



---

## revisiting 9/11 as a techie

5 messages

---

**From:** Project Humanbeingsfirst.org <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>

**Thu, Feb 10,  
2011 at 2:52  
PM**

**To:** Peter [an MIT co-alum who is plugged in with 9-11 Truthers]

Hello Peter.

Recently, only since the past week, I have become interested in 9/11 as a techie - courtesy of Dr. Judy Wood.

What I am learning is both frightening, and revealing. I am working on studying this much further. Previously I had never been interested in it, since I knew, the day of 9/11, that it was an inside job, and had focussed my attention on anti-war, and on derailing "imperial mobilization". I had known, and I wrote this in my 2003 book, that there is as much likelihood of it ever being unraveled as JFK's assassination. That people calling for new investigations, like the 9/11 truth movement people, were being plain-silly, who'd investigate when the judge/jury/executioner/sherriff/posse all eat at the same table and drink from the same globalist's trough; and the crime scene is gone! ... And none of these simpletons, at the time at least I thought of them so, really understood the concept of fait accompli. This is amply visible in my many letters to Jones/Gage/Ryan et. all. Here is just one of them:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/04/letter-911studies-nuking-iran.html>

So I was never a part of their circus show. Remember you invited me to join them in summer of 2008 at MIT, and what I had told you as I had declined? Well - up to this time, I had only thought of them as clowning, type-2 people in Hitler's classification (see my report on manufacturing dissent where I explain that from Mein Kampf).

But now, I have a different viewpoint as a I delve into this for the first time.

There are some really interesting things going on here at many levels.... But techie wise, I am going back to my EM waves and 6.013/6.014 - also 6.003 and 6.341 (you can see what these are in [ocw.mit.edu](http://ocw.mit.edu)). What Dr. Wood calls "interference", and what she calls "field effects".... and her apt term "New Hiroshima" are all interesting....

Based on what I have studied thus far, she is on the right track, and to me, it appears that Jones et. al, are the fabricators. I discovered Jones played the role of a "Science Hitman", SHM, like EHM, even for Cold Fusion way back in 1989 - there is a photo of him with George Bush Sr. signing off to DOE to investigate!! And I further uncovered that David Ray Griffin, whose praises Kevin Barrett sings, as the "dean of 9/11 studies" is a globalist:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m-TZypcH9eg>

And I further discovered that Barrett himself is promulgating disinfo - the latest case is his Susan Lindauer's interview - here is my deconstruction of that stooge pigeon (and all of that is missing in Kevin Barrett's soft-ball interview - why? Why is Kevin always so gullible? This isn't the first time I have problem in thinking of him as a simpleton - but is he?):

<http://atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/13939-an-intelligence-defense-of-julian-assange.html#comment-10214>

All this is showing me, that someone I had never heard of until a few days ago, is being marginalized deliberately by the entire 9/11 Truth Movement. Why? I never heard of Judy Wood's challenge to NIST and her Qi-Tam case which went up to the Supreme Court. See it on her website <http://drjudywood.com>

In my first order assessment based on what I have seen thus far in at least one dedicated week's worth of due diligence, Judy Wood is the most directly competent/qualified person based on her training to analyze 9/11 ....

Since you have been plugged in with Gage/Jones et. al, (they never replied to my letters in 2007-2009), what is your take on all this? I understand you are not an engineer and therefore cannot judge technical crap they put out first hand, but what's your feeling about all this? Do you have any info about Dr. Wood, apart from what's on her website? Have you ever met her? What's your opinion of her as a person? Does she strike you as a person of personal integrity? I know this is a hard question, but it is important to understand what motivates people - genuine inquiry, or to disinfo.

I am an engineer, and my studies, both as a professional techie, and as an amateur political scientist, are showing me that Jones et al., that entire gang of Truth Movementers, are potentially being taken for a ride by one or two people, who, maximally, are outright liars. I am surprised to discover this.... perhaps I ought not to be....

This is how I heard of Judy Wood, by accident, when Google on some entirely different matter took me to Red Ice Creations interview of her, of 18 January, 2011, and boy, I had never heard of Hurricane Erin either:

<http://www.redicecreations.com/radio/2011/01/RIR-110118.php>

I have had some cordial correspondence with Dr. Wood - and when I probed her technically, as a student trying to learn more and asking her for details of her hand-waiving, she thought I was a spook trying to figure out how much she knows and quit talking to me!!! I thought that was a bit amusing.... But don't blame her for being cautious as I can clearly see prima facie, that she is being squelched. Why is that?

