to an attorney or another [public?] and you actually have to sign an affidavit you collected the specimen on a specific date legal [inaudible] it needs to have a chain of custody ⁴⁵ signed and sealed and a seal that can't be broken – if that seal is broken it means the chain is broken but the bag has to go in a steel container to a laboratory by signed courier with a chain of custody number on it but a riser[?] has to give an internal chain of custody number intake so that there's no breaking of the chain [inaudible]
J:	I think it's an important point – we're talking about amateur people – helpers – and so if you get multiple people – 3 or more, for example – filming someone, filming someone collecting and then seal that in a bag and the dust as we have learned has a great deal of information carried with it [right] and that can then be taken to [inaudible] that's fine and it seems to me that if it's video-taped the procedure – I mean, these people that are collecting are not going to know to gather iodine 131 and plus an equal amount of cobalt 60, no, they're just gonna collect the dust and send it... I think we'll get a very credible case in a very short time if – if we can have co-operation of – truthers - if there is another 9/11-like event we can now do something to stop this - so that's a great goal.
D:	Yeah – I think that ... I really believe that meetings like this are - have stopped the death of millions. What I was told back in 94 by a special agent - she was in a cold-sweat telling me this - that at that time they

⁴⁵ Apparently Jones' McKinley dust sample does not have a chain of custody like the one Deagle describes, so how can an International trial be initiated with any evidentiary foundation? Does Deagle have a chain of Custody for the 3 samples he is "testing"?

[Edit: Judy did not actually give a presentation herself that day - please see [this article](#) for more details.]

John Albanese Signs Up for UK 9/11 Forum!

Recently, John Albanese signed up for our UK forum to post information about a new film he has produced about disinformation. He then [seemed to make allegations about Profs Wood and Reynolds](#), which I challenged him about. I have yet to see any evidence to support these serious allegations.

9/11 WAS an Inside Job – so what?

It has to be said that despite the many great efforts and significant sacrifices made by many individuals who are trying to campaign for the truth behind 9/11 to be revealed, little has changed in the last 5 years. The “police state agenda” has unfolded before us and enough measures are already in use to see that it is real. It seems that the perpetrators are not really bothered that we know 9/11 was an Inside Job. What can we do about it? They can still unfold their agenda without any significant resistance.

“Ding, Ding – Round Two!”

It would be nice to think that the fight to uncover 9/11 as an Inside Job only had “one round” and that we were well on our way to winning it. However, it seems to me, that we have now come to the end of “round one” and “round two” is now in progress. The perps are well-resourced and well-trained and are now beginning to land many more punches on those who are the closest to uncovering the links between the 9/11 Cover up and the other areas (like black technology and the energy cover up) which would undermine their power base.

Cui Un-Bono?

I have summarised in a table below who seems to have benefited and who seems not to have benefited in the “goings on” described above:

Judy Wood identified against her will	Steve Jones lauded and applauded for his “Why Indeed...” paper.
Judy Wood lost her job at Clemson	Steve Jones retired – and still salaried.
Judy Wood’s student Michael Zebuhr murdered	Steve Jones described in CBS News Piece as founder of ST911 (see also response from 911Scholars)
Judy Wood receives death threats	Steve Jones featured in “Improbable Collapse”
Judy Wood attacked for promoting “wild	Steve Jones thermite hypothesis evidence

