# CRep198pt1

#### **SUMMARY KEYWORDS**

9/11 research, Pentagon attack, controlled demolition, flight data recorder, yaw rotation, NIST report, explosive evidence, media control, scientific integrity, global war on terror, architects and engineers, building collapse, government cover-up, public demand, scientific method., debate, expert, vilification, curiosity, fear, media manipulation, propaganda, 9/11, COVID-19, vaccine efficacy, public outreach, deep state, imperialism, conspiracy theories, sociological study, Confirmation bias, conspiracy theories, cognitive dissonance, true believers, resilience, social psychology, epigenetics, intergenerational trauma, empathy, contact theory, dehumanization, sensationalism, scientific method, paradigm shift, cognitive load.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Speaker 1, Speaker 3, Speaker 5, Speaker 2, Speaker 4

- 00:17
  Coming to you
- 00:18 from the city of the weird
- Speaker 1 00:21
  exploring topics from the esoteric and unexplored to dimensions unknown, shining a light of truth on the darkest corners of our reality.
- Speaker 2 00:34
  Welcome to the curious realm. You welcome.
- Speaker 3 00:44

  Well, hello everybody, and welcome to curious rooms. Official coverage of the turning to tide 911 Justice Conference right here in Washington, DC, we have the great pleasure of being island by researcher Wayne Korki, Walsome to the show for the first time.

<u>^</u> 00:58

Wayne, well, thank you, Chris. It's a pleasure to be here.

## Speaker 3 01:00

Absolutely, it was a pleasure to be invited. This is a cause that I have been behind since things happened. And I have always said that at the at the very minimum, the government knew something, did nothing, but there is so much evidence to other things, and, of course, tons of rabbit holes that people have dug over the years. And we had a great conversation yesterday, you're here answering some questions on whenever people ask stuff like that, but you have some amazing research that you've come across into the attack on the Pentagon, as well as the grounded plane in Pennsylvania. How did you first come to the world of 911 research? And how did you come to your research on those two

### Speaker 4 01:41

well, in the beginning, of course, it also goes back to watching the Twin Towers be impacted and burning and and then miraculously collapsing all the way down and and my my jaw dropped about as to the ground as fast as the buildings did. And it's like someone's gonna have to explain this to me. And it sat that way pretty uncomfortably for many years. And then in the fall of 2000 and people kept whispering in my ears saying that, Oh, there's something really wrong. And I kind of blew it off. In the fall of 2007 I ended up with the opportunity to see a screening, a local screening of blueprint for truth, so by Richard Gage. So I went there explaining to see an architect explain how the buildings were built and why they failed. I was not expecting to go into a presentation on the buildings were brought down by controlled demolition. It was not something I was expecting. And I spent the next 18 months getting my controlled demolition thermometer to go from 60% all the way up to 100% it 18 months is a long time to be uncertain, and studying this stuff and and then around 2010 I got involved it in a small group, and ended up getting invited into the architects and engineers to help on the presenters team, or congressional outreach. Actually, this was congressional Outreach at the time, and so I did a lot. Did that work with them in various capacities as volunteer. Ultimately, I was on the board, and then I formed my own organization, and we left, we parted ways. I created the 911 truth. 911 truth outreach, which became 911 tap, okay, that was to try to take over a role that architects and engineers was stepping away from which is outreach. How do you teach people to do outreach? Sure, so in this role of doing outreach, one of the things I wanted to do was to explain what to tell people, to tell other people, and to do it accurately and with the best information possible. So began working with Barbara Honegger in order to develop descriptions of what actually happened at the Pentagon, because she was, I thought, the most knowledgeable person, because she has been studying it and talking about it for so long, but over the years, I ended up trying to put on a television show, five series, show on the Pentagon, talking on 911 one of the series was going to be about the Pentagon, And I was going to ridicule large plane impact, talk about the alternatives for the flyover, all this other stuff. But in order to get ready for it, I dug into the what the photo showed, what the what the video showed, what people said. And so I wanted to be prepared. And ultimately, I woke up to the fact that things weren't as I expected. The in the key thing was that the difference distance

between the engine impact into the generator trailer and the a retaining wall was 42 feet. And that's the spacing for 757, I said, Ooh, that looks I can't explain this. And I lost sleep for at least three nights trying to grapple with the fact that I my entire paradigm has just been, yeah, contradicted by the evidence for a second time. Well, that was, this was the first time I believe, well,

Speaker 3 05:42

the first time you weren't even prepared to be a believer. Or, you know, right?

Speaker 4 05:47

Yeah, that thought the Twin Towers. Yeah, exactly. So by going into the details, I started to accumulate ever more information this particular episode, the series of episodes never materialized on the local cable television show. So that's how I got involved in more or less kind of in the Pentagon. And I started to say, well, you know, on some of the calls that I was on, you know, this is what I see about the Pentagon. And the pushback I would get is enormous. And by going into these particular discussions and saying what you're telling me I'm wrong, I don't like to say things if I'm wrong, so I think I do my homework. So let me go back in. And then we go on layer, uncover another layer, and over the course of the time period from 2015

- 06:46 1415, to 2017
- 06:50
- Speaker 4 06:54

little mini, little, mini topics. Can you see the shadow of the engines or shadow of the plane at in the Citgo security camera. Yes. Where would it have been? It would have been over there. That's how come you can see the shadows here. Why don't I see the whole plane? Well, there's bushes, and they're kind of whited out because of the high contrast of the security cameras and things like that. So that's one of them. There's the impact into the into the face of the Pentagon. And showed how it it all kind of fit. It wasn't quite perfect. And then there's pushback on on that. Then I found out that there was a column nine, A, A, the outer row of the Pentagon. The column numbering there is column A, A, because it sticks out like a bay window before for 400 feet or so. So a column nine, A, A, the column is actually, this is the front it's actually bent like this about two thirds of the way down, there's a it's bent. And so what could have caused this particular piece of damage? And it turns out, through the analysis in a presentation I put together, that's where the wing would have hit the and so we know how high the building was, how high the wing was, and that's consistent with the retaining wall over here, because when the engine came the engine was over here, it hit the retaining wall. The wing would have been

right above it, and that would have hit right here. So the everything kind of aligned up. So that explains column nine, aa, being bent in bowed. It's still connected to the top and the bottom, so it wasn't whatever impact that it wasn't severe enough, like in many others, just sever the columns. Some of them are seen hanging. Some of them are just knocked out and gone completely so but just by taking a look at the details, you can begin to start to piece together how things looked. And then on the far right hand side there's the column. The last column on the first floor that is standing is column 18. The next column over is column 19. And on top of column 19 is the second floor column 19, and that about 18 inches up, is bashed and it's it's bashed in like this. It's mechanically knocked in, so it can't be explosives that would do this. And then the next column, column 20, has something a little higher up. So this is about 18 inches off the second floor slab. And then this other little the limestone is knocked off at about 36 inches, and there's nothing, no damage on the others, but the window frame between those two columns, between 2020, 21 I guess it is, is actually bent in the way that the windows in one of the presentations that I put together was, how is the how is the how? Pentagon facade made, not so much the facade, but the front wall. Because when I first started, and I repeated this, when I would do my outreach around the Pentagon with I in plain sight, I forgot the guy who who did it, but it was he would say, oh, there's how did you create this C ring exit hole with a small impact hole that's 20 feet in diameter for the big plane, then you have another 20 foot opening in the C ring exit hole. How did it all go through? And it had to go through nine feet, nine feet, nine feet of steel, reinforced concrete, yeah.

Speaker 3 10:38

And this is what I always heard as well, which is what I told you yesterday, was that it was hugely reinforced on the outside. And no, go ahead,

- Speaker 4 10:46
  - please. So it turns out, upon lots of research and finding pictures and where they talked about it is there's zero. Did you hear that? 00? Feet of
- 11:00 steel reinforced concrete. And
- Speaker 4 11:03

there were the the outer wall was the was the original limestone. It was backed by infill brick, two layers of regular, regular house bricks within concrete frames. And then to reinforce it, they had taken out the wooden windows, window with wooden and glass windows, and they would replace them with a steel inset on eight inch steel tubes, tubes, not girders or anything, tubes with cross members. And the windows were there. They weighed a couple of tons of peace, so they had to be pretty sturdy, and then they ran bolts up and down to tie everything together. And the whole purpose was to prevent a truck bomb on the outside from exploding and sending shattered glass, shattered bricks, into the occupants, killing them in the Cobar towers, that was a most significant piece of the damage for killing the Marines was the shrapnel. So the

Pentagon was designed against a truck bomb on the outside, there's also a layer of Kevlar to keep the brick shards. But this, it was not a very significant piece. It was just keeping the shards from flying. And that's it. Then you have the columns there, I think 2020, 22 inch columns every 10 feet, all the way through to the outer C ring. And the C ring, where the hole is, that people talk about is, again, it's a 20 foot wide, 14 foot high, two brick thick wall, no reinforcing, that's it. And so it didn't take a lot of energy for and we see things like landing wheels in the in in the debris that's outside of it. So so there's some massive things that have actually hit it and knocked down this unsupported wall. And you can see pipes that are bent kind of outward. Nothing suggests an explosive on the outside or explosives on the inside, and everything's kind of just tumbled most of it's the bricks are just kind of tumbled up, tumbled down. They're not, you know, far away. So of course, some things are. So I would do all these things and and it was my attention to detail. One of the other things that I ultimately did is I IN 2017 I took a look at the generator trailer. Now the generator trailer was hit by the right engine as the plane approached. And everybody just assumed that the plane would was going straight, and was it hit column 14. It was always aimed at column 14. Nothing could change it. It was going to go right through because there's so much mass. Blah, blah, blah. I took a look, and I said, you know, my basic understanding of physics and engineering dynamics says when you take that much energy, the energy to move multi 10 trailer, it's got to have some impact. Yeah, the plane is not on a track. It's fly. It's in the air. There's nothing except it's momentum that's keeping it from doing certain things in all the aerodynamics. So if you're going to take energy out of one side, the other side has to there's got to be a yard rotation. So I took a look at this, and I did a whole series of kind of graphical simulations. What. If I had a little bit of a one degree turn for every couple of feet I went forward, what where would I end up in? And I wanted to make sure that my my right wing would basically hit almost perpendicular, almost flat, against columns 1819, and 20, because that seemed to be how the damage looked. And on the other side, I wanted it to impact it column nine, a, a, two thirds of the way up. And what this also, what this ultimately did is it gave me a yaw rotation that's that's kind of a rotation in in in the air, the nose actually turns out, upon further research, that it wasn't headed towards column 14, it was to the right of column 13, between 13 and 14, and that this Yahoo rotation shifted the nose to column 14, but that kicked the tail out a little bit, or the tail moved out to the left and impacted the Pentagon so or the facade now, with the wing down here and impacting something up here. The only thing that could be up here is the tail. And so when you take a look at the will Morris photo, you see that there's, there's a there's supposed to be beams, the Pentagon's columns and and beams, and the beam between column 11 and 13 is missing, and all the bricks that surrounded the with the window, the infill bricks, they're all falling away. And you can see the the window frames. You can see the windows, but everything is falling away underneath it. And the only thing that could have done that would be impact to the tail. It's the only thing that is above the height wise, above the wing. So that explained that. And with a little more refinement, I got it. I got it so it looked really well. Of course, it's not an engineering calculation, finite element analysis, because I don't, I don't have those tools about this is what the mechanics show would happen. Explains why the that where the tail is and everything aligns perfectly, yeah. Now, most recently, I took a look at the generator trailer, specifically, and in particular the it has a a streak across the top, and that is in exactly the right place to be a scar or a trace of the wings, flap, track fairing. Can Say that three times, right? And what that is is that is the mechanism that takes the wing flaps and when they want to extend them out it, it controls how it goes. And so they are in house, in this these make these fairings, these mechanisms, some people say they look like canoes underneath the wings, and they're not very wide, but it was in the right, exact, right location for the for the to make the scar. And if you do that now, you now would know with great fidelity, the horizontal location of the plane. Otherwise it's kind of well, it's gonna it's coming in somewhere, right? Yeah, now I can tell you, within a few inches of where it was,

# S Spe

#### Speaker 3 18:28

I was gonna say, which years down the road. Is incredible that you have actively decoded this, because once again, that it's always been the narrative, as people would say, that that a plane hit the Pentagon. But right people have the theorists have said for years that it was not a plane, that it was more than likely a missile, because, once again, hardened concrete things like that. Then new data requires new research, you know. So the fact that you were bringing all this new data to the table is really a game changing situation.

# S

#### Speaker 4 19:02

It is. And so talk about a couple other little, little pieces of data here. So one of the other kind of the research projects I did was looking at the wire spools. Because people say, look at those wire spools. How could they be there? Obviously, they were pre planted, or something like that. Yeah. Or, or, How can this be? It's ridiculous to think a plane. Okay, so when I was doing this, these precision measurements, this most recent one, I said, Well, how far is it from the trap flap, track fairing to the the other engine, and a 63.1 feet. So I put that down, and I rolled it out knowing the kind of the dimensions of the the engine, and at if you kind of go through this and there's a slight rotation, it ends up hitting the retaining wall right where it's supposed to, and it hits the the the. The the back of what I call spool number seven. It's a tall spool, okay, and so it's actually hit like a like a croquet ball, all right? The other ones, the balls next to it, don't get hit, but they can croquet the other one, the one that mallet hits, goes flying. So spool seven got hit. And it also apparently went and hit column spool number four, and the two of those went rolling off. Spools one, two and three were hit by the plane fuselage, it appears because they were off to one side that leaves spools five and six right that were right next to seven untouched. And so when people say, How can this happen? Well, just like when you play croquet, you can hit one ball and the other ones are unaffected, yeah. And so that's where you see them in the immediately, immediate aftermath of the of the plane impact is you got these two spools there. The big one that had been standing to the left next to the retaining wall is gone. Retaining walls got a hole in it, a gouge in it, and so everything just fits together, absolutely perfect. So there's one more thing I want to get to before we talk about the flight data recorder, absolutely. And that is, as the plane yaw had this yaw rotation, the left engine is now no longer traveling at exact at the same 52 degree angle. It's now been shifted over, and it's got a slightly different steeper angle, which means it's going to go more straight inside the Pentagon, because it's it's kind of like swung around, and it's now in a different direction. And so the American Society of Civil Engineers Building Performance Report has pictures of lots of columns, and I'm looking around. I've looked at these pictures like hundreds of times. But when you go looking for specific things, you say, can I see something that looks like? And sure enough, column, I think it's 9b Maybe it's 9c is really kind of odd. It I'm going to do this twice. It looks like I can't do it. This goes in like this. It's gonna it's got a it's got a circle indentation around indentation halfway right? So if this is the column halfway up, it's got an indentation, and it looks something like that. What could cause that? Well, I don't know. It's either the engine casing impacting it and in bending the column still attached to the top and the bottom, or it's the wing, a piece of the wing, that's kind of wrapping around. Now, what this does is it puts the engine in exactly the right location to be under what's called the uplifted slab. There's a in the middle section, in the D ring on the second floor, there's a piece of slab that is up. It's, they called the uplifted slab because it's, it's, it's push up. It's actually not exploded up, which everyone says, but it's actually tinted. It's mechanically snapped up like a Graham two pieces

of a graham cracker, right? And so this is not what you'd expect from a big explosion. And major David King was not too far away. He he survived. Everything suddenly turned into fire around them. And said, what happened here? You know, no explosions.