Please let me know your overall take on this amazing new find on my part.... Also, what's your take on Hutchison Effect? I had never heard of that bloke either until I encountered Judy's website. I did point out to her that I didn't find her referencing him very impressive: here is my letter, just FYI (she never replied):

<http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/zahirs-letter-to-dr-judy-wood-feb-06-2011-whats-wrong-with-this-picture-publishletter.pdf>

best,  
zahir

---

**From: Peter**

**Fri, Feb 11, 2011 at 8:12 AM**

To: "Project Humanbeingsfirst.org" <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>

Zahir --

I am somewhat of an agnostic on the fine details of 911. I am quite convinced that a massive amount of energy had to be added to the buildings to break them up and permit close to free-fall. And I am fairly convinced that this energy was added in the form of Thermate. I credit Jones and his colleagues at the Journal of 911 Studies of bringing this to my attention.

Some history and opinion about Wood/Fetzer: Wood was a materials science Asst. Prof. at Clemson. Her initial work on 911 and the mechanics of gravitational acceleration was good and a positive contribution to Truth. But, she got fired. I doubt if she could have gotten a job anywhere, at least in academia in the US. At that point she hooked up with Fetzer. I do not know if or what the deal was, but I know that she must have been desperate. At that time her work changed direction. She became an advocate for some form of exotic weapon. Jones, I think correctly, took a position that this was very likely an un-provable hypothesis, that it was unnecessary to identify the specific source of energy (at that time he had not published on Thermate), that controlled demolition was provable by the nature of the collapses, and that these exotic claims, just like the no-planes allegations, would bring ridicule on the Truth movement. As a form of disinformation this is known as "poisoning the well". Fetzer argued in support of Wood on the principle that no hypothesis should be rejected a priori. As a matter of science, Fetzer was correct, but this was a matter of politics, not science. Incidentally, Fetzer, who claims to be a specialist in the philosophy of science, has published work on the art of disinformation. You can find it in the ACM online library.

Now, I would like to know what you think about the science behind Wood's work and EM waves. I understand her contentions about all the fried vehicles, but that might be explained by particles of Thermate.

One of the most interesting accounts is by a mysterious E P Heidner. If I can find it I'll attach it.

If you can get your mind around all this, let me know.

Peter

PS: Placing all this in a social/political context, I think it's important to note that trust in government is sharply declining. As a result, people are more willing to entertain thoughts that previously they would have thought outrageous. They are also inquiring because they know that something is wrong. These factors make conditions for the Truth movement more fertile. If it would catch on here, we have a public response like in Egypt. 89% of the people in Germany are Truthers, so it could happen.

PPS: I think that Wood's Qui Tam suit might have been designed to give conspiracy theories a "fair" legal hearing and then turn them down. I was disappointed by the exotic weapons claims in the suit. If they had made Jones-type claims, the case would have been irrefutable, at least as a

scientific matter.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Fri, Feb 11,  
2011 at 12:05  
PM

**From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>**

To: Peter

Cc: "Dr. Judy Wood" <lisajudy@nctv.com>

Dear Peter,

Like yourself, I have been agnostic on this all along - but courtesy of Judy Wood's website, I have got interested. I sense something very bizarre here. I mean even more bizarre than it had appeared earlier, of how three tall buildings can simply vanish so suddenly.

The evidence on Judy's website shows me that Dr. Jones is potentially lying to no less a measure than NIST with their pancake theory. There are no high temperatures as Jones claims, nor any thermite. See figures 5 and 6

<http://drjudywood.com/articles/dirt/dirt4.html>

This appears to be a low temperature, almost silent "powderification" (that's my coinage, Judy Wood uses "dustification") of three tall buildings in ways which are not explainable by any science I know of today. It is not controlled demolition. See the evidence she has compiled. Is that evidence fraudulent? If so, I'd like to know that.

Otherwise, it leads to the prima facie conclusion that this is a low temperature and not a high temperature, powderification and not controlled demolition, at a speed which is actually faster than gravity, destruction.

That latter point means a force pulling downward other than, or in addition to, the force of gravity "g" collapse.

Controlled demolition uses gravity to pull the buildings down under their own weight. So the demolition wave cannot go faster than gravity in the ideal case, assuming no resistance. Here we see it going faster than g. Also see Dr. Wood's BBE example and simulated timings of ideal conditions of free fall under gravity, compared to measured times. I had my high school kid model it in Mathematica and Judy Wood's numbers, given her boundary conditions, are so far spot-on - I am now playing with that to simulate more ideas and will make an interactive version available to everyone so that they can play with it themselves in Mathematica, change variables and see for themselves what happens.