	already looked for radio isotopes including Iodine 131, alpha gamma and beta emitters and of course for myself I looked at the steel and the dust [right] [inaudible] McKinlay so it will be interesting if you see something that I missed...
D:	What we’re going to be doing is that we’re using a technology [inaudible] because we also have to use the right technology because we’re going to be looking for stable isotopes above background by a marginally wide enough to see if it shows the isotope ratios that would indeed indicate there was enough mixing in the pyroclastic clouds that would be spreading and mixing and also....
J:	Why are you looking at the stable isotopes?
D:	No - we’re looking for these – these ones like the higher and heavier isotopes like you know ones like – like Beryllium 9 and ten ³⁷ you know Niobium 94 ³⁸ and Cobalt 59 and 60.
J:	Well Cobalt 60...
D:	The [principle was there?] if we find the heavier isotopes of Beryllium – that’s going to be a real [cruncher] because Beryllium is rare to see in places like – in and around a nuclear device.
^{27:30} J:	OK - So we need to analyse [?] that you’re working – that’s good – that’s the results are not yet in - OK
D:	Oh no - we’ll see and again we’re planning on running probably these 3 samples ³⁹ and if we get repeated samples negative there – if we get positive we’re trying doing it in a different lab – we’re also asking people like yourself – you’re a physicist ⁴⁰ – and samples of what you have and use similar types of technology if we get positive – we have to have somebody independent like yourself go and test not only test the samples you have but other ones to see if – even say one sample in 20 is positive for some of the isotopes by a wide enough margin...
J:	That’s important. You need the plus or minus too...
D:	Right plus or minus ⁴¹ – and a range of coincidence – you need enough samples positive – and it should be done not just by a range of individuals – so you can’t say he has an agenda so he’s trying to prove his theory so you can end up with independent corroboration...

³⁷ Beryllium 10 has a half life of 1.51×10^6 years - <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Beryllium> why is Deagle looking for this?

³⁸ Niobium 94 has a half-life of 20,300 years <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niobium> why is Deagle looking for this?

³⁹ Where did Deagle get his samples? Is he testing Jones’ sample from which some of the Thermite evidence was supposedly determined? The McKinley dust? Where did the 2 other samples come from?

⁴⁰ Good that he remembered this...

⁴¹ Plus or minus what? 10% - 20%? Units? Quantities? What margins of error are acceptable? How about a nice graph with error bars, perhaps?

- Rick Siegel for his amazing contributions to the fight for the truth and his lyrical and deeply insightful analysis of the evidence and the events as they have unfolded.
- Thomas Mattingly for his “mediation” and provision for public exposure of Reynolds/Fetzer/Wood’s evidence and analysis via The McClendon Group.
- Jeff Strahl for his concise and focused comments and contributions.
- Veronica Chapman for her succinct and acutely observed points.
- Jerry Leaphart for his diligent work from a legal perspective and for being a lone dissenting voice at the NIST/NCST panel conference.
- CB Brooklyn for his collation of evidence re Steve Jones and his willingness to post to the various message boards in order to expose this information.
- Gerard Holmgren, Nico Haupt and Rosalee Grable for being at the forefront of analysis of some of the evidence mentioned here long before many others were “on the case”.
- Many others for looking at the evidence and diligently working to expose it in ways they see as appropriate.

Comments, corrections and feedback welcomed.

J:	... what’s the half life?
D:	The half life is something like 72 hours – it’s very very short. ³²
J:	I don’t know...
D:	It’s very very short – I am pretty sure of that – we give iodine tablets and we tell people that within 72 hours they’re back to background.
J:	If anybody has internet we can look it up. But the point is these serious scientists ³³ analysed...
D:	They never went.... and looked for the other ones
J:	And the reason... no, they did look for others - and it’s in my paper – have you read actually my letter that addresses the many new hypotheses?
D:	I have looked at some of those things.
J:	Did you read my paper in the Journal?
D:	I think I remember having a look at that yeah...
J:	Because this was one of the main points –
D:	Did they test for beryllium 9?
J:	They tested for Iodine 131 specifically...
D:	And they did they do that by induction and coupled [plasma microscopy?]
J:	I didn’t go back to ...
D:	It’s actually a calculation based on ionization, so you have to...
J:	They measured the sediment layer...
D:	But what technologies did they use?
J:	It’s in their paper I’m sure...but I don’t have that recollection – I quoted the result.
D:	What they do is they use a thing called induction coupled iron spectroscopy – they back-calculated the difference between the base isotopes and the other ones.
J:	In addition they looked for ... the paper also cited in my paper where the scientists looked for alpha beta and gamma emissions. They said the alpha emissions were...
D:	This is the sediment in the Hudson...
J:	No, this is now in the dust as I recall
D:	The dust at the bottom of the Hudson – yeah...
J:	No not from the bottom of the Hudson... the dust from the world trade centre – [oh yeah] dry dust. So they looked for a new [degree] alpha beta gamma [inaudible] emissions.
D:	Yeah – it was closer – if there was neutron activation produce those things – it would disappear pretty quickly though...
J:	It varies a lot. I mean cobalt 60 – lasts a long time...
D:	Oh yes – Cobalt 60 – but....