<u>^</u> 23:47

So what could have caused that?

#### Speaker 4 23:51

Well, people also ask, What happened to the engines? So now we're going to, now that we know where the engine trajectory would have been let's talk about the engine. Chris, you ever watch football? Yes. Okay, so you know that. You know what a quarterback does, he throws a ball, puts a little spin on the ball, yeah, right. And when you get to go down the far end, you see that there's a receiver, and there's someone trying to keep the him from touching, from catching the ball, yeah, all that the frequently, the person who's trying to prevent them from catching the ball doesn't have to catch the ball. Yeah? He doesn't have to knock it physically hard out of the way. All he has to do is touch it, yep, because then what will happen the gyroscopic rotation when you touch the ball, it's going to, depending on where you touch it, in the rotation direction, it'll kick out again, and then once it kicks out, it wobbles and it's uncontrolled, and the receiver deflects and lose its gyroscopic control, and it's hard to catch. Yes, so. So the the Rotate. The engines that are inside the Pentagon now are now no longer wrecking balls. They are rotating gyrus, rotating masses, massive high speed engines, lots of rotational inertia. So all when they've hit these columns and they have to change direction, they're going to kick up. And so the the evidence is, I think, unassailable, that what happened is the engines, both engines, did a tumble and bounce in this in this one case, hit the the second floor slab and and tented it up. That seems to be the the best explanation. Okay, so that kind of covers the kind of the physical damage. And so now my most recent research that stemmed from the generator trailer flap track fairing was in discussions with peers and Ted Walters from the International Center for 911, studies where this research was first published, they gave me a lot of pushback, sure They're sure they're resistant to large plane impact

<u>^</u> 26:21

hypothesis, hypothesis, yeah. So

Speaker 4 26:25

the big thing, as I said, the flight data recorder shows that the plane is coming in with a three degree to the right angle for the thing that you're showing. Wayne, you it's not going to work your wings too high up. It's not in the right it's not in the right orientation, all this stuff. And I said, Well, this is as far as I can go. The Flapjack fairing stuff works. I can't. Let's just publish it the way it is. But that's an unsat that left me an unsatisfactory position. I said, I don't like this, you know, so mall, so I fumed for for a while internally, be, you know, we kind of got a publishing and mulled it over and said, I'm and also I talked with another person who bought

the flight data recorder, and he just says, that's all piece of crap, useless, faked. And I for 2019 conference in Denver on the Pentagon. David Chandler, Ken Jenkins, John Windham and Warren Stutz. I think that

<u>^</u> 27:44

was it. There

Speaker 4 27:45

were some things that were pointed out, such as a lateral a lateral acceleration upon impact. And I said, Well, David, why don't you ever talk about this? Oh, it's good. I don't really believe that it's accurate. I can't tell whether it's hitting the wall. Oh, come on. Can't you talk all right? So I'll look at it. So I got the data off of Warren Stutz website, Warren stuff.com, all the flight data recorder stuff is there. He found because the flight data recorder was impacted and the battery got disconnected, the last four seconds, didn't have any, didn't have a, what they call a parity bit at the end. And so the automated system for record, for for decoding, it didn't work because it didn't have the right parity bit and said it's corrupted. It was still written, but it wasn't finished.

Speaker 3 28:38

Okay, wouldn't have finalized file to be able to be read fully by the

Speaker 4 28:41

by the by the conventional software, the vendor software. So I knew that this data was there, and so I started to look at it. And lo and behold, that long story short, I first wanted to show that there was manual control, or not, of the of flight 77 so I take a look. There's a section. There's a report on the mate, on the automated on the autopilot when it was turned on or turned off. And you can see that the plane is flies up. The steering wheel is nice and smooth. No, nothing, no, no, really weird things going on. And then when the manual control is turned off, the pitch of the plane is going up and down, there's lots of acceleration, front and back, forward and back. As the actually flight 77 the hijackers, yes, they were actually did things like forward, throttle, go back, the plane would have longitudinal acceleration. It would start to go up. They actually, he actually played with the he took the plane out for spins. And unlike flight 93 in which they, I think they were just clueless. They were clueless. It's. Looks like they didn't know what they're doing. They didn't do any of this stuff. So at as the as I'm looking at this, I'm noticing all the things that that happen that are so different during the periods of manual control, when the autopilot is is turned off, and the approach. And it's absolutely clear that the that during the periods of manual control they were under when the autopilot was turned off, they were under manual control of people acting chaotically well and pretty well controlled, but they were inexperienced, obviously, and that's why I have autopilots to keep everything with moving nice and smooth, yeah.

<u></u>30:39

And then when you get to the ad, actual impact,

Speaker 4 30:45

the what I found is that there was lateral acceleration. When the right wing hit the generator, the right engine hit the generator trailer, it got kicked to the left. That's the yaw. The left engine was still at full thrust, the the lateral longitude, like what acceleration still increased, which means that it wasn't a data point associated with the impact into the wall, into the facade, because it's so it meant that that was a that was a valid lateral acceleration from the generator trailer there the role, the role to the that had been at three degrees to the left now was at 1.8

31:32 and then on the wall it was zero,

Speaker 4 31:36
and it and after I actually had to, I actually built a 3d model So I could show it using Legos,

Speaker 3 31:42

which is impressive. Like the it was, it was a strike, Doc Brown moment when you showed me the pictures yesterday was like, this model isn't to scale, but it was very much to scale. Actually, it was, it was very to scale.

Speaker 4 31:55

It was not, it was within a about a foot to 18 inches, with the difference between the pegs and all that stuff. Yeah, so there was a fine detail. Doesn't, didn't really, wasn't perfect, but it was close. It was great. But when I went through the generator trailer impact, I noticed that the generator trailer got rolled over in my little simulation, and as it rotated, and then it and then the front goes down, and that meant that the back went up, because I put put a little pivot in the middle, and that's the front that would be so the trailer Actually pivoted around the front right wheel as it, as it pushed, got pushed down over and the back got kicked up, and that is what apparently impacted, knocked up into the, into the into the flap track fair and creating the the scar. Wasn't the plane hitting it, it was the trailer getting kicked up that gave an upward momentum to the wing, which shows up as a slight as an acceleration, a vertical acceleration, of the pole plane, which changed the role from The 3.1 to the 1.8 and then with that, assuming that there's still some energy in that flexing wing, that it continued to rotate, provide the roll energy so there was zero another

33:35

eighth of a second later when it hit the the wall.

Speaker 4 33:39

So everything kind of really fits the flight data recorder absolutely contains information that nobody knew about. And this is, this is probably the most important point I want to make in all this discussion, please, is that people say the flight data recorder for ae 77 was faked, the impact data into into the trailer and the facade and the in the half second before

<u>^</u> 34:12

was not part of the official story,

Speaker 4 34:16

in that it wasn't part of the decoded data. It was in a section that Warren stud would not find until 2010 or 2011 and then there's the question of how would the NTSB have faked to the data? And the reason this is critical is that this no reports 00, reports of anyone talking about your rotation that had anything to do with the official the official story. It's not in the ASCE report. It's not in the Purdue simulation that the plane just goes straight in all of that

Speaker 3 34:58

makes it look like a beer can. Crushing into a building right?

Speaker 4 35:02

There's, there's nothing, nobody ever talked about it. The only, actually the only person I ever used the word, and the reason I use the word Thank you, was Sergeant laosi That CIT interviewed, and he says, well, the plane, the plane hit and did and did a yard rotation. And he questioned that. What's a yard teaching describes it so, so that's where I heard the word y'all put in the back of my head. And so

Speaker 3 35:28

this is the prime example of what I say on the show all the time, Wayne, which is when new data comes into a data set, you've got to be you've got to take the time to analyze you, and you've got to be able to even shift your own paradigm to even just allow the new data in?

Speaker 4 35:44

Yen. So just to kind of conclude this inlease this this segment, here's this impact detail that's

rep. So just to kind of conclude ans, preuse, ans, ans segment, here s ans impact actual and s

in the FDR was could not have been known to the F the NTSB technicians to stick it in there. Warren Sutton only found it even when it was found. David Chandler, who looked at it, had no interest in it because he didn't know what to do with it. It didn't fit the model in the story. It didn't at the time. Yeah. And then when I go and go through the details of the yaw rotation. It makes sense, but it's still not definitive, yeah. And only when I do the flap track fairing and do a few other things does it fit perfectly. And now you cannot claim that it is that this part of the that this aa 77 flight data recorder is faked. It's to me, to me. It is a got a 0% probability of it being faked. Now, flight 93 There's another interesting thing, immediately after the hijacking. Time of the hijacking, the horizontal stabilizers are are changed now, after the after the hijacking, the phone calls say that people were pushed, pushed to the back. That means that the back is going to be heavier, so the thing called the horizontal state stabilizer will will change to keep the unsafe way right. Yeah. And so we see that as a matter of fact, there's several stages where it looks like people are moving back and back and further and back, hiding in the back

- 37:25 in flight 93
- Speaker 4 37:27

not only when the there's the sound of the fight in the cockpit during the takeover, the control column gets pushed down. The autopilot apparently is reset, because it doesn't record as being out, but the mechanics say that it had been turned off momentarily. It recovers, loses 600 feet, and then shortly after that, the horizontal stabilizers show weight to the back being compensated for and then, and then in the misawi trial, there's the transcript for the cockpit voice recorder, and it says it, I think it's 957, 57 there's a statement by one of the hijackers saying there's an attack, and that exactly coincides with a change in The horizontal stabilizer to wait moving forward, which is consistent with the let's roll. So the flight 93 no one has looked at this stuff well in 24 years this,

Speaker 3 38:31

this is one of them that I've, I've gotten into with people for years and years, because it goes, it goes straight into Malaysia, into the Malaysia Flight, where it's like, they they vanished, this group of people, they took them, they put them into and like, gave them new lives. Like people think that the Challenger crew was still alive, that that was utterly faked. And when you start getting into that, when you start getting into the the issue of

- 39:02

  a How are you gassing that many people?
- Speaker 3 39:06

And then I can understand the remote control. We have remote control of major drones. We have f 16 that fly by remote control. So we can test missiles. They don't put a pilot in that thing when they're shooting it down with a missile. So I'm not denying remote control, but the whole story that a bunch of people were gassed, relocated, and dead bodies were put in their place, and that's what was in the plane, is totally blown away by the fact that flight data recorder information shows the actual considerable because it's not like, it's like, hey, Somebody's purse rolled down the aisle and shifted weight. We're talking hundreds of pounds of weight shift enough to make a horizontal stabilizer compensate instead of a pilot doing it, you know. So that like and once again, numerous situations that by timestamp of recording match up with these moments. Yes, yeah, in in the hijacking, right?

#### Speaker 4 40:03

So, so you know the outcome, maybe. How many times have I said I'll conclude with right? So let me just talk about the United Airlines, 175 which hits the South Tower. Yeah, there's a lot of people that have looked at the video and they say, oh, there's this complicated thing at the end that just is what's needed to get into the tower. And so this has to be a remote control thing. And I look at it, I'm an engineer, and I know what control systems are supposed to do, and I cannot, for the life of me, envision someone whose job it is is to write a control system. We're going to hijack that. We're going to fake the hijacking. We're going to hit the South Tower. You're we're going to go in. And it's mission critical, because we got to hit the towers for them to get off course so bad that the correction is an out of bounds adjustment, not just one, but two for because, you know, there's a lot of variables that you can't correct for. And if you go way out of one, and assuming, well, we'll just get back, you don't, you don't know if that might have been a gust of wind that's kind of blue and and you've, you've shifted over another six feet, yeah, or eight feet, or maybe even more,

° 41:15

from target zone, from target zone. So

Speaker 4 41:18

for, for a a rodeo type approach that's faked. To do this is inconceivable to me as an engineer. If you're going to do it, it's going to be gradual adjustments would be needed across a steady flight path in order to hit the target. Yeah, that's how cruise missiles work. That's how there's no incoming fire to dodge or anything like that. So for all these other hypotheses to exist

41:52 and be credible,

Speaker 4 41:55

fake or turns that make no sense, just to make it look like it, just to make it fit the story, just

right? Just doesn't make any sense to me. But this does open up the entire Pandora's box of absolutely, what was the goal of 911 Yeah, the end game. The end game, to me, was to create the global war on terror. Yeah, and I've gotten a lot I've mentioned this, this next hypothesis, a number of people here, and I've gotten a lot of pushback, and that is, I don't think hitting the towers was necessary. I think I think hitting, I think the hijackings by themselves and the attempted attacks would have been sufficient to launch the global war on terror. Potentially, there there was other things. Maybe they were truck bombs, supposedly in the basement.

Speaker 3 42:45

We know the towers. We know that there were reports of other people with explosives, going for tunnels, going for bridges,

Speaker 4 42:52

things like that, right? So we don't know what. We don't know what other fallback positions there could have been to create the terror.