What can cause this destruction - I haven't the foggiest idea. But it is easy to see, based on the evidence before one's own eyes, what it cannot be. Just like it cannot be the pancake collapse of NIST, it cannot be the controlled demolition of JONES using traditional kinetic energy explosive techniques. Why did Dr. Jones say it was Controlled Demolition? That it was thermite? That there was molten steel everywhere?

So I asked Dr. Wood some questions and she pointed me to a previous history of Steven Jones that I was entirely unaware of. Are you familiar with Cold Fusion and the role Dr. Jones played in scuttling it? Here is a link to a documentary: see the clip of Jones with Bush in the White House

[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rhdbU2sA8gE&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rhdbU2sA8gE&feature=player_embedded)

There is a longer documentary of which that one is a component - can't find link to that but you can find it by looking down the list of videos on the side. I watched that entire documentary.

So many questions are raised in it in the context of calculated obfuscation for special-interests of unknown nature (but representing the establishment), that I have coined the term Establishmentarian Science Hit Man "SHM" and "ESM", and use them interchangeably to express the same idea as John Perkins in EHM - sent in there to destroy or take over third world economies in the guise of helping them. An enemy disguised as friend. A Trojan Horse.

If you look at the Truman era Directive called NSC 10/2 for "plausible deniability", making up layered cover stories for masking covert-ops is standard operating procedure. If 911 was a covert ops of the highest calibre, would there not be sophisticated/convoluted cover stories already pre-planned and sprung into place as and when needed? This is true even if you assume anything other than Bin Laden did it - i.e., if you assume it is an inside job, then irrespective of how it was carried out, there'd be layers upon layers of cover stories, full fledged Techniques of Infamy for full spectrum hegelian mind-fcks. I have looked at cover stories and the hitmen sent in to muddy up the waters for introducing "beneficial cognitive diversity" in my article "Anatomy of Conspiracy Theory" in depth. You may have seen it before. Here is a link if you missed it:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/03/anatomy-of-conspiracy-theory.html>

That's as far as the existing explanations go. They are outright to be expected to be layered in cover stories, in red herrings, awashed with false clues, planted clues, basically everything that you might find in Sherlock Holmes novels and then some!!

Dr. Jones appears outright bogus to me, a SHM. He played that role rather well in scuttling Cold Fusion. Just that behavior in 1989-1990 casts doubt in my mind on Jones integrity. Anyone who is standing next to George H. W. Bush signing off on directives to look at a science thingy - and you can see Steven Jones right there, second from the left in his blue blazer - why did the President of the United States get involved at the highest level in the country with such urgency? This was only a science discovery for heaven's sake? And what was the outcome? The two discoverers were marginalized courtesy of Steven Jones. This is a very interesting paper by them - please see attachment.

How did they manage to get MIT and Caltech to fib results? Only in the same way that they can get Global Warming scam going.... mercenaries come with no religion, color, caste, or creed. Why can't Jones be a mercenary in your mind - all the evidence is right before you. Why should I take a mercenary's word for anything? I don't take Noam Chomsky's word - why is Jones any special? I never heard of him before 2007, and I never heard of Judy before February 2, 20011. And so, it is only the evidence they each present that I can judge them by, and on their past behavior, i.e., their integrity in past known performances if any. Jones clearly establishes himself as an Establishmentarian by participating as a SHM for Cold Fusion.