³² Iodine 131 has a half-life of about 8 days - 192 hours - <http://www.brainyencyclopedia.com/encyclopedia/i/iodine-131.html>

³³ “serious scientists analysed...” – as opposed to? “Comedy Scientists”?

her looking around and behind her. The people helping Jenkins felt they needed to change the lighting and camera positions. As you can see in the video, Jenkins is well lit and Judy is half in shadow for most (if not all) of the interview.

They set up their "ambush" two rooms away, out of sight of the Fetzer presentation – it is not clear how they got access to these rooms as the doors seem to have been locked before they were there. How did Jenkins know Judy would be there - who told him? Judy did not make a presentation on that day – she had attended to support Jim Fetzer. She was a member of the audience on her way to the rest room when they asked her to answer the questions. And why did Jenkins keep his plans of this "surprise interview" a secret? Why did Greg Jenkins present his ambush interview as if Judy were the invited speaker at the National Press Club?

Judy had no idea she was going to be interviewed, much less filmed. But, she did agree to sit down for one or two questions, on the condition that no permission would be granted until she had authorized the final product. Jenkins did not obtain a notarized signature and no preview was ever offered by him or anyone connected to him before he posted the video on Google, though he had agreed to do so, sharing an email and phone number. But, both the number and the email address turned out to be fraudulent. (In any case, it was surely up to Jenkins to be polite and contact Judy, who was the subject of the interview. He did not do this.)

The Video Itself

Much of the discussion in the video centres round a picture which Judy is shown of debris falling from the tower. Indeed, most of the first 2 minutes of the video is taken up with developing an acute focus on this issue. Even if one concludes Judy is incorrect about the exact nature and movement of this debris (which cannot be accurately concluded from the video interview alone), it must be realised that this is not the only point of data that Judy is concerned with. (She also discusses lack of damage to the Bathtub, subway trains and sub-basement mall stores. She discusses the highly anomalous "toasted cars", seismic data and small debris piles.)

Jenkins homes in on the "falling debris" issue without really addressing the subtlety of what Judy is saying. He tries to get her to say "no debris is falling" – in essence, what she is really saying is that the debris that is falling is largely *dust*, not large steel girders and slabs of concrete. She points out the very fine nature of the dust, Jenkins reacts by adopting a number of blank and confused and sheepish looks, and the discussion essentially goes nowhere. The photos of a "carpet of dust", with unburned paper mixed in, essentially highlight Judy's point, but Jenkins skirts around the issue by continually focusing attention on a single photograph and not allowing or encouraging discussion of the other related evidence. Judy also questions the use of the word "collapse" and Jenkins does not really explore this proposition thoroughly. A simple building collapse, again, would not cause ankle-deep layers of fine dust and even finer dust which spread into the upper atmosphere.