9 42:57
But I think the Pentagon

Speaker 4 43:02

had to be one of the things that was attacked. I think statement wise, absolutely, yeah, I think, I think flight 77 when it came in, it was looking to see what the damage? Where's the fire from flight 93 and there wasn't any. So they, they had to go make the turnaround to hit the Pentagon. This is my guess. And then, of course, that's because flight 93 was delayed, and it doesn't appear to be any communications between the hijackers. Yeah. So this seems to be how how it unfolded. But the key thing that I get the pushback from from my most recent question is, how important is it that the towers were destroyed? And because we're here in the towers of the central piece of evidence for 911 Yeah, I get a lot of people saying, Oh, of course that had to be and of course you had to hit it. So you need to have remote control to do it. But I don't even think remote control could work. One last thing about the approach into the Pentagon. The the we had the spiral descent, and the plane kind of lined up, and there's a the flight data recorder has a roll to the right when it except when it doesn't, and it looks like what happened was it had a roll to the right, and as it's straightening out, it still had a slight roll to the right. And I thought they were trying to get to the center courtyard. To me, that's the biggest target. Yeah, you want to hit the biggest bullseye, the center of the bullseye. But I think they had a visual on the V dot tower. There's a big tower next to the Sheridan. And if they went to the right, and the wind is coming from the north, they could have potentially been put unrecoverably off and missed the Pentagon, yeah, but if they went to the left of the tower, so they rolled to the left a little bit, and they went between the Sheridan and the V dot tower, and maybe even hit it. We don't know the. Some reports of someone climbing up there the next day to inspect it or repair something, then the wind would have blown it towards the Pentagon a little bit. But it seems like that when you look at the data, it's very suggestive of this last

minute correction to avoid the v dot tower, yeah, which they then had to dive. And the flight simulators, examples that we were shown last night at this conference here, where, if you didn't dive deep enough, you ended up flying over. Yeah, that they went low, and that's how come they hit the trees, the light poles, yeah, generator trailer,

#### Speaker 3 45:41

well. And you know, like you said, I also ascribe to the fact of, I don't think even, even minus the possibility of explosives or nano thermite or anything like that in the towers. Wayne, I also ascribe to the fact of, I don't think message wise. I don't think we would have had to have hit the towers to go into the war on terror, period. It I think four hijackings would have been enough for us to go after somebody, at least, to have the motivation. And like I've always said, it's really curious how we have a bunch of hijackers from another country and passports from another country, but that is not the country that we went to war with. We went to war with a propped up dictator that was put in by our CIA, as well as a terrorist leader who was propped up and financed and trained by our CIA. We went after two CIA assets, not after the country that actively had the terrorists, yeah, and that that's fascinating to me, and you can be a feel free to look it up, folks. It's pretty it's pretty interesting stuff that not a single of one of the hijackers came from those countries or was tied to them. And that's by FBI reports. That's by the the 911 report, everything.

## Speaker 4 47:02

And there's a actually a very critical piece here, in that Barbara Honaker is here, and she was instrumental in in although it's not part of the official story, Barbara Honaker was the driving force behind the getting the 28 paid redacted pages from the house investigation potentially read into the record like Mike Gravel did with the Pentagon Papers. That's right, and that was apparently the most brilliant thing, and Barbara deserves all the credit for absolutely, because that that got the Obama administration say, oh, there's nothing here. Just redact a few words and we're all set. But if it wasn't for that, it's not still not everything. And the thing is, the that shows that the FBI knew about it, that people were funding it, that was well known, yep, and that it makes it, that makes it not just to let it happen, but a make it happen, yeah? And shows that there are, that they're nurturing a select set of individuals who are willing to, yeah, potentially willing to to go through with this, with this,

## Speaker 3 48:09

this plan, yeah, so. And you know, even, even the first attack on the Twin Tower, even the or the World Trade Center, rather, I should say specifically, because it was the parking garage, even that first attack was two separate FBI informants from two different cases. Who the case officers were like, You know what we should do? We should get informant one and two be together, and we should see what information we could get from them. If, if we let them shake hands and then they ended up planning a bombing. So had the FBI never introduced these two guys. We would have never had the first bombing on the World Trade Center with the truck to begin with. Or it would have been different, or it would have been different, one of the two. And that's just it. When you start looking at these things once again, like I've always said, it is, at the very least, a fact of sadly and horribly, our government or actors within it saw something

was happening and did nothing as Yes, a means of exacted control, as a means by which to pass laws to remove liberty or even to allow black budget programs to get higher in in ranking with with contractors thereof, who then served us overseas in these campaigns, you know, black waters and things like that. So I want to thank you so much for your time today. Wayne, it's more than enlightening. And like I told you yesterday, I think that you are a very, very Keystone person, at least in these interviews, as far as what an idea of how to bring in new data to a data set, and how to be able to readjust and pivot and look at things from a scientific perspective when presented new data, instead of holding on to the instead of ignoring the ladder that's being. Lifted to the tree that you've climbed up in

Speaker 4 50:03

when in details, details matter. This is my mantra. So they do absolutely.

Speaker 3 50:08

And you know, I'm, I'm only an audio video engineer. I am in no right? An engineer like you are. However, it's one of those when the wiring diagram doesn't work out. You either need to look at the person that drew the wiring diagram or figure out a new wiring diagram, because you've been given new data, you know. So thank you so much for your time. I greatly appreciate it. Before we let you go. Let everybody know where they can go, to find your presentations, where they can go, to find your work, where they can go, to find all of your important research into 911 Wayne,

Speaker 4 50:38

well, the place where I'm working on putting most of my archives are up on David Chandler's website, which is 911 speak out.org there's a section called research collections, and Wayne costi is one of them. Okay? I also have another website called censored by Sefi. Censored by Sefi, S, E, F, i.org and that recounts me trying to present a paper to the European Engineering Educators Association in 2015 when I had an accepted abstract. It's in their booklet. I show up to France, then they say, oh, no, no, you can't present. And I say, I'm gonna, I'm gonna show up and to the board meeting and say you're not allowed to come. When I came, they walked me out the door. It was a, it was at a little University outside of Leo or Leon, or Leon's. And so it's a little tram station. I handed out copies in English or French. Had two different languages of the paper.

**51:52** 

Wow, some kind of guy, Wayne,

Speaker 4 51:54

some of some of the materials are there, and that's one of the other

## Speaker 3 51:58

archives. Well, once again, thank you so much for your time. I greatly appreciate it. Thank you so much for all of your work into this. As I've told people for years, at the very least, we need truth, we need disclosure. We need to be able to bring these things before Congress in a larger way, for the victims, for the families, things like that. That is what true justice is. Is looking for the truth doggedly till the end. So thank you for your work into that greatly appreciated while you are online, checking out all of the amazing work of Wayne costi, everybody make sure to stop on by the International Center for 911 justice at IC nine eleven.org make sure to stop on by Richard gages website, Richard Gage, nine eleven.com when we come back from this quick commercial break, everybody, oh yeah, make sure to stop on by curious realm.com it's where you can like, follow, subscribe. It's where you can share this episode with everybody that you know that may be having an issue with accepting that something else may have happened that day. And of course, we will be back with our continuing coverage of the turning the tide, 911, Justice Conference right here in Washington, DC, right after This, folks,

#### Speaker 1 53:20

the key to good science is good research. At the heart of good research is a good data set with the field observation and encounter log from curious research, you can easily keep track of your investigative information all in one place, making it easier to review cases and readily see comparisons and contrasts between them, whether out in the woods, watching in a back room, gathering EVPs, or using high tech gear to track UFO, UAP activity, this easy to carry pocket sized scientific data log is the perfect companion for any field researcher. You can find your copy of the curious research field observation and encounter log@amazon.com or visit the official curious realm store at curious realm.com forward slash store to reserve your copy for yourself, your family or a mind that you want to open that website again is curious realm.com forward slash store.

# Speaker 3 54:39

Well, hello everybody, and welcome back to the curious home continuing coverage of the turning your tide. 911 Justice Conference right here in Washington, DC, we have the great joy of being joined by Monica Seki. He was here presenting yesterday at the 911 conference. Let everybody know what what do you do for a living? How did you. Come to the world of 911 investigation, and what has led you down the road of data that you've been following?

#### Speaker 5 55:06

Well, I'm an anesthesiologist, okay? In practice for about 22 years prior to that, I was an engineer. Okay? My My degree is in electrical engineering, and I spent six years working for the for department of defense contracts, okay? And had kind of a conversion moment when I was about 25 and I was working on a prod project that was funded by the Office of Naval Research, and it took us up to the Arctic. And, you know, it just struck me. Maybe it was the cold air, or, I don't know what it was, the fresh air, the fresh cold air, yes. And it was I basically came to the realization that I should have come to years before, which is, I was in the business of making it

more efficient to kill people, or in general, you know, that wasn't actually the project, but, you know, that's what defense is. Yeah. Yeah. And so I came back and back down to the floor 48 and within a couple of months, I was taking classes to apply to medical school. So I had this big, you know, sort of shift in my career. And the reason why I bring this up is that it's interesting, because in retrospect, I can see how very, very intelligent people can miss the big picture,

Speaker 3 56:23 absolutely right? And scientists are frequently very myopic,

#### Speaker 5 56:27

very way they look at this, yeah, because they were looking at an interesting problem, it's like, oh, what absolute problem, without seeing how it fits into a greater worldview, I would say, yes. And they, you know, everyone I worked with was amazing and very, very smart, and, you know, the only reason why I was allowed to go was that one of the scientists couldn't pass as physical or being up on the ice for six, seven weeks. And so, because I was working on the project, I was young, and I could, you know, do some of the more labor intensive parts of setting up a camp up there, I was allowed to come and so it was a really heady experience. But my point here is that these were all very, very good people, yeah, and they were just involved in doing things that I didn't appreciate anyway. Fast forward ahead about 25 years, and I was, you know, as the head of my department in a relatively busy community hospital outside of Boston, as the director of anesthesia, two kids, nice house in an affluent neighborhood, and out of nowhere, we were hosting a dinner at our home with some close friends. And after dinner, my you know, we're all sort of looking at our phones, and my wife came up to me, and she said, Yeah, you know, I just never made any sense to me. And I said, But, and she showed me a video of of what I thought was a hotel in Vegas coming down as well. What's wrong? What's the problem? Well, the problem is, is that this happened in Manhattan on 911 and then everything changed, yeah, everything changed, yeah. It was just something I couldn't let go of. And, you know, rather than going to YouTube and and seeing what people say about it, I went directly to the NIST report, NC star one, a final report on the collapse of building seven. Yep, and it didn't take very long to say, this is just a, you know, it's thrown together. It's thrown together. Yeah, it's not an investigation. Yeah, you know, they basically hinge their entire hypothesis on a computer model. Yes, right? Which is a reasonable thing to do, which is you're not going to build a building and see what happens. And so, you know, to be very, very clear here, in the essence, in the interest of being uh precise, if you apply your hypothesis to a model and the model behaves in the way we observed, then your hypothesis could be right. There may be another hypothesis, sure. But if your if your model behaves differently, then your hypothesis is wrong. There's no question. This is not about buildings or nano thermite. This is epistemology, how we come to our understanding the actual scientific method. It's a scientific method. So the hypothesis is wrong, yet they said it was right. You can see that their model does not behave with what we saw. So They proved themselves wrong. They proved themselves wrong. Yet they are, you know, chanting from well, you know, they're writing in official documents that we proved it right, yeah, but it's literally, it's Orwellian, it's wrong. So in any case, the next thing that happened was an examination of the Twin Towers. And, you know, I remember where I was, just like everybody, and I was in Philadelphia at the time, I was finishing my last year of training at the University of Pennsylvania, and that morning, the event happened, and what I

remember distinctly was the South Tower. Were going down on live TV. Some people, you know, a lot of people saw it in replay, but I saw it live, yeah, and we were all sort of stunned, like, what just happened? Where did the building go?

<u>^</u> 1:00:11

And then later,

Speaker 5 1:00:14

over the next couple of days, we saw those buildings go down over and over and over again, and then all of a sudden, no more. They wouldn't show it on TV anymore. And we were told, because it was very, very sensitive to victims of the families, yeah, families of the victims. So we never saw it again, and I never looked at it again. But after I saw what happened to World Trade Center 716, years later, I had known about that building, I went back and looked at the footage, the actual video footage of the Twin Towers, and you can see that that was those buildings are blowing up. There are explosions happening far beneath the crush zone. And it only takes a little bit of, you know, understanding of how the physical world behaves to prove them wrong, like forget about you know, are they squibs? Are they explosions? Is it air compression,

Speaker 3 1:01:02
the explosives used, or anything like that? It's that's

Speaker 5 1:01:05

very hard to say. But, you know, anyway, my approach in this, in this movement, is to try to find a thread that the average person can grasp on to make sense for themselves, yeah, as opposed to, well, that, that expert says yes. And this, it's a big,

Speaker 3 1:01:20

nebulous issue. And one of those things are, like, you don't even have people within the community that agree with each other on many things that you know. So, like, I work in the world of ufology and and phenomena and things like that, and when it even comes to paranormal things like that, you have clashing ideals in the phenomenology of how things work, right, you know, and when you when you have that, it's hard to come to any kind of scientific consensus, either as an independent investigator coming to science or science now coming to us, yeah, with things like quantum entanglement, stuff like that. So, like, it's like we just got done talking with Wayne costi, and like we said, when presented with new data, you've got to be able to take that dispassionately into your data set as a scientist, as a

scientist. Well, you know, what really struck me was, I have friends who are in engineering and mathematics and architecture, and when I looked at the buildings and saw right away that there were laws of motions that were being violated by the explanation we're given, namely, the third law of motion, which is, you know, people Say the with every with every action, there's a equal and opposite reaction, as it applies to this system, yeah, if we think that the top of the building is crushing the bottom of the building, then those forces have to be applied to the top of the building. So if the bottom of the building is being crushed, and the top has to be crushed too. I mean, if that's your, if that's your, if that's your understanding. So that cannot happen unless the top of the building also gets crushed as it's crushing the bottom of the building. You know, just that's something that you can prove to an 11th grade physics class. Yeah? However, when I offer this explanation, this simple, simple explanation, to people who should know better, all of a sudden their eyes glazed over. Yeah, you get the shark eyes? Well, they were like, but what you're saying here means that you You're right, and NIST is wrong, which is impossible. So let's just move on. And so that's when I realized that we had a much bigger problem. It's not about the science anymore. It's about our programming. Yeah, and those who should know best seem to have abandoned their clinical their acumen about what they should know the most, the letters after the comma, the letters of the comma can totally indoctrinate you absolutely. And so I was stunned to see that this is actually what was going on. And so I took some time away from work to I worked part time to write a book which has to do with the bias in our minds beautiful and in science and in history. And it was basically like most of the book is a setup for the reader to investigate how they come to conclusions. Yes, and understand that if you're going to get to the truth, you have to remove bias that's right in your mind. Yes, and polish your filter, my policy filter. But, you know, a mind, it's not so easy for a mind to recognize its own biases. It's like asking someone to see their blind spots. So you have to approach it obliquely. And that was the, I think, what was interesting, what was the, you know, interesting aspect of the way I wrote this book, and it leads you to the seventh chapter, which is an open now that you've, sort of, you know, unpacked all of your biases. Now let's look at the irrefutable facts about 911 in the effort to, you know, open the mind of at least a few people, sure. And you know, of course, things don't really move that quickly. And, you know, I don't know how many people read the book, but. Um, but science changes slowly, trying science. Science changes slowly, um, but, you know, but I don't think it's about like work. I don't think this is going to be an understanding that's coming from the top down. There's never going to be, I don't think there's going to be truly an independent investigation that will say, Okay, now we know that they that they blew up, that the first of all, the public has to demand it. Yes. In order for the public to demand

#### Speaker 3 1:05:23

it, we also still have to have evidence to because otherwise, all that we can do is look at the flawed things that they have put forth and examine that if we don't have actual physical evidence, like prime example, in the NIST report, they said they did not look for proof of explosive material because they didn't expect that there would be explosive material. Now, I don't know if that's how you normally conduct a forensic examination, but when you think about a collapse of a building, reports of other explosives being in the town, explosives being used on the World Trade Center previously, you'd think that explosives might be something they look into, into the collapse of not one, not two, but three buildings.