Well, look at the material on Dr. Wood's website. There is a lot there, and I only draw attention to just one item above, figures 5 and 6 discrepancy. Can you explain it? Unless you can show me evidence that Judy has committed fraud, there is evidence on her website, which I believe indicates Jones has committed fraud upon the public. As Judy pointed out, and as I had noticed it too when I had first read Jones papers, why had Jones, Ryan et. al., not brought up thermite in their NIST challenge? Go back to their Fourteen points of agreement with NIST paper - where is thermite mentioned in it? Is thermite mentioned by them in any submission they made to NIST? Or is it only present in their so called "peer reviewed" papers on their Journal of 911 Studies? This is an inquiry, not an assertion. Please let me know. Furthermore, I discovered Bentham charges you money to publish - \$800 for Jones paper. No referee qualifications are mentioned. Who are these peers who review Jones paper? He paid \$800 dollars to get a technical paper published? Do you think I can write some gibberish and get it published there - in fact, Bentham has flooded me a few times for paper requests to me as an 'expert' in my field - what field is that? Don't feel surprised when I tell you that everytime they come up with a new journal, they end me an invitation to submit a paper, the last one was on philosophy! And how did they get hold of my name? Because I had written the Bentham publishers when they published Jones paper in 2007 or 2008 thanking them. At that time, I didn't know about Jones and had accepted his findings. But today, not only do I suspect him of deceit, but I also suspect Bentham to be no different than those online degree diploma mills to lend instant credibility to dubious people. I hope my initial skepticism may be forgiven if I am shown to be mistaken. So show me my mistake. Show me that Jones is not fraud - other than faith that is. I show you that one of these two have presented fraudulent doctored evidence - is it fig 5 or fig 6? Just one deceit is sufficient for me to discredit a person - I don't need to be buried in pile of shit to know that the stink is rotten.

As for what did happen on 911? I don't understand it any more than anyone else.

And I am unwilling to speculate, primarily because I also don't have any expert-level technical understanding of this domain of high energy/high frequency physics and new aspects of electromagnetics which only perhaps the black-ops and deeps people know. See this conference for example - pdf attached. It is a classified conference, and it talks of directed energy weapons, or DEWS, and these weapons are based on photonic energy, which interacts with matter in new ways hitherto unknown by the study of Maxwell's Equations. But the proof of the pudding is in its eating, and you can see that laser is a directed energy weapon, but its primary

modality of destruction, evidently, is by heating. On 9/11, we are looking at some new systems whose modalities, inter alia, appear to be low temperature destruction. This is not speculation, this is evidence before our own eyes. Where are the hot fires? But I don't know much more about it. I have no opinion on planes, and even on the presence or absence of thermite. Just that controlled demolition cannot have been the primary modus operandi here. I have no idea whether it may have been a sub-component, or a calculated red herring planted for cover stories later on. This is right from political science 101, and rooted directly in NSC 10/2 and not an idle speculation. So it is plausible that thermite may have been present, just like planes may have been present. I haven't looked at this at all. When I cradle 9/11 in political science, I expect deception all around. And I have to become a forensic detective questioning whatever I see. And I saw the drama on 9/11 and its biggest actors was the airplanes, and Osama bin Laden flying them. If I rationally question the latter, why might not other people who have looked at this deeper than I, rationally not question the former? Both are shadowplays to create a narration on Plato's screen in the underground Cave. Nothing more - dwelling on them is to get mired in the minutiae and that's part of the agenda of seeding confusion and occupying people in low order bits of the matter while the higher order bits remain un-addressed, until fait accompli is seeded. Like I say repeatedly, a 150 years from now, even the 6th graders will know that the native American Indians were genocided with small-pox laden blankets, etc. Fait accompli - neither you, nor the 9/11 truthers tend to pay any attention to it - and I have essays upon essays on my website trying to get Jones et. al. to pay attention and do you know what Kevin Ryan had written me? He is looking to establish 1000 years of peace by showing 9/11 to be an inside job! What a load of bullshit - don't you think?

As for my new teacher Judy, I also don't understand Dr. Wood's claims of "interference", "mix and match", and I don't understand what is this "free energy" business got to do with 9/11. Although, by now, I have read many articles on zero point energy, and it is evidently the same or similar to what physicists call "dark matter". An hypothesis which is as old as Wheeler, and yet to be demonstrated in real life in a manner which can be called science by scientists, i.e., repeatable. So far, no one can prove this to be true. There are also two scientific American articles on this - here are the links:

<http://www.padrak.com/ine/ZPESCIAM2.html>

<http://www.padrak.com/ine/ZPESCIAM.html>

And this fantastic documentary on free energy is minimally eyebrow raising:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6472393167194458119#>

But I have now also seen talks like this one, and read almost similar material, which sounds almost gibberish to me, but in fairness, I also don't have the expertise to directly evaluate what they are saying, but also in fairness, none have shown empirical evidence which is repeatable:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5738531568036565057#>