	wondering if there were additional things besides thermate and – the reason is we want to check those because here's the key issue to me... if it shows it wasn't and they used thermate, will they go directly to nukes next time? Or will they use a combination of the same kind of things and the next type of explosive to destroy the [inaudible] cities?
J:	The next one is a little beyond the question. It's an important issue... [right because...] but I would like to focus on... so you will look for radio isotopes? It's support looking... doing those types of tests - I think that's the way to do it. The crucial test if you see an abundance and not just, ye know fluctuations statistically...
D:	it's got to be a large enough margin that it goes beyond...
J:	A hundred times or something the iron 58 or 59 or the iodine 110 then you can say "Well this is truly anomalous - we really have something that we can home in... and so on..."
D:	It will help...
J:	On the other hand if you don't see those large excesses...
D:	Then it adds additional support to your thesis which is thermate.
J:	Well perhaps, but on the other hand - in any case we'd say - this hypothesis - we tried it we did the tests, the evidence was not there because evidence is what we require.
D:	Oh, absolutely.
J:	Yeah – so we agree on that - that's good. I'll look forward to your results ²⁹ . And I do have one more thing to say about this... because iodine 110 was tested for a month after... the – just about a month after the event... after September 11th and what was done there...
D:	Was this test by US geological?
J:	It was Leoy et al as I recall. Now...
D:	Where did they test it from? Was it water samples? Or...?
J:	It was sediment in the water.
D:	Right. And what did they find?
^{19:08} J:	What they found was that they found sediment layers that clearly identified the World Trade Centre dust on top and it's identifiable ³⁰ , as I mentioned you have the silicon rich spheres and the iron rich spheres. I mean there's no...
D:	Yeah, right because it was turned into a vapour right?
J:	No I don't agree with that but...
D:	[inaudible] Your kind of vapour [inaudible] [okay] it melted into these little

²⁹ Deagle is discussing results he hasn't had yet – so he has no evidence? Is this what he is saying? If he is so concerned about the next attacks, why has he taken so long to do the tests? Didn't he think of completing them before making a presentation at this conference?

³⁰ How can they know it is "clearly" identified as WTC dust? -- especially if it contains little to no iron? And, is it assumed this dust promptly sank to the bottom, right by the shore? What about the stuff that floated downstream?

If Prof Wood had refused the interview, no doubt that fact would have been plastered on various message boards as evidence that she was avoiding questions (but it seems that people are more reluctant to say this sort of thing about other 9/11 researchers than Prof Wood).

Some people who have watched the video think that Judy Wood is dodging questions, or not answering them well. I would suggest that this is exactly the impression the video was set up to give. Additionally, techniques have been used to suggest that Prof Wood's view should not be taken seriously – an off the cuff remark she made about “pennies falling” is used as the theme for the closing “song”. This isn't a scientific analysis or discussion – it's a piece intended to ridicule Prof Wood and divert attention from the data.

If Jenkins had been so unhappy with Judy's explanations and he had been genuinely interested in exploring the hypothesis, he could have requested another interview, under more suitable circumstances, rather than posting what he had.

A “Scientific” Method?

If anyone thinks that an ambush video, conducted close to midnight and posted on the internet, without final agreement of the person concerned, is a valid usage of the “Scientific Method”, then there may be wider range of data available for usage in Scientific Papers and peer review than has been in general usage up to now. (Also, the interview was conducted by people who trespassed within private property. The time stamp on a still picture of Judy's group with Judy's camera shows a date of January 11, so - it probably was after midnight.)

This video is included in a link in Greg Jenkins' paper entitled [“The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers”](#) on Steve Jones' [Journal of 9/11 Studies](#). The title of this paper is already loaded, and suggests a conclusion to the reader before it has even discussed any of the data. This is not a Scholarly or Scientific approach to the problem. Perhaps a title of “Could Directed Energy Weapons have been used to Demolish the World Trade Center Towers?” would have been less loaded. The video and paper seem to have been posted on the internet within 3 weeks of the Ambush interview. In any case, Prof Wood has repeatedly stated the Beam Weapon paper is not yet finished.

