

Is There Evidence For Directed Energy Weapon Use on World Trade Center?

By Ron Avery

I attended and live-streamed a presentation made by Dr. Judy Wood, a former professor of Mechanical Engineering and research scientist in experimental stress analysis, on Sunday 3/15/2015 at Blinn College in Brenham, Texas. She says that she has concluded a complete and sufficient investigation of the destruction of the three skyscrapers (1, 2, and 7) and the four low rise buildings (3, 4, 5, and 6) at the World Trade Center. She says that the structure of the buildings, including the steel, was turned to dust in mid-air before our very eyes. She says her book, *Where Did The Towers Go?* documents her complete investigation. About 12 of us had dinner after the presentation and I asked her if she knew who had this ability and who used it. She said Applied Research Associates Inc. She went on to say they would know who has such technology if they don't.

Comment [adj1]: This is not correct. She did not say this at all. She has said she has completed a forensic investigation of the destruction of the WTC on 9/11 and nothing in her book about this has been refuted.

Her evidence consists of eye witness accounts, photographs, and video taken at the WTC. I asked her at dinner if she could prove an energy weapon was used on the WTC if she had a bucket of dust and some steel from the WTC. She said she doesn't need any of that and has already proven that and documented that in her book. Her presentation consisted of many of the photographs and videos we have all seen before a many times. No doubt we have discovered things as we have gone along over years looking at these photos and videos and we all can admit we have been told by the mainstream media what to think about what we have seen. But it seems that Dr. Wood is doing the same thing. She is telling us what to think about what we are seeing. When I asked Dr. Wood what evidence she has of such an energy weapon being used on the WTC she said we have video of it turning to dust (2 of 2- 00:36:57). Another at the table provided a picture of her book cover where five frames of a video are shown. Dr. Wood claims these progressive frames show the last standing "spires" turning into dust. I thought it was just dust from the demolition that settled on the steel and when the spires finally fell from lack of support they left a trail of dust coming off of them in their fall. I went to YouTube and found a video that really did look like the steel was turning to dust but I also found other videos of the same event that looked like what I thought. I must conclude that this "evidence" alone is not conclusive proof of "dustification of steel."

Comment [adj2]: You may have misunderstood this – you need a direct quote or a recording of this. What she has said in other interviews is that ARA would or should know whose weapon was used. Or they would know more about it than Dr Wood, or you or me.

Comment [adj3]: Had you seen the information about Hurricane Erin before then?

During the presentation (01:12:35) Dr. Wood showed a video of what looked like a half inch square iron bar or tube about two inches long standing on end being deformed and leaning in one direction as the result of imposing a magnetic field around it without the use of heat. This, no doubt, is proof that a very strong magnetic field can weaken the strength of a material such as iron. I asked her near the end of her presentation (02:11:16) if she had any evidence of such a technology being used on anything larger. I said the WTC is gigantic and the iron bar was very small and that would be a very large jump in technology. She had no earlier known example but spoke of other WTC site conditions which are also unconfirmed. Certainly we can all agree that the mere existence of a technology is no proof, by itself, that it was used in a crime without a direct link.

Comment [adj4]: Have you studied the WDDTG Book? Have you watched the other presentations where this is discussed. This particular issue is a "talking point" on the AE911 (who have not taken court action) "DEW Debunk" page.

Comment [adj5]: Indeed. Well, that's why there is a lot of other evidence in the book and in the presentation proving that this is what happened. For example, remember the people in Stairwell B at all?

Comment [adj6]: Really? Is that what she said in the presentation? Go back and listen again. What she actually showed was a comparison between effects seen at the WTC on car door handle and the bar in JH's experiment.

Dr. Wood showed a slide (01:56:06) of two small piles of powder, one of iron oxide and the other of aluminum and said; that is what is in thermite, but the existence of these two compounds in all the dust samples does not mean thermite was used to destroy the WTC. She said thermite could not turn the buildings to dust as we have seen. Near the end of her presentation I said that I was an architect and had studied the paper on nanothermite and said that the sample did not contain mere components of nanothermite but the manufactured super nanothermite that they were able to ignite. She said that when the Towers turned to dust it made the powdered iron oxide and aluminum which are the components of nanothermite. But she did not address the fact that

Comment [adj7]: You seem to be misunderstanding what was shown. 2 sets of parallel evidence – showing the same or very similar phenomena. What you take from that is up to you.

nanothermite must be manufactured in a specific manner to be explosive. One cannot make a Cadillac by merely putting iron and aluminum in a room. The same goes for the manufacture of super nanothermite. Dr. Wood is denying the fact that fabricated super nanothermite was found in all the dust samples. She also said nothing about the iron spheroids which were found in all WTC

Comment [adj8]: Correct – but the evidence of nanothermite irrelevant. What bright flashes, flames and explosive sounds did you hear as the towers were destroyed? Why didn't Jones and Gage submit this "conclusive" nanothermite evidence to NIST? WHY?

dust samples which can only be produced by heat sufficient enough to liquefy iron to the point that it will condense with equal surface tension in the atmosphere causing a sphere like a drop of rain. She must deny heat to maintain her theory.

Comment [adj9]: Oh dear! You have not read the WDDTG book!! It is in there!