#### Speaker 3 I.UU.US

Yeah, to be very clear, the reason, the reason that why they gave for not looking is not that they don't expect to find any. They say that nobody was witnessed any. Which is it? Which is not true. It's demonstrably pro that's true. Yeah. And so, yeah. And the reason why, I think that's important, part, very important, is because we have on record, you know, first responders, 118 firefighters, saying that they were there and they saw explosions. But most, most importantly, you know, for everyone out there is that we had three dozen media sources saying that there were explosives. Yeah, right, but why didn't they come forward and challenge the nists, you know, results sections, when they said, Well, nobody heard any, yeah, but you heard some. So you need to say, wait, wait, we heard some. So the fact that they were silent, yeah means that we're looking at something much, much bigger than, Oh, well, we didn't really figure out we have a media that's

#### Speaker 3 1:06:54

it's a willful ignorance. It's their control on the part of science, at a minimum, it's a willful ignorance. Well, yeah, I mean,

Speaker 5 1:07:01

there's lots of willful ignorance in science, absolutely.

Speaker 3 1:07:04

And we talk about that on the show regularly, like I founded curious research. And one of the big things we put up on screen regularly is the scientific process and the fact of, even if you're a paranormal experiencer, if you observed something, you had a question and you sought more details, you're a scientist. Man, yeah, like you have begun the first three steps of science. That's correct. Only questions whether you bought a ticket to the science trainer, if you're eating a Twix at the station. That's it. So when, when scientists don't go with immediate observations, people who were boots on the ground, helping hearing explosives, seeing explosions, like those are observations, and when you choose to ignore that from the data set, once again, you have not started off with a hard scientific foundation right to build that tower upon. No pun intended.

Speaker 5 1:07:54

Yes, that's absolutely true. They're not being scientific, but the media is not holding them accountable. Absolutely, that's true. That's the bigger problem. Absolutely, if the media held them accountable, which means the public has them accountable, then they they will be compelled to do their job. But the media is in cahoots. This is a massive problem for a free people. Yes, if the media is in cahoots with the government, then we don't have a free society anymore. Yeah. So that is demonstrable proof that they are not. They're working together, instead of one holding the other accountable. So that is, you know, another takeaway from this, as you absolutely as you're pulling this part, it's like, oh yeah, you know, one building crushing another, explosions. But wait, hold on a second. Why? Why? Why does it take an

anesthesiologist to talk about this and write a book about it. Why isn't our media doing it? And so, you know, after two and a half years of sort of pounding my head writing a book, I was basically saying, you know, what we need? We need another massive event that will clearly be the a deep force that's doing something bad to the public, that's being excused and being shifted to take away our liberties, just like 911 was, and within a couple of months, lo and behold, something happened. Yeah, we had a virus that came out of a wet market in Wuhan China, and suddenly infected the world, global pandemic. And everybody was, you know, told to stay home and put on your masks and wait for the vaccine. And, you know, look, I'm gonna be very clear here. I I'm a physician too, and I happen to be an anesthesiologist. Okay? And so right away, I was like, Wait a minute. You want us to put on masks to stop this? Like I've worn a mask on my face for 40,000 hours. I know what they can and cannot do. So I'm not a virologist, I'm not an immunologist. I was like, whoa, wait a minute. You're asking us to put on a mask on kids. Oh, this is insane. This is insane. And so right away I was like, oh my god, this is another big event that's being Yeah, right. And then it started one after the other, things started to happen. You had you had doctors all over the place. You had. The CDC saying, Well, you know, natural immunity is not going to be as good as vaccine immunity, wrong? Never the case. How is this being accepted? This is before we even had a vaccine.

#### <u>^ 1:10:10</u>

It was very interesting to see unfold in real time.

#### Speaker 5 1:10:12

Then I happened to catch Yeah, well, I'm going to keep going with this, please. I really do believe that, you know, I this is sort of an appeal to my medical colleagues, not the ones that are necessarily establishment, but the ones I've been working with for the last three or four years during the pandemic, I left my job to go work for children's health defense, to write about in a way for the public to understand what's really going on, and all of these things are related. You know, it's very look. I want to be very clear here for a long time, people in this truth community didn't want to say anything about covid Because it's like, well, we don't, you know, it's not so high

# Speaker 3 1:10:47

scope. I had things silenced on YouTube. I had, I had things, well,

#### Speaker 5 1:10:52

things can be silenced. But you want to keep your movement focused on the truth about 911 but we've gone beyond that. We need, we need to come together to make sure that science is done with integrity. Yes, and we have two groups of people right now. We have the 911 truth movement, and we have the people who are have been speaking out about the fact that we've been doing the wrong things about covid, and the numbers are being gamed. And I and, you know, there's so many, so many, so many places where you can go to show you that our governmental data sets have either been manipulated or being misinterpreted. You know, just

like how many lives were saved, that's all based on modeling, and the models have uncertainty sure and how many people were killed by the vaccine. Oh, we're not going to look at that. But, you know, we have CDC own adverse event reporting systems reporting 1000s and 1000s of deaths, and we know that system under reports by a factor of, you know, 10 to 100 so for someone to say they're safe and effective is absolutely wrong. And you know, I know we went off topic here, but this is more about. This is more about it's more about 911 it's

# Speaker 3 1:11:58

more about paradigms of control, you know, and how the media is complicit with science, is complicit with government, and even even we get it into the show all the time about the fact of it's it's hard for a lot of letter wearing scientists out there to to want to say something different, because they either are threatened with the removal of their letters, no different than any first responder who reports something, may lose their job as a sheriff if they're like, hey. So I went out to this call for a UFO and yeah, there was this UFO in the sky. If that Sheriff reports that the next time he's on stand, a defense attorney is going to eviscerate him. Yeah. So, so I noticed that you have a report that you filed about a UFO. So you believe in strange things like that. That's very interesting for somebody that's supposed to be a forensic person, like a sheriff, you know, like you, you could lose cases because of your belief. So it's interesting how those things are suppressed, yeah, and how, once again, even scientists are veered toward the group concept of what the group thinks, instead of making a stand and going, No,

## Speaker 5 1:13:08

well, that's very true. Yeah, it's very true, you know. And to draw some distinctions here, you know, when you talk about the paranormal, paranormal, you can't really measure that by the ways that by normal means, right? But here we're talking about data, and we're talking about actual measurable things, that's right. And I am continuing, continually stunned by how little curiosity there is in the medical establishment and the medical orthodoxy to challenge themselves and to actually we, you know, look, I was a victim of that, I would like a study would be shown to me, and I would say, Okay, I'm just going to read the abstract and the conclusions. Okay, that's what we found. But it's very rare for a physician to go outside their field and read the methodology section, that's right, and to read the discussion and to to ask for it. Let me see the let me see the raw data. Like we never do that. We don't have time to do that. Yeah, we just trust the peer review process. The peer review process, is broken. And it's not just me saying that we have, you know, ex editors from the New England Journal of Medicine saying it's broken. But we seem to just, you know, close our eyes and just listen to what the experts say.

## Speaker 3 1:14:16

It's interesting, because one of the points I bring up regularly is Sanjay Gupta, whenever he was head of the World Health Organization, things like that. What was it him?

#### <u>^</u> 1:14:24

That was Sanjay Gupta. Is the CNN, okay,

## Speaker 3 1:14:27

there wasn't, it wasn't Sanjay Gupta. Then I'm trying to remember who it was that was with the World Health Organization while people were trying to get medical cannabis going through. And after he left, was like, wow, I never saw the studies that actively showed the medical uses of it, yeah, because the World Health Organization said for years that like there is no medical benefit to cannabis or marijuana because of the studies that they were shown, they weren't shown the independent studies that weren't sponsored by Bayer pharmaceutical and other companies who have vested interest in that not making it. The market, correct, you know, and it's interesting, because, yeah, those things are all over the place in science.

#### Speaker 5 1:15:06

Correct? Yes, there's a lot of distortion in science. But, you know, these are very, very big things, and these have, you know, a direct impact on the average person, absolutely. And there is, like, Look, I'm a physician, and I didn't learn about vaccines other than this is when you have to give them, but all of the research that goes behind ensuring that they're safe and effective is absolutely based on a false idea that they've been tested properly, which they have not well.

#### Speaker 3 1:15:35

And like you said, the fact that you you deal regularly with the respiratory system. You regularly wear a mask. You know for a fact that there is no mask that's going to block a virus from coming out from your breath. It's there to block your spittle, yeah, but that's like saying that a condom prevents the HIV virus from leaving the condom. No, that's made to stop the sperm, yeah, not the virus that it says on the package that that it's, don't trust this to stop HIV, right? Because the virus is smaller than the sperm, right? Contrast, correct, correct, yes. I mean, there are misconception of society, yeah, and what science gives us, right?

## Speaker 5 1:16:19

I mean, there are apparati that you can wear to block it. But that's not we were asked to do. We were asked to wear a bandana and go and sit down. That's right. So that's what I'm saying. We have to be very, you know, I'm being very particular here, because when you generalize, then people just pick apart your argument. Say, oh, that's, you know, you can't actually stop it. No, we have to be very, very precise when we're trying to offer a counterfactual argument. That's right. And you know, one of the problems that we're having, for example, with the 911 truth movement, please, is that there are many people who don't actually understand that they they agree with us, but they don't know how to explain it properly. Yeah, and they're the ones that can be picked apart and say, Oh, well, that person doesn't know what they're talking about. And that, you know, they made this over generalization. We have to be very, very clean with our message, absolutely. And that doesn't always happen. And you know, there's, there's many, many examples of that

#### Speaker 3 1:17:08

well, well. And once again, when you, when you have numerous people who have, who have climbed their parapet of data and and made their stand and said, This is what is it can be hard. Be hard for the average person to navigate that nebulous space, yeah, you know, because they aren't an engineer, they aren't they aren't a anesthesiologist like and an engineer you You were both. So you have a very unique point of view, not only as an engineer, but also as as a scientific anus, easy, religious.

#### Speaker 5 1:17:41

But you know, Chris, the problem here is that it doesn't matter what I think. You know. It really does not matter what I think. You know, someone has to decide whether I'm right, or someone who has equal training that disagrees with me is right, absolutely so. How does someone this is a very important question that should have been asked many times ago. Is, what do you do when Experts disagree? What do you do as a non expert? Yep, how do you approach the problem? Yeah, do you just say, Well, I don't know. No, there's a way to approach it. Okay, there is a way, please. And I'd like to explain that, yes, well, the first thing is to say, is to first of all, admit that you cannot know objectively. That's why they're the experts and you're not. So you are not going to be able to objectively say that this person is right and that person is wrong, because this is this. This is the situation I'm sort of setting up. You're not the expert. They are. They know more than you about the subject. How do you know? Well, you're not going to be able to know, but you can approach it indirectly. Now, if you look at this objectively, and you don't know who's right, what you have here are two people who are saying, I'm right and he's wrong, and if you listen to the other person, they're trying to mislead you, okay, like they look like mirror images. They should be because you don't know. But there's a huge difference. There's always one massive difference. One side is saying, can we have a debate about it? Yeah. And the other side is saying, Oh, no, no, no, no, no, we not talk about it. If we talk about it, then, you know, people get the wrong idea. Under what such, you know, circumstances, would you believe the person who does not want to have a debate? I mean, that's what we do. We're like, oh, it's super No, we can't listen to them. Why would you believe them? Okay, that's the first point. The second point is, one side is saying, Look, let me explain it to you. I know you're not the expert. I know you're not the expert, but, you know, I'm here to answer questions, and I can try to explain it to you. And the other side is saying, You need to trust us. This is the way it is. This is the way it is. Look, you're not an expert. Don't try to like, you know, play doctor on Twitter. You're not a doctor, this is what the establishment says. Do you like? I hope people can understand that as a very, very that's an attack on your own character. Absolutely, it's like so you're telling me, one side is saying that I'm too stupid to understand it, and the other side is saying, no, actually, I can explain it to you. Why would you go with the side that says you're too stupid? Good to understand, stupid to understand. Yeah, okay, a third point. And you know, both sides actually, they're not exactly different on this you have to be very, very careful when, when you hear a group of people who are telling you to believe them, start vilifying the other side.

#### Speaker 3 1:20:15

Yes, thank you. I do not have an applause button on this system, but I do at home, and that is when I

#### Speaker 5 1:20:21

would hit it. And again, it has nothing it. You know, it's not about being a nice person. You have to understand what's happening in the person's mind. Yes, in order to actually vilify someone and say, Oh, they're stupid, or, you know, they're dangerous, you shouldn't. You know, there are bad people. Yeah, okay, once you commit to saying that you have to be 100% certain you're right, that's right, you have to be right. Number one, I would say it's impossible to have 100% certainty. Now, what happens to the person who spent a year and a half denigrating people? How easy is it going to be for them to change their mind to backpedal, correct, they might be able to say, oh, yeah, I was wrong. You know, my mistake. I didn't know enough saying that I was a jerk. Yeah, that's really hard. So now you're now dealing with another group, the same group that doesn't want you to argue, that doesn't want you to have a debate, is they're now stuck in a situation where they are biased into holding on to their position because they don't want to be embarrassed by being a jerk. Yeah, so for all of those reasons, as a non expert, you should be able to say, I'm going to go with a person who wants the debate, who wants to explain it to me, and is not being a jerk. That's right. Okay. You could be wrong, but here's the other question, is, if that side does not want to have a debate. How would they ever know they were wrong? Yeah. So you could be right, but if you're wrong, you may not be, you know, you may not be able to correct your course of action for a very long time. Yeah. So everything should point to the other side, like with regard to covid, go to the experts and physicians who have a contractual position who want to have a debate. Why would you listen to them? So you know, this is this has been spelled out in socialist social science experience experiments before, in the 50s with Solomon Asher. You aware of

# Speaker 3 1:22:07

him? Yeah, absolutely. And to be clear, you are not saying that vaccination doesn't work or anything like that. You're saying that specifically in this case, yes, this is the situation. This is the situation. Feel free to look at it. It's a pretty fascinating situation. I brought that up the entire time, yeah, on my show regularly, the fact of we are still in the midst of this, like, there's no way by science that we can have the answer yet. Yeah. Like, that's like saying that because we've done a year and a half long study about this medication, that we know what the intergenerational effects are going to be if somebody's on this medication and has children, what's, what's the effect on them three, four years down the line? If you're not doing a generational study, then you don't know, right? So you can't say that for a fact.