In Part 1 of his paper, Dr Jenkins states (about the debris) *“This means that, within error, all of the debris in the WTC complex can be accounted for within the sublevel collapses.”* If this statement is correct, then [how did the goods in the Mall Stores survive?](#) How is it that [the subway station has only a relatively small amount of debris and the train is not badly crushed and damaged?](#) If the sub levels were indeed filled with debris as Jenkins suggests, then how can [rescue workers have been walking around in the sub-basement levels so easily?](#) Also, why does the reference for the data Jenkins has used come from *The New York Times* and not some more directly scholarly or scientific work from FEMA or NIST or the

	building literally turn and then tilt and then, all of a sudden, that building just went poof ²² so whatever turned that building into you know a destructive ye know ash cloud had to be powerful enough to literally take that tilted piece - that could have fallen over and fallen a great distance and literals turn it into fine particles whether they're nano particles or just the dust.
Person	Could that be just conventional weapons?
D:	Sure it could be. The only way is to first test the hypothesis is to measure things like neutron activation. But I wonder if there's other chemical tests that I said - that measure chemical residues for other [inaudible]... did anybody test those?
^{13:44} Person	How close are we to finding out this kind of a measurement?
D:	Did anybody test those?
J:	Let's get back to the ... let's get back to the crucial test - neutron activation. So we're looking for radio isotopes that will tell us whether or not there were neutron... nuclear explosives.
D:	Right.
J:	So let's look for example at... and I know you're doing some testing...
D:	Yeah we're going to do some testing... and we expect that as little as 10% of the of the ash material of the buildings for the whatever particle size to be acceptable to actually do the test on because we expect that and - I'm certain – that you're right and there was thermate or super thermate ²³ in the building which would have generated a type of ash which would not show neutron activation but there may be additional material in parts of the building where they may have used these devices [inaudible] within 50 or 100 yards... [inaudible]
J:	What size of mini-nukes are you talking...?
D:	The ones I was told they removed unexploded from the Oklahoma City Murrah building and the guy who told me got court marshaled - and I got fired into [inaudible] so I can believe him - were 1/10 of a kiloton Micro nukes U.S. Army Corps of engineers and that they measured tritium which means that they're...
J:	These are initiated with a fission reaction ?
^{14:52} D:	He didn't give me the details on that. They were U.S. Army Corps engineers fourth-generation Micro nukes and what I was told from other contacts is that they have Micro nukes now that can be activated by very high-powered magnetic pulses and lasers and that they have those fourth-generation type of Micro nukes available now. [inaudible] – no, this is classified stuff that I was told.
J:	Let me see if we can actually get to 1/10 kiloton fusion bombs we have a

²² This is a term Dr Wood has used...

²³ No evidence has been provided that Super Thermate was or has been used or is in use anywhere.

Transcript of “Micronukes vs Thermite/Thermate at WTC”

Discussion took place at the Vancouver 9/11 Truth
With Prof Steve Jones and Dr William Deagle – 24th June 2007

Transcript by Andrew Johnson

Footnotes mainly by Andrew Johnson, with additional comments by Prof Judy Wood.

Video: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-1184826770885695772>

Audio:

<http://www.checktheevidence.com/audio/911/Prof%20Steve%20Jones%20&%20Dr%20Bill%20Deagle%20on%20WTC%20Destruction%20-%20Vancouver%20-%2024%20Jun%202007.mp3>

This is quite an extraordinary discussion in many ways – and in my view, clearly demonstrates that neither Jones or Deagle are being completely honest in their discussion.

You will hear them:

- Claiming to be discussing the evidence, but in reality they don't discuss much evidence at all.
- Deagle claim Seattle has been pre-wired with mini-nukes.
- Jones suggesting that if there is a nuke-attack, 9-11 truthers should get dust samples and send them to Deagle or Jones.
- Deagle claiming he has evidence of mini-nukes from “contacts” but he hasn't completed testing his samples – even though he is very concerned to find out what they will use for the next attack.
- Deagle claims he is 100% sure thermate or superthermate was used to destroy the towers.
- Deagle describes the effects on toasted cars as being potentially from an EMP pulse, but he dismisses the evidence for DEW.
- Jones gets Deagle to agree that the evidence of no planes hitting the WTC towers is “ridiculous”.
- Deagle claims micronukes were used in the Oklahoma bombing.
- Deagle doesn't know whether they are fusion or fission nukes.
- Jones mentions WTC Iron quite a few times.
- Both Jones and Deagle talk about an Isotope of Iodine 110 – but this is extremely obscure (the stable Isotope of Iodine is 127).