When it is not repeatable, reproducible by others, is not reliably-repeatably measureable, it is not science in the sense we are familiar with. When it is not empirical, it is not a product. When I see a product, I can understand it. But before then, it is all in the realm of imagination, where, ultimately, all science takes seed. Some come to fruition, others become sci-fi novels to entertain the mind, which, perhaps in a century or two, also become science. Mavericks, and clearly Nicola Tesla was one such maverick, make the product first, sometimes based on intuition, sometimes just experience, and then retrofit it with an explanation which becomes science. No one can call Tesla a quack. Sometimes, there is no clarity for a while, of why something works, but the product exists which no one can refute. The best example is the apple falling from the tree. You can think of it as a product which existed for millions of years until Newton wrote down an equation for it a few hundred years ago which made it a science. Using Newton's equation, we can now build things, and they work as predicted, reliably, and can be produced by anyone. I write this to clarify that I am unwilling to dismiss tinkering. I am a tinkerer myself, and before I understood electronics, before I understood speakers, I had built an amplifier using transistors and a speaker system with an enclosure design. Later when I attended MIT I learned the science of what I had done, which also taught me how I could make an even better one now that I understood stuff better, and I also took a course with Amar Bose on Acoustics where I learnt how silly my own speaker design was!

However, one cannot construct a complex machine, a sophisticated system, without knowing an underlying science, one that delivers accurately on demand. Such a science must underlie what we have seen on 9/11. That is simply empirical. Because of its precision, it is not a random event. Because it happened, it clearly has a military weapon grade precision system behind it. This is why I like Judy's apt terminology "The New

Hiroshima".

And I find it more than curious that Hurricane Erin was parked outside NYC on the day of 9/11/2001 and know one had even heard about it until Judy Wood discovered it. I only heard about it last week, to my utter amazement. Why? Because a hurricane can be modeled, to the first order, as a large, infinite, parallel plate capacitor - a source of almost infinite charge! The other plate is the earth! A discharge, and this empirical, creates current, thus a magnetic field, thus an EM wave. This is EM 101.

Beyond that, what can one say at this time? I have no idea how it is actually related to 9/11, except that it is curious that a source of almost infinite power was parked outside NYC. How was it harnessed? Who knows! I won't speculate.

But I have already discovered that Dr. Wood's reference to John Hutchison, by way of explanation that this was Tesla related, is not science at all - did you read my letter I referenced earlier? John may be a tinkerer on a discovery which is not repeatable by others, but he also himself claims to have met "a UFO", i.e., is an "abductee", for heaven's sake!! I am supposed to take that chap seriously, never mind his unrepeatable experiments? Here is the link again, and please see what he himself has to say why no one can reproduce, repeat, his experiments:

<http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/zahirs-letter-to-dr-judy-wood-feb-06-2011-whats-wrong-with-this-picture-publishletter.pdf>

Therefore, anyone citing Hutchison is minimally "poisoned" in the eyes of rational people like me who see UFOs and Aliens etc. from the lens of political science and social engineering. See my article:

<http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/01/aliens-and-ufos-hegelian-mind-fck-pt2.html>

And I don't know why someone would deliberately "poison" themselves! Tinkering is fine, but you can't call it science until it becomes science. Therefore, you can't draw on it to make explanations of military-precision grade weapon system either, other than speculatively. Why would one speculate like that? There is no knowledge contained in it which can be called science! Only conjectures and hypotheses. That's okay - but then prove it, answer questions on it, and don't call my inquiry "spook"!

Interferometry is evidently Dr. Judy Wood's own field, by her own declaration, and she well understands that the "interference" phenomenon, in the traditional usage of that word, is only caused when two traveling waves of like frequency interact. Two waves of very dissimilar frequencies cannot cause "interference" - in the traditional linear sense in which the superposition theorem applies - and when I asked her about this "mix and match" business she was talking about in her interviews and on her website where she showed the entire frequency spectrum and implied one could mix and match two very different frequency bands from the electromagnetic spectrum to cause "interference", she had her paranoid reaction to me.... I don't understand why this reaction, but I sympathise with her given that she has experienced all kinds of discreditation by people who were previously supposed to be allied with her. Only time will tell who is shilling for whom, and who is disinfo and who is honest - which is what I wrote back to her.

I am still studying this EM.... but from what I see ab initio, without any a priori interest in any of the players, both Jones et al, and Judy et. al, the evidence brought forth by Dr. Judy Wood on her website is new and revealing to me. It discredits Dr. Jones et. al. I am almost convinced of it - unless the evidence she is presenting is fraudulent.