## Speaker 5 1:22:58

You can't say for a fact that is very true. We're not, we're not looking at things, these things, in a long term, sort of range of observational period, yeah, but, you know, look, let's just go back to this time of the start. You know, just like, right after 911 Yeah, please. Like, what about right after, you know, the vaccine came out? How many people knew what to ask their doctor? Yeah? None. You know, ask your ask, you know, here's a the utility of a vaccine, for example, is not in its efficacy. You know, people say, Oh, it's 95% efficacious. I would say probably, maybe 1/3 of doctors don't know what vaccine efficacy means, yeah, okay, but that's not the metric for the utility of a vaccine. The utility of vaccine is, how many people do you have to vaccinate in order to prevent an outcome? Yeah, right, like a smallpox that's the number I needed to vaccinate. How many? The reason why you need to know that number is that now you can make a risk

benefit analysis if you need to give 1000 vaccines to prevent the outcome, how many adverse events you're going to cause? That's how you do it. Most doctors I've talked to are recommending the vaccine. They had no idea what the number needed to vaccinate was, but that's why we need to talk to the public and say, This is what you need to ask your doctor and ask them to go find out. And when they say, Holy cow, I need to vaccinate 2500 people with this covid vaccine to keep them out of the hospital, that's that's a pretty crappy vaccine.

Speaker 3 1:24:19

Unfortunately, for the last 20 years, though, we have straight up commercials that are like, go ask your doctor if you need to be on this medication. That's right, without any explanation of the symptomologies that it's helping or if things like that, it's going to tell you the adverse effects, yes, but it's not going to tell you, like, everything that you need to go. Do you need to even ask your doctor about

Speaker 5 1:24:39

this? Right? You know, we know we need to have an intelligent public in order to expose the lack of intelligence coming from the

- Speaker 3 1:24:45 orthodoxy that is, that needs to be on a t shirt, right?
- Speaker 5 1:24:49

Yes. But you know, this all comes out to public outreach, which is sort of like, what I like to do is to write about things. I have a sub stack that I'm, you know, promoting because I stopped writing for children's health defense. But these are the kinds. Of issues that have to be,

Speaker 3 1:25:02

well, they've got to be funded head on. You've got to, you've got to be able to ask the question. You need

Speaker 5 1:25:07

to have a public that's curious, absolutely. And that's, that's another problem, but, and there's no way there. Here's the thing. You know, I've thought about this a lot, and I know we're winding down

<u>^</u> 1:25:15

here, but we have plenty of time.

- Speaker 5 1:25:19
  - How do you instill curiosity in a person, it's very hard.
- S Speaker 3 1:25:24
  You got to start like, well, when they're young, hopefully you've
- Speaker 5 1:25:28

instilled but even then, it's like some kids are curious. Well, the curiosity is well, how do you how do you make a non curious person curious? And my I would suggest to you that you cannot. People are inherently curious, yeah, and some people aren't, yeah. How do you how do you suppress curiosity? Oh, it's very easy. Fear, yeah, if you're fearful, you're not going to ask. Like, Well, I'm not so sure about the solution. You're just going to go with. You want to believe that someone's there to save you, yeah? So before, however, before we go into a place of negativity, it's like, oh my gosh, there's nothing we can do because they just keep instilling fear, making us less curious. There's no hope. There is. There is actually an antidote. The antidote is suffering. When you've suffered enough, now you're like, What am I doing wrong? Like, tell me something am I doing? Like, why? There's gotta be an answer. There's gotta be an answer. I want to do something different, so it's not hopeless, but and, and it's almost a balance, you know, a metaphysical balance, because if they're imposing things upon you and the population that get you to suffer and be fearful, eventually it's going to backfire on them when people say that's enough, yeah, I really need to know more about this before you tell me to do the next thing. And that's what we're seeing right now. Like, you know, when 911 happened, yeah, they got their way. But a lot of people woke up to, wait a minute, they're lying when, when they got their way with covid. A lot of people said, Wait a minute. This is now we have. We're in a very, very interesting moment in our in our history. We are. Yeah, it's an inflection point. And that was, you know, basically the commentary that I had to offer it to start off the the symposium here yesterday, absolutely was that this is a turning point, and we have to visualize that this is going to happen, that it's going to change. Yeah, visualizing, though there's no hope, and being realistic about it is not going to help.

Speaker 3 1:27:14

Yeah, no, no. Negativity doesn't help us do anything. It doesn't help a conversation. It doesn't behoove a conversation, it actively drives people apart and makes people not want to talk when there is a common ground that can be found. And once again, when you I love the idea that you are teaching people to come to the point of objectivity with with what they think about, because that's something that we talk about all the time, is the filters through which we see things. I have an older brother, and the example I give is you come to both of us and ask us what Christmas in 85 was like. We'd probably both mention Castle Grayskull as the toy that we got. Yeah. But beyond that, we would have different experience. We would have different observation because we're different, independent people seeing things through a polished filter

of life experience. That's true, you know, and that that's something that you have to be willing to take three steps back from, yeah, and go, Wait a minute. Maybe I'm viewing all of this through my actual just lens of experience and not looking at the points of datum that make up the data set.

#### Speaker 5 1:28:21

That's right. Well, yeah, that's it's a big challenge. It is. And, you know, yesterday, I made an appeal to all of the doctors I worked with, even though it was a 911 event, yeah. And this is when you do that, people in our movement start to get a little bit annoyed. Some people do because, like, this is about 911 it's not about covid, it's not about medical freedom. But at some level, you know, we've been at it for 24 years. It's about the freedom to ask the question, correct? It's, well, yeah, I mean, some people feel differently than I do about I'm not, I'm not saying that you need to do you have to believe what I think the covid vaccine. But my point here is that we have a very, very smart group of people who've been have been able to dissect very complicated pieces of information and come up with a cohesive argument against the covid narrative. These are the people we need on our team. It's not about, you know, it's like, you need to come over here. You know how hard it is. Let me show you this data set as well. Yes, and we're up against the same thing that they're up against for four years. We've been up against it for 24 years. You know, it's the wholesale manipulation of the way science is done, and so we have to come together. At some point we are going to come together be because we have a a common adversary, which is the media. If the media was fair, they would have given voice voices to doctors like me during covid. If the media was fair, they would be giving voices to people that are out there right now talking about all the science, but they don't. So we need to get to the media. People have to say that media system is messed up.

#### Speaker 3 1:29:55

2012 I bring up regularly. Feel free to look this up, folks. I will look. Look at the camera, as I say it. Smith munt act, just Google. Smith month act struck down 2012 the Smith month act is actively what prevented propaganda, government created propaganda from being disseminated through the news. That was struck down in 2012 that's an interesting thing, that was an actual law that we had in place that they were like that, that needs to go. And shortly after, there were reports of government reporters that were there to make sure that these things were put out in the news. And that's all news agencies, folks. I don't care whether you're talking red or blue. Feel free to go look up project Mockingbird, yeah, or operation mocking version, yeah. The idea of putting putting these people into news organizations to falsely lead foreign governments, all kinds of things. So this is a normal black bag tactic. This is no different than what we did against Tokyo rose back in back in Korea. You know when Tokyo Rose was broadcasting to our troops, we were broadcasting to North Korea and China, no different than pamphlets that were dropped by both sides over over jungles in Vietnam. This is, this is a propaganda campaign and that that's, once again, red versus blue. And it's something that we bring up on the show all the time, is it's not when you're looking through that polarized filter, sure of red or blue, you will never see the red looking through a blue filter, nor will you see the white light in the middle, correct? You will only see blue, yeah. And that's an important thing to consider. You've got to be willing to read three sources a day of news that you don't trust. Yeah, about the same topic, yeah? Because it's a dissenting opinion, you got to be open dissenting opinion. You have to be, well,

# CRep198pt2

#### **SUMMARY KEYWORDS**

9/11 research, David Chandler, physics toolkit, building seven, freefall, nanothermite, explosives, propaganda, Syrian war, chemical weapons, digital ID, Central Bank digital currency, social movements, state crimes, International Center for 9/11 Justice., 9/11 Justice Conference, Matt Campbell, controlled demolition, thermite reaction, building seven, NIST report, legal battles, UK Attorney General, fragmentation of remains, first responders, scientific method, conspiracy theories, fire codes, building collapses, forensic pathology., 9/11 justice, building seven, explosive demolition, fire codes, architects and engineers, International Center for 9/11 Justice, Ted Walter, Richard Gage, Senator Ron Johnson, Dennis Kucinich, conspiracy theories, public awareness, legal action, first responders, cognitive dissonance.

#### **SPEAKERS**

Speaker 5, Speaker 3, Speaker 4, Speaker 6, Speaker 2, Speaker 1



#### Speaker 1 00:00

Well, hello everybody, and welcome back to the curious realms continuing coverage of turning the tide 911 justice right here in Washington, DC, we have the incredible pleasure of being joined by the indomitable David Chandler. I when I saw some of the as I told you before, and as my audience knows, I am not deeply I'm embedded in a lot of groups, but yours is one of the only names that I am familiar with when it comes to 911 really. And some of this data there, there are only a few, like when I was invited to come and somebody was like, Do you know who Richard gages? I was like, absolutely. I know who Richard Gage is, but you are one of the names that I prominently know, okay, because you are a voice of reason when it comes to a lot of things with this. And I have said, I have said for years that at the very least, our government allowed something to happen as a means of control, passing laws, what have you. And there are a lot of rabbit holes that people have dug over the years. My job as a host with this show specifically is to help unmuddy The waters from the dirt that's been kicked in from all the rabbit holes being dug, to talk to researchers like you who say, Yes, something happened, but let's back things up, and let's look at things from a different light, given new data, because, unfortunately, a lot of people don't, don't like looking at new data. It may clash with the paradigm that they've come to accept. Things like that. So how did you first come to the world of a what's, what's your background? Okay, work wise. And how did that? How did you come to the world of 911 research an investigation to begin with.

S

#### Speaker 2 01:42

Okay, I teach physics. I mean, I'm retired now. I'm a physics teacher. Taught physics and math

and high school level and junior college level and astronomy and so forth. So that's my field. And one of the things that when I around 2006 or seven. I'm not quite sure just when it got started, but I started, oh, my sister actually went to a conference and brought a DVD from somebody who had a bunch of 911 stuff on it. And the thing that I would forget, the narrative on there, but the videos that they showed, the clips like showing the buildings coming down. The thing that impressed me about, like the North Tower when it was coming down, is that it was just like it's blowing outward so much it was just billowing out. And I that seemed weird to me, and there were actually chunks. You could tell that there are heavy materials. They were being thrown out sideways. In fact, they were actually out farther than the dust cloud. So I was leading the dust cloud. Here is this prominent chunk of stuff, which I later basically figured out is probably one of their wall units. The units were like three, three stories tall, 30 feet tall, and with three, three of these columns, with a couple of spandrels. And so those would be multiple tons. How many tons depends on where it was in the building, stronger and more bulky at the bottom, and tapered down anyway. But it was at least, maybe, say, figure, four tons, okay, and but it was out there leading ahead of the dust cloud being expanded horizontally, and I got curious. I said, Boy, that's going fast. I wonder how fast. And when I say, I wonder how fast I my brain starts thinking, how would I figure that out? And I just, at that point, I just took a ruler and freeze frame the video, and I got, I looked up some data on the internet for how wide the buildings were, like 69 meters per on the wall. And so I I calculated, but from how far down and how far out it went, I was able to figure out a trajectory and estimate the speed it was being thrown horizontally. My estimate was it was being thrown horizontally at about 60 miles an hour, that's coming out of a building. How would you throw like a multi ton object, whether it's four tons or something else. How would you throw something like that horizontally out of a building at 60 miles an hour,

Speaker 1 04:26

especially a building that's going through natural collapse?