Like many other things in life, settling on an incomplete theory will cause most everyone to be either defensive, offensive or willing to alter their hypothesis and theory. The last option is most rare. All of the "evidence" provided by Dr. Wood leads to her matrix of decisions (01:58:32) about what she must defend and attack to maintain her theory. She has chosen cold fusion (dustification) and electro-magnetism as the tool used to "turn the WTC into dust." But once she has settled on that she is forced to reject the possibility of super nanothermite being present in its active manufactured state in the dust samples as it is totally unnecessary. This is why she spent much time in the presentation discrediting Dr. Steven Jones who participated in the dust sample studies that found the super nanothermite. But she also arrives at her conclusion with video and statements made by people on the site during clean up that are inconclusive. She tells us what to think when we see video and photographs much like we were told when viewing security camera footage from the Pentagon. The WTC demolition is not a controlled environment with no dust in which to observe the complete disintegration of steel. There is dust on everything and it trails everything on the way down and can look like nothing but dust when it actually contains hundreds of tons of steel.

Comment [adj10]: Really? Where did she say that? She actually, when asked, used the term electro gravitic magnetic nuclear interactions.

Comment [adj11]: WHY have you left out what Dr Wood covered on cold fusion?

I asked Dr. Wood (02:31:29) if anyone would have to enter the WTC property in order to use this technology to destroy it and she agreed with me that no one and no tool would be needed. Using her suggested technology, the crime could be done without ever entering any part of the property. This severs the crime scene from the crime. No evidence from the crime scene would necessarily be important. If her theory is correct, we would need to clear all related to the site of any wrong doing as nothing was necessary for them to do on the entire property. This is why I asked her who she thought did it and she replied, Applied Research Associates, Inc. But she has no direct evidence connecting this corporation to the event. She added that they did it or should know who did it but provided no evidence. She is light years from obtaining evidence worthy of trial, and conviction.

Comment [adj12]: What theory? She presented evidence of what happened. And a (partial) parallel set of evidence of someone else's research!

None of us can deny that Dr. Wood has a large following. I think there are reasons that she is very popular. First, she delivers a theory that does not need direct evidence linking any people to the site itself. We need not think of Larry Silverstein or who provided security at the site or even the airports or anything else regarding the WTC site. The investigation is over with Dr. Wood and she also told me that herself. There need not be any further investigation according to her and her followers. All that is necessary is for the public to back her to force the government to make a "disclosure" that the technology exists and that they put it to good use rather than bad. Second, Dr. Wood's theory means that this new technology now advanced to this degree can be used for good to clean up nuclear accidents like Fukushima as she said. We talked about disclosure at dinner and I said even if all the 9-11 Truth movement backed you it would do nothing because we do not have a lawful government that would do anything and neither are they going to have a trial on any of this. She seemed shocked to hear that as well as the others sitting at that end of the table.

Comment [adj13]: What's that got to do with the evidence of what happened at the WTC?

Comment [adj14]: Really? Anyone watching Larry Silverstein can see he knew something about what happened and had to "play a role" but how does that effect the physical evidence?

Comment [adj15]: Oh really? When exactly did she say those precise words? I think you will find that what she said is that her investigation proves what happened to the towers – using about 8 different types of evidence – seems you didn't pick up on any of that apart from the obvious video evidence of the steel turning to dust. Simple speaking, your "review" misses out the witness testimony, bathtub status, seismic evidence, stairwell B discussion, aerial views of the site etc etc

Comment [adj16]: So what did she say? What are you trying to say?

Comment [adj17]: Who has said that? Quote someone when possible.

Many have suggested that Dr. Wood is an agent of disinformation to distract and divide the movement. I think she has honestly tried to solve 9-11 but in her desire to solve the crime with her belief in the perfection of a new energy weapon she feels she must attack other real evidence to maintain her theory. This is unfortunate but not an indication of being an agent. I think all dissention in the 9-11 Truth movement is caused by the overthrown government that will not investigate 9-11. This vacuum of law enforcement and legal investigation has made everyone of 111-ra-3-25-15-wood.doc 3 of 3

us an investigator and we feel compelled to think of a new theory or come up with new evidence that would be so overwhelming that the government would be forced to act. This is not going to happen! If we had a lawful government in place we would have already investigated the crime arrested the criminals, tried them before a jury and convicted them and punished them accordingly. But we don't have lawful government and our dissolved unlawful government will never do such a thing. Because no matter how the buildings were brought down, it was done so

by those who have overturned our lawful government and operate our dissolved government and they will not use it to prosecute themselves. You may watch the Dr. Wood presentation I streamed at: <http://new.livestream.com/RonAvery/Wood>

Some may be inclined to think I was sent by Architects and Engineers for 9-11 Truth to undermine the work of Dr. Wood. You can rest your mind. My name was even taken off the petition for a new investigation because I attended and streamed the Dr. Wood presentation at Blinn College. And Richard Gage, founder of said corporation says "our otherwise fine working 9/11 relationship has come to a close." So we can say for certain I was not sent by anyone to do anything. And I think we are all in a hell of a mess without lawful government.

Here's what I do think. We don't have evidence because we have ideas and facts. Facts are not relevant unless they have a direct link to the crime that can be proven without doubt. Everything else is just ideas and theories that can be pursued but once they come to an end without a direct irrefutable link they must be discarded and left behind for the sake of us all.

Comment [adj18]: Why would he do this, do you think? If Dr Wood "just has a theory" as you suggest, what's the problem?

Comment [adj19]: OK – so there is no evidence – on what would you base a "new investigation"? Are you a solipsist?

Ron Avery is a semi-retired architect, author and speaker on topics regarding Christian theology and the principles of property that regulate every aspect of lawful government.
Reply to: taphouse@sbcglobal.net