Even though Deagle suggests there is going to be a multiple nuke attack in the USA, Homeland Security don't seem to have expressed an interest in this.

Listen to the audio or read the transcript.

	the front of the vehicle was affected in areas even just a matter of... like the back part of the vehicle wasn't affected [inaudible] in the immediate thermal pulse area let's say, of a conventional big explosion let's say the conventional bit explosive let's say a lot of TNT. ¹⁸
8:34 J:	Let me address that. If there was thermate - which we agree on – so you have these hot particles -- Iron principally -- in the dust being blown at the vehicles - that could also give this pattern of damage, near the buildings because of the hot particles blasting and carried with the dust and blown against the vehicles. So what I'm saying...
D:	You're thinking [inaudible] just looking at the pattern, and then again this is only hypothesis I don't think it gets to the theory level but if you look at the effects - if it was indeed - these vehicles were at a distance away there they're at a distance that is so great that the thermal pulse is unlikely and also the kind of damage indicates that it is more Para-magnetic than thermal... in other words the damage would have affected, say, mirrors but yet would not have melted the vehicle. ¹⁹
J:	Let's see - I have looked at those corroded vehicles quite carefully - I have discussed them with a number of people – scientists - and what you see is pock-marks in some cases which affects the metal and it appears to be quite corrosive this would be consistent worth... a ... sulphur - like a sulfidation attack.
D:	Yeah, I mean we could have a combination of both. You could have a combination of pyroclastic jets of super hot iron and sulphur compounds like we're talking about - and a Para-magnetic... because you can have both... or you could have had a combination because one of the things I was told that happened in Oklahoma City is that they had layers. Whenever you do a controlled demolition whether its... and I talked to munitions people since 911 on this who have worked inside of military - the Army Corps of engineers and other people in special Ops and Delta ... say if you're ever gonna do a controlled demolition you have to use things like high explosive cord[ite] – thermate, RDx and other things and of course the thermate in the super thermate are great for cutting... but you have to have charges to blow out the sections... plus you have to have enough kinetic energy to blow - you know, giant sections... so it had to require pretty massive bombs.
10:38 J:	So we agree that there is corrosion and it could be a combination perhaps... or it could be thermate...
D:	It's probably layered. I think ²⁰ it's multiple types of detonation device.

¹⁸ Again, directed energy effects are being discussed here (even if from some EMP or Micronuke weapon to which Deagle alludes) so this contradicts the earlier statement about “no evidence of directed energy” – see footnote 6.

¹⁹ Is “para-magnetic” energy the same as “directed energy”?

²⁰ ...and the evidence for this thought would be? As his results of isotopic testing are “not in yet” – see footnote 29.