Unfortunately, and in summation, the explanations brought by Dr. Wood herself, I have to admit, are over my head as of this time. But just looking at the evidence she has compiled from the public domain, and ignoring her explanations, shows me that there is yet another explanation waiting to be discovered. That, in fact, if anything, just like 911 cannot be explained by the NIST's version, it also CANNOT be explained by the JONES version either!! At least for my little brain - all these people are big shots Peter. I am a plebeian, and my project is the plebeian antidote to hectoring hegemony. I am not impressed by big shots - as you can tell:-)

Please take a look at figures 5 and 6 to start with on the link provided. Visit some of Judy Wood's other pages.... judge for yourself and let me know which you think is fraudulent, figure 5 or figure 6.

I am cc'ing Judy Wood because I think it is about time we spotlight only the evidence, ignore private speculations and preferred explanations, and perform that science we already know how, beginning with

principles we understand applied to data in front of us - and go from there. I have to thank Judy Wood for bringing this data to my attention. Steven Jones nor Richard Gage ever wrote back to me. Judy Jones not only replied, but actually gave me the courtesy of carrying on a conversation - until she turned it off her self. I appreciate that courtesy - but I won't let it prejudice me.

In general, there is no reason to make assumptions and invent hypothesis unless we actually need them. And I think, based on the evidence in front of us, thanks to Dr. Wood, we do need some new hypothesis on how these buildings were turned to instant powder ("dust" in Judy's parlance). I rather that this study came out of prominent scientists themselves than mavericks and SHMs. And Judy Wood has put her own stake in the ground - this is her new book - let's you and I both read it, and let's put aside her personal conjectures and focus on the rest of the material evidence she brings forth. Either that evidence is fraudulent, or it is genuine. That is the first determination to make. I haven't made that determination fully, and am in the process of doing so. Subsequently, if the evidence is genuine and undoctored, such as the magnetometer reading of the earth's magnetic field on 9/11 is outright inexplicable, and is that graph real or fraudulent. Let's see what conclusions we each come up with independent from what she has come up with, just by looking at this evidence. Minimally, my first order inclination is to believe that this is not a simple kinetic energy event as postulated by the planted explosives mantra, any more than it is a collapse due to fire mantra of NIST. Can I therefore postulate a photonic energy event? I don't know as yet.

And if only I can get the MIT/Caltech/Harvard profs to do the same, to just look at the evidence but not in isolation from the context, rather, with much forensic emphasis just like Sherlock Holmes on a crime case - for that is doing the correct level of real science here, cloaked as matters are in overwhelming deception. Right?

I am working on writing a formal paper on only presenting the evidence, and a much more rambling longer one to contain the political science / social engineering context which I can't all bring forth in a short technical paper.

Sorry for the length of this letter and making you read through it all:-) Like Judy once wrote me: "Wow! Words flow easily for you."

Hope it makes sense and enables you to take a second look at Judy Wood's work, unprejudiced by what you already know from Jones et. al. Perhaps we will discover her to also be a fraud? Or, perhaps the lone Socrates? Remember that Socrates was reviled - not invited to the White House to shake hands with the leader of the free world!!

Best regards,

Zahir

[Quoted text hidden]

---

## 2 attachments



**Fleischmanreflection.pdf**

702K



**Zahir's DEPS Conference to Dr Judy Wood Feb 04 2011 - Have you seen this Directed Energy**

**Systems Symposium.pdf**

127K

---

**From: Peter**

**Sat, Feb 12, 2011 at 5:16 AM**

To: "Project Humanbeingsfirst.org" <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>

Zahir --

The source of figure 6 is [http://drjudywood.com/pdf/060907\\_WhyIndeedDidtheWTC.pdf](http://drjudywood.com/pdf/060907_WhyIndeedDidtheWTC.pdf) . It refers to a document on Woods' site, not Jones.

Peter

[Quoted text hidden]

---

From: Project Humanbeingsfirst.org <humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com>

Sun, Feb 13, 2011 at 6:58 PM

To: Peter

Cc: "Dr. Judy Wood" <lisajudy@nctv.com>

Peter - that document you note in your reply letter is Dr. Jones famous paper "[why indeed did the wtc buildings completely collapse jones thermite world trade center j24.pdf](#)" on his 911 Studies Journal website, only cached by Dr. Judy Wood on her own website as [http://drjudywood.com/pdf/060907\\_WhyIndeedDidtheWTC.pdf](http://drjudywood.com/pdf/060907_WhyIndeedDidtheWTC.pdf) . But look at this anamoly - the two versions are different with different timestamps, different number of pages, and the figure6 is missing in the one on Jones' website today.