Speaker 2 04:30

Well, whatever it is, okay? So that was one that really hooked me. And so with that, I entered the truth movement. In other words, I figured, okay, I I actually have an angle where I can actually figure out stuff about this. Yeah, the other thing I came to see as time went on, I have a tool that I use when I'm teaching that you can use for measurement on videos. So for instance, say that you do a I mean, in the olden days, when I was in. Cool. You had these little ticker tape things on a vibrating thing, and it makes little dots. And so you have to calculate and measure and figure out acceleration and things like that. So you drop something and you you pull the ticker tape through this little thing, yeah, well, okay, there's a much easier way. If you take a video, say, I just take, take an object and drop it. I just take a video clip of it, import it into this program. The one I was using earlier on was called physics toolkit, but there's a newer or better one that the audience can actually download off my website. It's called tracker. I have actually have a kit you can download from my website that has the some of the primary videos and the calibration data and instructions on how to download a free copy of tracker. And you can do the measurements yourself. You can learn it. But anyway, so I use tracker, and so that if it says you go through the video, since you're dropping a ball and you want to learn about acceleration of gravity, go bing, bing, bing, so you put a mark on each instance of the ball, go frame by frame, and the software captures the position And the time from the frame

rate. And so with position and time measured, you can measure acceleration, velocity, momentum, kinetic energy, all of these things that involve parameters for motion. Yeah. And so you can just read it off. And if you want to take a ball and throw it up, and goes up and down, and you find out that it's accelerating downward at 9.8 meters per second squared. Is the magic number in metric units. That's the acceleration of gravity. And it's, by the way, it's accelerating downward as it rises, as it's at the top, and as it's coming back down. I just touched a little bit of physics there. So even though it's slowing down as it rises, because the acceleration is downward, yep, and it's speeding up as it comes back down, because acceleration is downward. Anyway, you could see all that. So that's the type of thing that you use this for, is teaching physics concepts. Awesome. Well, I look at the motions on the World Trade Center and say, I wonder how fast that's coming down. And so I basically got into this. I had a opportunity to give a talk at a physics teachers conference at Occidental College in Southern California. They had this physics teachers day at Occidental College every year. I knew the people organized that I participated a lot of that. And so I said, here's an audience that's actually going to appreciate it if I do some more quantitative stuff. Yeah. So I basically got, actually, back then, I was using physics Toolkit, which is a cruder version of the same thing, okay, but basically I measured everything that moves. You know, those little jets that come out the squibs, okay, just shooting out the side at 150 miles an hour, by the way. Wow. So here's this jet, and it's not just gas. It's like debris. You can see that it's stuff that's being thrown out, yeah, so it's being squirted out the sides, basically, somehow also that's actually being caused by little explosions. And so anyway, so there's so much to be seen. And just watching these videos, I just got, got a whole repertoire of stuff that I had measured. I put it on YouTube. And then Justin Keogh, one of the guys who was a board member of architects and engineers for 911 truth, contacted me. Said, how about you join our team? So, yeah, I got invited on, and I started the thing that was nice about working with a group like that was that you have other people to talk to that are a peer group. So Justin's into physics, and other people are into engineering and so forth. So working with engineers and physicists and all sorts of people, okay, and so, pretty much everything I would investigate, I would sort of make my little video. Description of that sure and pass it around and have it internally peer reviewed by this group of guys who would critique it. And now the other thing is, I was not an expert at doing the videos, and one of the guys on our team was more expert at it than I was, and I learned a lot about that. There was another guy who was doing a lot of videos himself on the on YouTube. But he was, it was like he was an arc. He was archivist. He had all sorts. He had everything that's out there, good quality I could but he had an ability. He knew exactly what he had. Out and where to find it. I would describe, okay, I saw this interesting thing going on with this video, and it has its line where the corner of the South Tower is lined up with the steeple of this church, and it's sort of right on the edge. Oh, I know which one that is, and that would be in my inbox within the hour. Wow, so and you would find good quality copies, whereas on my fine on the YouTube, like a fifth generation thing, you know,

° 10:28

somebody's VHS record,

Speaker 2 10:30

yeah. So basically, I was able to get to do much more, higher quality measurements and so forth, yep. So that's what I got into. Then what I really became known in the movement for is one of the things that these guys, one of the Justin, actually said you need to measure building

seven, because there's a lot of people saying it's coming down at freefall, is it really, or how close? And so forth. I measured the North Tower and it was not coming down at freefall. A lot of people said it was, but it wasn't coming down about two thirds of free fall, so I just set that aside for the time being. But building seven at first, the pictures you get mostly are have the camera looking up at it, which is not a good angle if you're trying to do measurements. But he found there's another there's several other pictures that are taken from farther away that have the camera level with the roofline, yeah,

Speaker 1 11:25

where you can just see a couple of levels of the building and in the roof, and you

Speaker 2 11:30

can see, you can see the building, but the camera is looking level, and that's critical, yeah, and because then the measurements are real, rather than having To take an angle into account. That's right. So I measured it, and I was rather surprised. It came down absolutely precisely. Bingo, right at freefall. It wasn't like almost free fall. In fact, in the way it rounded out, it actually looked like it was slightly more than free fall. That's not real. That's, you know, measurement error, but it was as far it was Indus. I described it as indistinguishable from free fall, yeah, so, and it went for two and a half seconds, and it had sudden onset, it was there, and then it was immediately a transition from being fully supported to being in absolute free fall. Yeah, free fall implies there's absolutely zero support. Yep, no resistance, no resistance, whatever. So all those columns in the building had to have been basically their supports. The support of those columns had to be eliminated. So they're being blown out somehow. And you know, they're being blown out, rather than progressive collapse, like NIST was trying to say, because the roof line came down level, yeah, and that means all across the building. It was failing simultaneously, and it let go all at once. I measured three out of the, I mean the three visible corners, three out of the four corners you could actually see and measure them. They all transitioned. They all started down and transitioned to free fall simultaneously within a 10th of a second.

**13:15** 

Yeah. And

Speaker 2 13:16

so it's something that's a coordinated that building, building seven is 100 meters side to side. Okay, it would cover a football field, yeah, reaching into the end zone a bit. Okay, there's 100 yards for and a meter, slightly more than yard, yeah. Okay, so it was, is that size building? And how are you going to get that size building to collapse straight down through its structure at freefall. Yeah, it's, it has to be. There's no way around it. It's being blown out, yeah? So, yeah, it was laced with explosives,

**13:53** 

especially the fact, and I want you to know, David

Speaker 1 13:58

wtt WTC, seven is the point that I give most people feel free to look into it and let that be the new point of data that you may take into your data set, because that is the one that changed my mind. It was the one that was like, Wait a minute. I've got to look at the other things that people are talking about and at least give them credence to look at them, whether or not I go down that rabbit hole any further

Speaker 2 14:22

buildings I'm at least going to look at? No. Building seven is not a rabbit hole. No, absolutely not. We're talking about a very concrete, yeah, measurable thing that's in public exactly. It's in public view. It. There's nothing to say. You can't measure it, and you can measure it yourself. You download the stuff off my website. You can do the measurement yourself. Yeah, and I actually have given this to some students. I can justify that it's not politics. It's not being political. That's right, it's a public event of great significance. And here's a tool that I've been having them use for other things. Things in learning physics, yeah, use that tool and measure that. There's a question out there. People say, Oh, it's coming down at free fall. And NIST was saying, Oh, it's coming down 40% slower than free fall, yeah,

**^** 15:14

which is a marked difference. That is a vast

Speaker 2 15:17

difference. That's a blatant lie. But they can discover that for themselves by just, Hey, you don't need me to tell you that. Yeah, go measure it.

Speaker 1 15:25

Yeah, exactly, exactly. And once again, it's one of those, when you dig into it, and when you start looking at those things, it really becomes an undeniable fact. And once again, that leads you down. Well, if, if that's not the way they said. What about the rest? And looking into that, and then you and then you can get into squibs with people and stuff like that.

Speaker 2 15:48

Let me tell you, the North Tower I've said comes down two thirds of G. Well, I revisited that because, okay, what's the meaning if it's coming down at two thirds of acceleration, of gravity.

But if you do the graph, velocity versus time is the key. And so here, if it's just being supported.

and this turns a line, and if it's a straight line, that means constant acceleration. Well, if the graph has a straight line, graph coming down, so it's accelerating downward the whole time, but not at G at two thirds of G. So I thought, Hmm, now for that case, you have to do the equations you set up in physics. You set up what's called a free body diagram. So you have a block and you say, what are the forces acting and figure out the acceleration. Guess what? It turns out that if it's coming down at a uniform acceleration at all it is. It is basically being resisted by less force than its own weight. So here is so turns out 90% of the support, in the case of the built North Tower, 90% of the support has been removed. Okay, in order, and that's the way the numbers work out. Yeah? But it takes the, it takes the knowing the physics to get at it, yeah? Building seven, the advantage is, any idiot can look at that and you can tell that doesn't look normal,

5 Speaker 1 17:17

yeah, even, even comparatively, when you put it next to a hotel that's being broken down. It's, it's mirror image.

Speaker 2 17:23

Mirror image. So building seven, does it for free? Yeah, no. Physics needed the North Tower. It comes out with exactly the same result. It had to have been demolished. It's an implication. It's not like, it's questionable. It's absolutely just as certain as building seven, but you need to know the physics to be able to get that result. Yeah, okay, so I can get there, and I say that's just as good a way to show it as building seven, but for the public, building seven means you don't even have to worry about the equations. You just get the fact that it's free fall and you're home free. Yeah, um, anyway, so that's some of the stuff that I did earlier on.

Speaker 1 18:08

Yeah, no, let me ask you this as far as comma and letters and your your position as a teacher and even amongst your research associates in the field of physics. David, how was your presentation received by by your associates? When you were like, Hey, I just, well, I want to show you this, folks.

Speaker 2 18:29

I happen to do what you think. I happen to be working the last nine years of my career. I was teaching at a charter school that worked with Homeschool families. Okay? So it was a sort of a little bit of a hippie dippie kind of a school, sure. And the person who was the head of the school was, I mean, she was supportive. She thought I was doing good stuff, and so I didn't get any pushback from my administration. Now, other people, like Stephen Jones lost his job over this. He was at BYU, yeah. And Kevin Ryan was working for underwriters Laboratory. He lost his job, yep. And there's various other stories like that. I was lucky that the people that I was working with were supportive of my efforts and so forth.

## Speaker 1 19:13

Yeah, well, and this is the reason I ask is because this is a topic that we bring up regularly on the show when it comes to people with commas and letters behind their names. You you can say what you want folks about, like, oh, sciences, there's a real fear when you have spent your career on something, you have a new point of data to add to the system, but what you're going to add to the system totally bucks the system. You can talk about at that point, programs losing funding, programs losing grants. Once again, you losing your job, you being discredited as official.

#### Speaker 2 19:48

I was a high school teacher, so it's not like grants and things like that, sure. However, yeah, I was lucky to have that environment that I wasn't persecuted for. Yeah, yeah. I wanted to come back to one other thing though. Please. Okay, let's go back to building seven. Okay? And I'd like to show you the implication of free fall, all right. Like, what does that say about in real world terms? What does that mean about 911 so I did, by the way, I did a series of articles on medium.com if you look up medium.com and you put free fall, and you put my name. It's sort of hard to look it up in their search engine, but you'll find it because a lot of other stuff out there, yeah. Or you can go to my website and I have a link to it. It's called 911 speak out.org and right up at the very beginning of that, I have a link to the medium article. Okay, okay, the medium article. I go through the whole business of explaining free fall and so forth in a series, okay, I think it's a six part series. But at the end, what I do is I say, Okay, what does this mean? If you accept or come to the conclusion that building seven had explosives, and that's what brought it down. Then here's what follows. Those explosives had to been planted prior to 911 they weren't done overnight. So that tells you it was not a surprise attack. That tells you it was coordinated. So who's coordinating? Well. Somebody laced the building with these explosives. Somebody had to come up with these explosives. It turns out, some of the people in the movement have figured out that it was they were using nano thermite, which is a military grade version of thermite, nanoparticles, rather than regular grains of iron oxide and aluminum, aluminum. So iron, iron oxide and aluminum. But if you have nanoparticles of outside you get reactions that go so fast you can actually use it as an explosive or as a rocket propellant and various other things. Yeah. Okay, so it would you found nanothermite, unreacted chips of nanothermite in the World Trade Center dust. And you also found iron spheres, iron microspheres in the World Trade Center dust, billions of these things. Yeah. So where do you get iron microspheres? Well, you had to melt some iron and disperse it as droplets, which means you have an explosive environment that's going to spray this molten iron, and then it it's it solid, if it cools and solidifies on the way down, and it drains the dust as little iron spheres. There's billions of these things out there. And I have a, I have a little sample of not very high grade World Trade Center dust. You You can see iron sphere is all over the place in there. Wow, wow. Under a little Hey, you get a USB microscope for under 100 bucks and plug it in, see it, and you can look at your own.

## Speaker 1 22:51

And you know, there are a lot of people out there. I'll look at the cameras. I say it. If you doubt the existence of nano thermite, feel free to visit curious realm or curious research and and put forward, slash knowledge. Go to our knowledge vault, and right there is the actual, like, patent

for nanothermite.

# Speaker 2 23:11

Okay, like I did that before Richard gage came on the show a few weeks ago, because it if one of the things we do, like I told you, is try to demystify these things. So yeah, if there's a program out there or a patent, we put it on there so that we can actively show it on screen. And I know, like these things exist. I haven't seen here. See theory. I saw the, you know, the article that Niels Herod and Steven Jones, and there's a collection about half a dozen people who participated in this research project, but the identifying the Nano, thermite, in the dust, and that I have a link to that on my website, incredible. So you can go there, yeah. So let me finish my little narrative. So you basically start from you have explosives in the in building seven, that leads to pre planning, which means foreknowledge and participation in the event, and it involves coordination. Well, this puts constraints on who we're talking about, who has the ability to coordinate the planting of the explosives, the access to the buildings, has the expertise to do the planning of the explosives, to make it effective, and to make it a timed, triggered event. And then you have, you have to coordinate with the military to not shoot down the planes, okay? And the FAA, yep, you had to coordinate with the State Department, because they brought some of these guys in from Saudi Arabia through a particular consulate, I believe it was in in Arabia, the there's a particular guy where a lot of those people came through that same guy and sort of got phony baloney visas. Here also you're coordinating with him. You're coordinating with NIST, because NIST created the most incredibly bungled, terrible report. Their report. Report is absolutely garbage. It is literally Swiss cheese. It is really, really garbage report on building seven, yeah? And, I mean, maybe the general public, because it doesn't recognize that by reading it. But you know, you anybody? Yeah, I'm reading it. I mean, I rip it apart in terms of the part where it overlaps with what I'm doing research on. Yeah. So the point is, somebody is who, who has the ability to lean on NIST, which has a great reputation as a scientific body, and to get them to produce such a garbage report? Well, who's upstream from NIST NIST is in the Commerce Department. It used to be called the National Bureau of Standards, yep, okay, and the Commerce Departments in the executive branch of the government, so upstream from NIST, you got the White House, yeah. So who's in the White House that might have something to do with this? But, I mean, I'm saying the trail leads right there. It does it. So you really do have major implications. So even though it seems like a simple measurement of one little corner of the event, it is there's just, it's, there's so many things about the event that could be researched. But that one little corner literally leads you to the White House door. It's a

## Speaker 1 26:17

linchpin corner that when it falls, the whole narrative crumbles.