	year in February said he could see some action, some event in the United States or elsewhere that would be blamed on Iran and that would then justify a defensive attack on...[inaudible]
D:	Well of course that's what Cheney said too - he said that before, he's ordered STRATCOM to prepare attack orders against 440 targets inside Iran both....
J:	and they're looking at using tactical nukes...
D:	Right...
J:	... I understand it's a possibility, so this is a very serious situation. I think there is some evidence that we agree on ² .
D:	Oh absolutely.
^{3:33} J:	... I thought that was a good place to start. We agree first of all that the discussion should be evidence-based. ³
D:	Oh absolutely it can't be based on opinion ⁴ ... because the thing is ultimately if there is not evidence that could ultimately get into a court [inaudible] the court - public opinion then it shouldn't be dismissed but it should be based on scientific evidence.
^{3:50} J:	It needs to be based on solid evidence, okay. We agree on that - and as we look at the evidence -- I don't think this is the place to go through all the evidence ⁵ --
D:	Yeah - no, no, no.
J:	...but we have both looked at quite a bit of the evidence then. And we agree [inaudible] understand...
D:	It's like the scientific method, you have to have a hypothesis and a theory, and a number of anomalies that could be explained by that theory then you propose a test of the hypothesis - null hypothesis and the test I see beside the evidence we have so far from the US geological about tritium and there is some discussion of whether it could be from something like [exasymes?] which I think is a bit of a stretch but the thing that will help us to close that door to determine if there were indeed some kind of devices in one or more places in the building could be if there's heavy isotopes. Now if they're not present then it means that obviously...
J:	I wanted to establish what we agreed on...
D:	yeah. We're agreed on the thermate of course... it had to be
J:	there is considerable evidence...

² ... so let's not talk about the evidence we don't agree on? Is this cherry-picking evidence, perhaps?

³ Wouldn't it be better to have the evidence displayed on a screen for easier or more focused discussion? There is no powerpoint here – no co-ordinated discussion – just a “friendly chat” – even for supposedly “volunteers” - they are or were both professional scientists – can't they do better?

⁴ And yet, significant portions of the following discussion are based on opinion only.

⁵ So they *won't* be talking about the evidence in this discussion then...?

D:	Oh... there is no disagreement there at all... yeah...
J:	OK and I think we both looked at the directed energy weapons...
D:	that's... no evidence, in fact I was a doctor taking care of people working with people for 6 years working with directed energy weapons for US Star Wars. ⁶
J:	OK you have a lot more background... ⁷
D:	yeah so I know about Tom Bearden's type of coherence interference weapons systems and scalar weaponry and plasma cannons at Lockheed Martin and skunk Works and Lucent ⁸ Technologies and the company I was working [at] was General Dynamics.
J:	Let me try one more while we're on a roll here and agreeing. How about the "no planes hit the towers."?
D:	That's ridiculous. ⁹
J:	OK, I agree with you.
D:	In fact, what I was told from my contacts inside the U.S. Air Force, Air Force Academy and so on, is those were probably not United Airlines jets but they were probably E-10s that were flown in there. That's what they told me. That err In fact, I knew this from being a civil aviation examiner ¹⁰ that all jet aircraft, commercial jet aircraft, worldwide, have been capable of being remotely taken over control for over thirty years.
J:	Well, so we agree that jets did hit the towers. ¹¹
D:	Oh yeah, jets hit the towers.
J:	OK now lets get to the...
D:	and of course the other thing is the architectural thing that jets couldn't take them down because I have friends that are architectural ¹² . In fact across the street from where I live in Halifax, this thoracic surgeon's son is an architect in New York and he said he knew immediately -- literally within seconds after both jets hit the towers that there was no evidence whatsoever... because they teach this course... in architecture around the world that these buildings were built to withstand up to a 9.5 earthquake ¹³ and there's absolutely no evidence a jet aircraft could bring down these buildings at all, or even the burning of furniture or anything else so the

⁶ That settles it then – no discussion of lack of debris, dustification effects – Deagle was a Doctor in the SDI programme – he knows - that's all we need to know...

⁷ Is Jones about to say that he has little experience with energy weapons? Six months ago, he said they don't exist.

⁸ From my understanding, Lucent Technologies was formerly part of AT&T - a telecommunications company which had/has little to do with weapons technologies.

⁹ Isn't this an opinion – no evidence, after all is discussed here...

¹⁰ Check Deagle's resume... more later.

¹¹ But what about the physical evidence which shows planes did not hit the towers?

¹² Shouldn't this be “friends that are architects”? Surely he means Structural Engineers?

¹³ New York is not in an Earthquake zone.