I thought that strange, and looked on my own harddrive. I knew I had read Jones paper the moment it had came out - or soon thereafter. This is what I found: 4 versions of the Dr. Jones Jones paper which were downloaded by me directly from Jones 911 Journal website at different dates starting September 2006 up to March 2007. I attach all four of my copies for your review, and they have the following dates of creation and other statistics as they appear on their respective PDF summary page:

1. WhyIndeedDidtheWorldTradeCenterBuildingsCompletelyCollapse2 Dated-9-7-2006-5-04-13pm-48pages-1.13mb.pdf
2. WhyIndeed09 Dated-10-9-2006-2-43-43pm-48pages-1.23mb.pdf
3. WhyIndeedDidtheWorldTradeCenterBuildingsCompletelyCollapse Dated 11-14-2006-1-30-31pm-48pages-4.79mb.pdf
4. Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse Jones Thermite World Trade Center J24 Dated-1-25-2007-2-11-11pm-47pages-4.77mb.pdf

All these versions on my local harddisk are inexplicably slightly different in content and pagination. However, all contain the same official date of publication which is imprinted in the footer on each page like this: **Journal of 9/11 Studies 1 September 2006/Volume 3**, Yet, each has a different creation date and timestamp, file size, number of pages, etc. in their PDF Summary Report - indicating they have been continually and silently revised since the advertised publication date. But there is no annotation in the text itself to identify that updates have been applied to the text after the version published in "**September 2006/Volume 3**", and after a peer review organized by Kevin Ryan! A printed hardcopy made after January 25, 2007 of that Jone's document from that official website, cannot tell that the original peer-reviewed version published on September 07, 2006 was different. **This is a big problem!!!!**

Now, the version on Steven Jones 911 Journal website today is evidently the same 47 page version noted in my list above, with date on the PDF Summary page which reads: 1-27-2007 2-11-11 pm 4.77 mb. Here is the link for Jones current version on his website once again:

[why indeed did the wtc buildings completely collapse jones thermite world trade center j24.pdf](#)

Interestingly, just as an aside, I had linked to that 47-page verison of Jones' paper in my March 2007 article which you can see here: <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2007/03/whytalksfail-letters-and-replies.html> **wihout realizing that there were multiple versions and that I had read a different one in September 2006!!**

What Dr. Judy Wood has cached on her own personal website on the link you sent me, is evidently one of the 48-page versions listed above which, and at least from the timestamp, appears to be the original version which was peer-reviewed and first published by Steven Jones!

Judy Wood's cached version has the following statistics on its PDF Summary page: 9-7-2006 5-04-13-pm 48 pages 1.13 mb! Notice that it is identical to one of my cached versions noted above. And that is the date which most closely matches the publication date in the document's footer imprinted on every page: "**September 2006/Volume 3**".

Here is the bizarredom: page 18 is identical in both my and Judy's cached versions. The figure on that page 18, is the figure-6 cited by Dr. Judy Wood in her [dirt4 article](#). But that figure is absent in the Jones later version of 1-

27-2007, and which has since been on his website. Why did Jones silently remove that figure - which the evidence which Judy has been presenting on her website all this time indicates is a fraudulent/doctored image?

The only pertinent observations I can make here, without any speculation, is that Steven Jones has been continually changing the text of his published article after its publication date, which is advertised date, "**September 2006/Volume 3**". Why did Steven Jones not leave a note in that document that it has been modified since its peer-reviewed publication on the Journal of 911 Studies website?

That much publicised website isn't presented as Dr. Steven Jones's private or personal website though - as it advertises itself as containing peer-reviewed papers and a technical Journal in its own right - just look at its name!! So which of the many versions of this document since its first official publication date "**September 2006/Volume 3**" was peer-reviewed?

Is it kosher to silently remove a doctored figure after the paper is supposedly published after a peer-review, without admitting it? Imagine what would happen if this was a mainstream scientific journal like Nature? I think this is scandalous to say the least! And it also shows that all this hoopla of peer-review that Steven Jones makes is bogus to fool mostly his idiotic followers who couldn't tell the difference on the day of 911 that it was self-inflicted. He has correctly identified his followers as type-2, people who were formerly type-1 and "woke up". See Mein Kampf, or my report on Manufacturing Dissent to understand this very essential social engineering principle upon which the entire edifice of Manufacturing Consent is constructed. If you deny that his audience is primarily type-2 - then you really need to read my report, at least the preamble where I quote from Mein Kampf, Edward Bernays, and show why Hitler could ignore manufacturing dissent in his Nazi socialist republic where there wasn't even any pretense at dissent, but a "democracy" which is projected as being "inimical to imperial mobilization" and which relies entirely on the illusion of "freedoms" and the facade of vigorous debate, really can't: <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/06/wmd-master-social-science.html>