#### Speaker 2 26:21

It's one, it's one such, yeah, it's literally. And there are linchpins all over the place. Absolutely go to the there's, you know, the Financial Crimes part of it. There's all kinds of different aspects that people have researched. Yeah. So my particular angle is the physics of it. And hey, high school physics, just the simple, let's measure that motion. Yes, figure out how it's moving, and

then think about it and understand what is the implication of what it is you just measure, yeah, precisely. If you go to 911 speak out.org I have all of my research there, and I have John Cole's research. He's an engineer. He'll be coming on tomorrow. He's coming on. Okay, his research is there. I have a lot of Wayne costez research there. He's another engineer. Yep, he was just on. I have Frank legs research. He's a chemist from Australia. He died a few years ago, but I basically took over his website, and I've reproduced it as a subset of my website. Oh, great. So I've archived his material there. He did a lot of pioneering work, especially investigating the Pentagon and so forth on other the World Trade Center as well. He's done a lot on all of this. So anyway, it's a big site. Has a lot of stuff. If you go through my tab, I list each of these people. You go through my tab, I have lots of little short clips like some of them. By the way, you can see stuff being blown out, yep, in this cloud. And if you track some of these things, here's a chunk of stuff that's being thrown out of the South Tower, and then boom, you can see it explode and go into two directions. Yeah. So you're seeing explosions. And by the way, boom, the things that went out, they split. So it goes from one to two to four pieces all from one chunk that starts with and so you're actually seeing high energetic reactions within the debris that's falling out of the tower. Yeah, and that's just by looking at these videos forever. Absolutely. And I can say there's, I don't know how many hundreds of hours or 1000s of hours of looking at falling buildings I've done over the last decade or two, but I started about 22,006 that's what, 19 years?

#### Speaker 1 28:44

Wow, wow. And, you know, like we've said with a few people, sadly and horribly, it takes a long time for a lot of people to heal about a lot of things. I think that we as a country are finally coming to a point and to a head where people are ready to accept some of these very hard truths that 20 years ago, on the cusp of this incident, they they were just not willing to explore the concept because of the injury personally of the attack. And I

## Speaker 2 29:14

get that, I can see that I get that. I get that however. You know, there's another side that people who were damaged by this event, or had people, the family members, or whoever deserve their justice? Yeah, they need justice. I mean, they need, I would think, Oh, I know it's, it's hard to raise the topic, topic again and all that. But if they need resolution, yeah, and part of that resolution is to know the truth. That's right. So I would think that's the case. It's up to, you know, they have to come to terms of it on their own. But that's, that's my contribution, is try to get things that I can know for certain. So I don't like, I do not like the whole spinning of. Are fanciful theories out there, and the more outrageous, the better that kind of thing. Yeah, I think that's destructive.

#### Speaker 1 30:08

I think it's destructive to the conversation.

#### Speaker 2 30:11

Absolutely, it's important to keep your feet firmly on the ground. And the kinds of things I'm

absolutely, it's important to keep your feet infiny on the ground. And the kinds of things this

doing and the kind of things that I was involved with other people that we're doing early on, and what I'm continuing to do so I'm currently coordinator for scientists for 911 truth, and I'm also on the board for International Center for 911 justice. And in both of those groups, we're basically having people have rational, rational approaches to this, for keeping our feet on the ground. Yeah, and I think that's important.

#### Speaker 1 30:45

It is massively important, and I want to thank you for doing that, because, like I said, this is a topic that I have wanted to explore for a long, long time. I have wanted to talk about it, but one of the things that I do not do on my show is dig rabbit holes and kick dirt into the water that we're all drinking from. My job is to help on muddy the waters, help people who cannot understand some of these deep, thick, hard topics, and talk to people like you who were grounded in the science, who were grounded in let's look at this from a scientific point of view, and the science just doesn't add up. Yeah. So thank you so much for your time. Thank you for your years of dedication to this one last time. Mr. Chandler, please let everybody know where they can go to find out more about your work, where they can go to get involved with your work.

Speaker 2 31:34

Okay, my website is and it's my website, but I've brought in several other engineers and scientists of various kinds.

**31:45** 

Anyway, that's 911 speak out.org

Speaker 2 31:49

and then I'm involved with our with International Center for 911 justice. That's, I see nine eleven.org and scientists for 911 truth. That's scientists for 911 truth.org Absolutely, those are the three things there. If you go to my website, it has you'll you'll be there for a long time. It's a huge website, if I'll just tell you this, if you're just getting started in this, if you go to the 911 speak out website, on the front page, the very first video clip is building seven so many people haven't seen it, a little five minute thing with all the different points of view. The second video is a talk I gave at the University of Colorado in Boulder several years ago, and it's about an hour long talk, but that one video is probably the best concise summary of my research. So if you want to understand what I've done on this, nutshell it, it's my research. It's not all angles on this. There's a lot of other people who have other kinds of research. But if you want to understand the kind of research I've done, it's encapsulated in that one video, I think, probably better than anywhere else. Then if you look at the tab, and I have a pentagon tab, if you want to get into that, I have the tab that has all the different researchers that are in that I have archived on my site, and you can see what each of those guys are doing and so forth.

#### Speaker 1 33:10

So incredible. Well, thank you so much once again for all your work while you were online, checking out everything from 911 speak out.org as well as the International Center for 911 justice at IC nine eleven.org everybody make sure to stop on by Richard gage.com or Richard gage nine eleven.com as well as curious realm.com that is where you can like, follow, subscribe. That's where you can find all of our live coverage from amazing events like this one, stay tuned through this quick break. We will be right back with our continuing coverage of turning the tide 911, Justice right here in Washington, DC, right after this, folks, you

#### Speaker 3 34:04

the key to good science is good research. At the heart of good research is a good data set with the field observation and encounter log from curious research, you can easily keep track of your investigative information all in one place, making it easier to review cases and readily see comparisons and contrasts between them, whether out in the woods, watching in a backroom, gathering EVPs, or using high tech gear to track UFO, UAP activity. This easy to carry pocket sized scientific data log is the perfect companion for any field researcher. You can find your copy of the curious research, field observation and encounter log@amazon.com or visit the official curious realm store at curious realm.com forward slash store to reserve your copy for yourself, your family or a mind that you want to open. That website, again, is curious realm.com, forward, slash, store.

## Speaker 1 35:22

Well, hello everybody, and welcome back to our continuing coverage here at the turning the tide 911 Justice Conference in Washington, DC, we have the pleasure of being joined by researcher piers Robinson. Welcome to the show. Thank you very much. It's good to be with you before we get started. Let our audience know what you do in the world of 911 research, and how you came to the world of 911 research to begin with.

## Speaker 4 35:46

Piers, sure, well, I'm currently the research director and a board member of the International Center for 911 justice, and I've been working with them for two years now. And primarily my role there is to facilitate research into various aspects of 911 I'm also co editor of the journal for 911 studies with my co editor, Kevin Ryan, okay, and the purpose of that journal is to facilitate research and publication of detailed analyzes of all aspects surrounding 911 and also linked events, global war on terror, covid 19, looking at structural, deep events, and essentially to try to facilitate high quality analysis, both scientific and then from the social sciences, into questions around 911, and around, I guess, more broadly, State crimes against democracy is a way of thinking about what we look at, yeah, and that's my primary role. How I got here, in my background isn't I'm an academic. I worked for 20 years in the United Kingdom at University of Liverpool and in Manchester and Sheffield, where I was a full professor. And My academic background is, or to work at the field I worked in was international politics and communications. So I studied war and conflict and the propaganda, yeah. So really overlapping the fields of Political Science, Communication Studies, international relations. And as part of that, you know,

I would look no historically, normally, at questions such as media impact on foreign policy formulation, media coverage of war and so on. And you know, at a point around 2015 I started to become more aware that there were problems of 911 and at that point I realized, well, this is going to be an interesting, tricky topic to broach with my colleagues. Yeah, because, as we all know, academia is pretty constrained, well disciplined. They don't ask those kind of really difficult questions,

#### Speaker 1 37:51

thick and high walls in academia and science, very thick and high walls that they stand on and behind.

#### Speaker 4 37:58

Indeed, indeed. So you know, I was aware from 2015 16 on, was what had gone on 11 I'd spent time looking at architects and engineers material and the work of other people, and didn't take long to figure out, okay, we're looking at a false flag here. And so then for me, as an academic in a university, and the universities I were in work. They're called Russell Group universities, in case you couldn't do the Ivy League in the elite universities. And so I was thinking, Well, how am I going to manage this? Because I can't play that game of saying, actually, this is off my subject area, you know, I, I, I'm a I'm a chemist, for example. This has got nothing to do. What I do my subject area is international politics conflict, so I'm gonna have to address this. And I simply I can't ignore it, and but I knew that if I start to engage it, this is gonna cause me problems. Yeah, so I, you know, by the time I become a full professor, that was a point at which I said to myself, Well, do you know what? By the age of 50, I'm gonna have to step out of the mainstream, and that will allow me to actually pursue more independent research, and to look at 911 along with a lot of other sort of very controversial issues which I've been involved in researching Syria chemical weapons, is one specific area which I've been involved in a lot of work on, yeah. And so it was a recognition that I'd have to get out and get into an independent space that as well. That's what I did in 2019 and couple of years ago, Ted Walter, who's the executive director at 80 911 asked me to join. And so I said yes, and that brought me fully into examining aspects of 911,

## Speaker 1 39:42

and and since then. I mean, of course, you were no longer teaching at the university, things like that. But since diverging onto this path, how do your fellows that you did research with and that you did work with the university or work with at the. Universities. How have they kindred to your work? Have they kinder to your work?

#### Speaker 4 40:04

Well, the interesting thing is, mean that there's a parallel story here. Is it by 2018 I, with a group of colleagues, were examining the Syrian war, and we were looking at the propaganda in the Syrian war, yeah. And then we started to look at the alleged chemical weapons attacks, and because we are conscious that these things don't look as though they've been carried out by

the Syrian government. And we set up a little Working Group in 2018 and we had a very large number of academics who joined us and said, We want to look at propaganda and the war in Syria. And you know, one of the aspects was looking at chemical weapons. And we set up this working group, and we put up a website, and before we'd even published anything, we were being attacked in the British media.

Speaker 1 40:49

We were propaganda had already started. Believe it, yeah,

Speaker 4 40:53

believe it or not, we were on the front page of The Times newspaper, wow, the day that France, Britain and America retaliated or attacked Syria for the do alleged Duma chemical weapons attack. Yeah. And there we were on front pages of times as sad apologists working in universities, and they also had an editorial which was essentially calling for our job. Yeah. So I was always already in deep and at that point, you know, most of my academic colleagues supported, but, you know, I was already working there. We were, there's a lot of us and the working group, all academics, most of us are Russell Group universities. So we were okay. We were over the target. We were, you know, in a sense, really pushing up against what we ultimately discovered was a British propaganda operation in Syria surrounding chemical weapons. And I guess that was a bit of a baptism of fire, and that sort of, I think, at that point, a lot of support from colleagues, but also more mainstream colleagues starting to be slightly sort of nervous. Okay, where's peers going to now? And but that was fine, because we carried on. We persisted, persisted with our work and our research, despite the media attacks which we were getting under. But at that point in 2019 I then said, decided I'm going to get out and I'm going to take the independent path. And since then, if you sort of combine it with covid and everything which has come out of that in terms of awareness, there's quite a lot of us academics who are in this critical space, yeah, so some of them are still within the system, and I still work with them. So one example is Tim Hayward at University of Edinburgh, okay, and other academics who have, for example, retired or Emeritus, you know. So they just, they do look at 911 so I work with them. And, you know, in a way, I've managed to balance, I still managed to work with quite a lot of people in the mainstream. I still publish in mainstream academic outfit, fantastic and so on. But I think more broadly, yeah, quite a few of people who I worked with in the past who, for example, younger academics who I'd supported. You know, it was interesting to see how they sort of turn the other way and but it's predictable, because people don't want to lose their jobs. They don't want to be associated so. And you know, as you said, academia,

Speaker 1 43:29

you can learn, your letters, your grants, very, very constrained, everything.

Speaker 4 43:33

So in a way, you know, you do lose friends, but I've always been impressed at the number of nearly who do still talk to me and who have come along the journey. I'm sure, who've come

people who do sail talk to the and who have come along the journey, i'm saile, who we come

along the journey. And as I say, we're not small in number anymore. I mean, covid was a good sort of process in this respect, because with covid, a huge raft of medical scientists have realized that, wait a minute, there's a lot of propaganda. And academia is not as free and as unconstrained as it should be. That's right. So a lot of people me, and such as myself in the social sciences, were saying for a long time, sort of, you know, the systems rigged, yeah, and so on. But people don't pay too much attention to social sciences. But then when medical scientists started saying this with covid, yeah, there's actually a very large number. So Jay Bhattacharya, for example, who's now an NIH Director, yeah. You know, these people became aware of corruption within our political systems, bias, bias within the academy and so on. Yeah. So I think there's a there's a lot of us now. And you know, whilst I think I've lost some friends, so to speak. You know, I still got a lot of friends. And I think over time, there's going to be a growing push by, you know, academics who want to want to be able to do their job. That was always my things. I wanted to do my job. But academics who want to do their job, that there will be a push for the creation of, you know, either improving these. Listing universities or developing new universities, that's already underway. So, you know, I'm, I'm optimistic on that front. And so lost friends, some friends have stayed, but there are more people coming into this space, recognizing 911, for example, JFK, that is almost becoming mainstream now,

#### Speaker 1 45:21

you know the the Syrian conflict that you're talking about, that's, that's one of the things i i bring up regularly as an example of propaganda things like that, because that was, that was directly tied to the Benghazi raid that happened like those. Those gas weapons were actively traced back to the forward base in Benghazi, which is why the raid happened that killed our embassy person who was actively an arms salesman on the side. And this is all data that most people haven't looked into. Most people, why does it matter? Is the famous quote from Hillary Clinton on the floor. Why does even it matters because we actively sold the weapons that caused the war that we went into. That's why it matters.

#### <u>റ</u> 46:06

Yeah, exactly it was.

#### Speaker 1 46:09

And we let his death be the catalyst, once again, for me to put forth false information.

#### Speaker 4 46:16

Of course, his article, The Rat line, the red line, and the rat line about the Gupta 2013 Yeah, and and so on. And that was the first of the big alleged chemical attacks. Yeah, and, yeah. I mean, this was, it was a dirty war. It was instigated by us. It is, of course, part of the 911 wars. Yes, on the list, absolutely. This is a direct consequence of what we've been seeing since 911 in terms of your aggressive projection of

#### Speaker 1 46:44

right there in the Benghazi compound was where you have the famous picture of John McCain with ISIS, who were the people that we propped up to help get rid of al Qaeda, who then, well, filled the space, filled the vacuum of al Qaeda, like what always happens with the people that we train in finance, yeah? And it's, it's fascinating to see those things and to see that, yeah, this is a paradigm that has been followed again and again and again in numerous to at least from Vietnam forward,

6 47:12 for sure,

#### Speaker 4 47:13

for sure. Yep. I mean, in right linking out of 911 it's, yeah, al Qaeda was always on our side well. And this is a creation

#### Speaker 1 47:21

numerous times, you know, but it's interesting how, when the war on terror started news, I never forget, folks, the famous announcement of, you know, we've got to create a shadow government. We need to create a shadow government that can be there just in case. And it's like, well, wait a minute, we already have a just in case plan. What do you we have a continuity of government plan for a reason. What are you talking about? A shadow government that's going to make other decisions? It was really interesting to see kind of that softball pitch across the plate of this is just here with a bunch of other info that I'm talking about, and really seeing that come to light in cases like Benghazi and things like that where like, yeah, I and you used the F word A while ago, false flag. It's a word a lot of people don't like hearing because of its tie to things like Sandy Hook yeah and Alex Jones, who used that in a very wrong aspect with that. But that doesn't mean it's a false term or that they don't exist. Feel free to look into the USS Maine, for sure, took us into the Spanish Americans.