There is a lot more in my earlier letter which you didn't comment on Peter. Jones' Cold Fusion scuttling; David Ray Griffin's own globalist statement, etc. But thank you for checking this item - and I now request for your explanation of it if you can. Or perhaps you can ask Dr. Jones: 1) why he removed that figure ; 2) why did he do it silently after it had supposedly been published by his "Journal", and after a peer-review at that ; 3) has he ever done that before with his other papers? Ask him point blank mon ami - and give him the pleasure to repeat the "Nixon denial"! Confront the crooks - I always do - but they never pay any attention to me! You might have better luck with your habitual politeness:-)

I think there are many problems with these famous leaders of 911 Truth Movement. I have no leaders. None of these people mean anything to me. I am surrounded by liars and opportunists, uncle toms and mercenaries, all shilling for the hectoring hegemon in their own compartmentalized/self-serving way. Only evidence interests me. And Dr. Judy Wood's compiled evidence-set interests me a great deal. Why is it missing in Jones' compiled evidence set? Dr. Judy Wood's demonization also interests me. She reminds me of Socrates. That does not mean I accept everything Judy Wood says - and you can see that amply in my letter. It also does not mean that I endorse Judy Wood's work blanketly. What it does mean though, is that I do not, as of this writing at least, believe Judy Wood to be a liar or deceiver or fabricator or doctorer of evidence. Unless I discover otherwise, this is my current working assumption. And it also means, Peter, that I believe Judy Wood's book and evidence need a serious examination by those who claim to be "truth" seekers. Perhaps that means different things to different people. I am really not a truth seeker - I don't have time to go in search of the "River of the Arrow" (Rudyard Kipling's Kim). I am a justice activist - and I am driven by the fact that my people are being killed left right and center. I am not interested in JFK mysteries. Therefore, along the lines of my own motivations, what interests me in Judy Wood's evidence is the notion of "New Hiroshima" - because if there is to be another "New Pearl Harbor" to launch the new stages of "imperial mobilization" to cement world government, new red herrings will trivially be let loose among the public, with gullible dissent-people set running after rabbit holes. And I think Jones and Deagle were doing exactly that in their staging of it with their bizarre "22 nukes" talk, and advising the activists to have geiger counters handy to look for radioactivity etc. after another 911. Just examine the import of that if a "New Hiroshima" is the actual destruction modality - no one would be the damn wiser with their geiger counters, or, it could be used to trivially plant bs evidence to blame Iran!!! But there are no nukes - only New Hiroshima! Get it? It is a lot harder to move nukes around in this country because each one of them is so strictly controlled. But it is easy to move some bs evidence of radioactivity around to set a false trail...

Please keep bringing anomalies to my notice Peter. I am impressed that Judy Wood had the foresight to cache that document. I do that myself everytime I remember to do so, after I got burned many times citing quotes from Reuters and AP reports only to discover that they kept updating their stuff, and that these would disappear all

together. And I noticed that citing material from individual people's website is always dangerous because they edit things without intimation thus jeopardizing the integrity of the citation. So as you can see here, I now [archive the PDF](#) of many important things and often cite the cached version as well. It is a royal pain!

Please note that I am once again cc'ing Dr. Judy Wood. I thought of Cc'ing Jones but I think it might be better, if you wish to extract a response from it, that you write him privately and ask for clarification on the above matter in your own style! I have no patience for mercenaries except as an in your face confrontation - but if you still believe in his integrity, and you may well be proved to be correct, please write him and inquire.

Thanks.

Best wishes,

Zahir

[Quoted text hidden]

---

#### 4 attachments

 **WhyIndeedDidtheWorldTradeCenterBuildingsCompletelyCollapse2 Dated-9-7-2006-5-04-13pm-48pages-1.13mb.pdf**  
1159K

 **WhyIndeed09 Dated-10-9-2006-2-43-43pm-48pages-1.23mb.pdf**  
1259K

 **WhyIndeedDidtheWorldTradeCenterBuildingsCompletelyCollapse Dated 11-14-2006-1-30-31pm-48pages-4.79mb.pdf**  
4904K

 **Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Completely Collapse Jones Thermite World Trade Center J24 Dated-1-25-2007-2-11-11pm-47pages-4.77mb.pdf**  
4886K

---