## Speaker 4 48:29

It's a military tactic that's right, and you go through history and you see it being used time and time again in order to mobilize populations, to get them get the blood boiling and to get a war starting, that's false flags. And you know, the people who plan and instigate these false flags, I mean, I would imagine their perception on on these things are that they these are the necessary dark deeds in order to protect the national interest. Yeah, yeah, so on. And yes, it's very Machiavellian. But there you go. Machiavellian politics, absolutely. And so that they see these things as sacrifice and justifies the means and justifies the means. And we have to sacrifice lives and sometimes to get that population to wake them up, to get them

Speaker 1 49:15

to go, to shake them away, we exactly violently shake them

Speaker 4 49:19

awake. And they're willing to do they're willing to commit these crimes, yeah, in order to pursue these what they see is these higher objectives.

Speaker 1 49:26

And that is a frightening reality that honestly, you know, as we've talked with sociologists here, as we've talked with doctors, people like yourself, you know it's, it's a reality that all too many people, it's so frightening that the comfort of it not being it not being able to exist, or the idea of a conspiracy being too large for people to keep a secret, that's more comfortable than the actual hard fact of No, no, these things happen.

Speaker 4 49:55

No, nobody wants to come to terms with the fact their own government. That would commit crimes such as 911 Yeah, you know, there's a, there's a great podcast or video by Francis, sure, and I think it's on a 911 and she's a psychologist, and she talks about how, you know, getting over this bump of recognizing false flags or state crimes against democracy. You know, the problem is very similar to the problem that you see in families where there's abuse going on. Yes, is that often the mother, for example, doesn't want to entertain the possibility, nor do the siblings, and so they basically Black it out, and yeah, and so on. And, of course, the argument there is that, okay, so that's understandable in that situation, because they were they don't want to see that the father, the protector, is doing that kind of harm. But it's a similar relationship, a parallel relationship, relationship between the state and the population. It's a parent child relationship. So nobody wants to go to that. So it's a it's a big psychological hurdle to get over, yeah, and then once you're over it, you are in a space where, yep, okay, these bad things, forgiveness and healing can, of course, nobody wants to go there. Nobody wants to sort of wake up and think, I'm living in a world, yeah, where, you know, is upside down compared to how I thought it was yesterday, and my government might harm me. So I think, you know, people put their head in the sand for a lot of those reasons,

5 Speaker 1 51:22

and the frightening reality, there's an example that I give that's only happened within, if I'm not mistaken, the last five to 10 years where there there was construction going on in an Eastern European town that was occupied by Nazis, things like that. And as they constructed, they started finding bodies, and not just like, hey, here's a grave, like, here's a body with another body and another body. What's up with this? And as they excavated and did ground penetrating radar, they found a mass grave. And come to end up this entire town piers decided that the atrocities that happened were so horrible that they would never speak of it again, ever, to the point that nobody in the town knew that that mass grave was there anymore. Yeah, that

that's the point of denial that in an entire society can personally agree. I can we all agree that this is so horrifying that we will never tell our children that this happened here? Yeah, on the on the ground that they live

## Speaker 4 52:30

on, yeah, so you can understand, yeah, how these things happen. And of course, the people who instigate these false flags know that, yeah, they know that most people are not going to want to go there. And then the people who do well, you can smear them. You can shut them down. That's right. Of course, sometimes people are taken out as well. I mean, I'm thinking of JFK assassination, absolutely. A lot of people who are material witnesses wound up dead, so they're willing to control, as it were, the narrative. That's right, taking action, smearing people, for example, as as was the case of myself and colleagues over Syria. You shut people up and so on. And then everybody else, you know, just either head in the sand or or how was not paying attention? Yeah? And of course, if the mainstream media isn't raising any of these issues, then a lot of these people won't have any idea about what was going on.

#### Speaker 1 53:22

Yeah, and I'm sure that you and your colleagues felt greatly vindicated when things and granted, there's still a lot of denial about the whole serious situation, but when truths and connections to things like Benghazi and stuff like that came out, I'm sure you felt more than vindicated.

#### Speaker 4 53:36

We were Vincent. We were vindicated when two scientists from within the organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons who are investigating a do attack. Basically, there was an internal challenge to the investigation because it had been corrupted, and ultimately they became whistleblowers. And I still work with both of them, fantastic. So we have indicated at that point is that this is not a bunch of crazy political scientists? Yeah, there are real scientists from an organization which is investigating these chemical attacks, and two of their chief scientists are coming out saying, wait a minute, this, this investigation is being corrupted to point the finger at the Syrian government. Yeah, we were clearly vindicated at that point.

## Speaker 1 54:16

Yeah, yeah, exactly. And it's one of those I say on the show regularly. Make no mistake, we have conspiracy theorists in the world. They're called Das. Their job is to literally take a set of specific data, build a narrative and take 12 people in a box down that road. Yeah, exactly that is their job, that is, it is to wedge that data in there. However you have to to make that happen, yeah, and, and that same thing happens in media that say, you know, I've said it to the camera. I'll say it again. Feel free to look up Smith munt act 2012 and you will find numerous things just Google. Smith munt act 2012 and you will find numerous articles from NAACP. All kinds of things where it's like, yeah, the Smith Mundt Act, which was what prevented the US government from giving propaganda to the news to disseminate, was stricken down. And at the

same time, people who were going to put out what the government said were put into place like it was straight up Operation Mockingbird rebirthed, like they resuscitated it and gave Frankenstein life again. Yes, and it's frightening to see those things. It's frightening to see that in actual action, that is zero conspiracy theory, that is actual news articles. Man, news articles real things.

#### Speaker 4 55:38

But of course, I mean in recent years, as somebody who studies propaganda, it's become increasingly obvious to a lot of people that there's that kind of propaganda going on in the West. Because, you know, historically, certainly mainstream academia. So propaganda is something which happens, you know, in Russia or China and so on. It doesn't happen around here, but we're in a different space now, because a lot of do recognize that they are being manipulated. They are being propagandized. And so, yeah, and and so there is a there is an awakening going on. It's been a slow, painful one, 911, slowly over time. Yeah, but the JFK, JFK is almost mainstream awareness now. So these things are opening up, and people are aware of this kind of manipulation, these kind of crimes which are going on, and it's bit is greater than it has ever been, I think, the history of our western societies, yep. So, you know, we are in that, you know, and it's a battle at the moment, because, again, they're working very, you know, stating the authorities or the Deep State or the military industrial complex, whatever label you want to use, they're working extremely hard, yeah, to try to sort of control the parameters of dissent. But I don't think they're being very successful. I think what we're seeing with 911 and essentially, you know, the acceleration and the spreading with people such as Tucker Carlson talking so openly about it, I think you know, we're on the cusp of, you know, significant awareness, which will ultimately lead to political change. Absolutely, it will be a fight, and they're going to work hard to shut us down, but the

#### Speaker 1 57:12

scabs going to come off with the band aid. Yeah, you know, like, sadly, folks, I hate to tell you, it's going to be a painful personal process for all of us, for all of us, exactly, you know. But at the at the same token, you look at things in the last 810, years, once again, even even the idea of Fourth Amendment and and the 100 mile law here in the United States, most people do not realize. Like the example I give is, if you drive from Houston to Louisiana on i 10, you'll now see Border Patrol, and they've been there for a decade. That is because there was 100 mile rule put into place where anywhere within 100 miles of any port of entry. And that means, if you are landlocked in the middle of the country, but there's an inbound airport with borders and customs control, you have 0/4 Amendment rights within 100 miles of that spot. So yeah, your right to a legal search and seizure, habeas corpus, all of that is suspended within 100 miles of any port of entry to the United States. And that's fascinating, and very few people know about that. That is an actual law. It's out there. Feel free to look at the NAACP websites. It's interesting to see those kind of things being strategically put into place chess pieces on the board, where it's like because of this one overarching thing, we can now have prism, which Edward Snowden is now living abroad in hiding because of, yeah, where, where we showed the fact that the federal government was tapping every single phone, every single social media device, even the idea, I talk about it regularly in Q tel, the financial arm of the CIA that looks into future looking technologies, gave initial rounds of funding to to Facebook, to meta, and one of the first news stories you ever heard about Facebook was Hosni Mubarak was, was that flash

mob that led to the overthrow of Egypt, where they never found the guy who had the account that was like, You know what we should do? We should all go meet in the town square and tell Hosni Mubarak to get out of here. Yeah. Nobody ever found that guy.

# S

#### Speaker 4 59:29

Well, in the 90s that there was this wonderfully idealistic sort of academic debate about the internet is here, this is going to democratizing, this is going to empower us, and so on. And of course, it has that potential. And of course, some ways, it has worked in that way. But also, as with any new technology, it has an emancipatory power, but very, very quickly powerful people learn how to use it. And of course, the internet, the digital environment, and so on, huge energy put into, you know, a. Artificial Intelligence, algorithms and so on, and with, with a view to manipulating and controlling people and that sort of technology, it's a double edged sword, yeah, but of course, yeah, this technology is a way of controlling us. And of course, you know, you look at all the debates about Central Bank, digital currency, digital ID, getting people on a digital grid, you get control over them. You do, which is the great danger. And they're pushing, no, some forces are pushing for that,



#### Speaker 1 1:00:29

my God, man, that I was just on Clyde Lewis two nights ago, talking about the genetic blockchain concept, that they're talking about a block. You forget 23 of me use this new blockchain technology to guard like, Oh, my God, oh, that's a dangerous concept. Yeah, you know, that is, that is how you can start getting ethno specific viruses. That's how you get, like, all kinds of things when you surrender that kind of data to that system, yeah, you know, and, and that's just it. The the metricing of far reaching, calm consequences, one of the examples I give for the Internet, I've just turned 50 all of a couple weeks ago, so I'm a Commodore 64 kid things when you had to tell them what to do specifically. But one of the projects I was part of in the last year or so, with curious research was actually helping digitize an entire UFO archive, okay? And one of the things in that archive, the researcher was hugely into Heaven's Gate. He knew Marshall Applewhite, things like that, and tons of news footage, like about 20 hours of news footage that I watched and digitized. And the one thing that every expert kept saying, and that was like 2000 up around there, when, when the comet happened and the suicide happened with the Heavens Gate cult, but all of the sociologists, all of the experts, everything, kept saying numerous things over and over and over and all of these clips, and it's the exact same thing that we say right now, all of these people on the internet who are lonely and looking for friendship and looking for acceptance of their idea is who they fed off of, all of these people who are on the internet who are not able to filter the fact from fiction On the internet, yeah, is what led to this. And it's like every single thing that we're 25 years down the line, man, it has not changed. People are just as susceptible to the exact same trash that goes on the internet. They're they're still just as susceptible to that want of acceptance and confirmation married dangerously with the confirmation bias, you know, and societally, when you look at that, that's a that's a precipice, that's somewhere where people, much like our two party system, that's a lean to that's not a house that'll Blow left and right, any any time you want it to which is exactly what it's used for. It's used as a didactic of control of the population of look at what the blue people are doing. You don't want that. Do you? Look at what the red people are doing this four years. You don't want that. Do you? Um, that's just a fully didactic means of control by this system. Yeah, you know.

# S

#### Speaker 4 1:03:21

But you know, ultimately they know this technology. We're talking essentially about the digital environment, the digital fluid and so on, is that, you know, it does for the people who want to manipulate it and it will use it for purposes of manipulation. I think they overestimate how much control it reach it ultimately has, because people also live in a real world. They do. And this is one of the things which I observed during covid 19, is that, you know, there's a huge amount of propaganda, and they were using social media and so on. People dropping dead in China, for example, apparently from covid, yeah, and so on. So they were using for those purposes. But, you know, ultimately, or very quickly, with covid, a large section of population was saying, we don't buy this, and when they started to talk about everyone having to have an injection to it, and so on. And one of the reasons for that is that people also talk to each other, people go out and so on. People experience a real world. And I think that's why the propaganda around covid Well, to a large extent, I know that it's more complex picture than this, but you know, to a large extent, it failed. They did overreach, because a lot of people became aware, wait a minute, the hospitals aren't filling up. There aren't dead people on the street. Do I know anyone who has covid or anyone who's died from it? Or Not really? So when they do propaganda in a war, yet people's only source of information is through the news and so on. They can't experience that war directly. And so, yeah, so there's a lot of power over people's mind, but with covid, you know, they were trying to get power over people's minds telling them what's going on around them. And so, you know, there's a limit to this. People will engage in real world communication as well. And I know that, I know, of course, we're living in a world where all the kids have got their smartphones, and all the adults have got their smartphones and so on. But, you know, a lot of people do have one foot in reality and are able to see outside of that. Yep. And I think ultimately, although this technology is very scary, and I think issues surrounding digital ID, Central Bank, digital currency and so on. All of that is very, very dangerous, and we need to push back against that. But I think, you know, people are always going to be able to step out, throw away the mobile phone, throw away the smartphone. And you know, if you know this is ultimately, if they push too hard on control, that is exactly what will happen. People will suddenly, at some point, there'll be a tipping point people will realize this is, this is a tool of my enslavement, well, and they will throw it away. So it's not, we're not. They are not omnipotent. They cannot. There's not a situation where they can use this technology to get total control. That's right. And we're all screwed. So, yeah, you know. And people will, will will wake up to if they push too hard and again to make when again, people, people communicate outside of this space as well. That's right. You know, it's funny thing say, but people still go to the park and play football where I live. People still go to pubs and bars to drink and talk with each other and so on. That's right. So, you know, there is a real world and then there's a virtual world, yeah,

# S

#### Speaker 1 1:06:24

and that is a huge distinction to make. And as I tell people all the time on the show, you have to remember that all these things are tools. They're tools that are there to, A, make our life more convenient. B, help us build a better life. And much like any hammer, you could build a house, or you could knock your builder in the head with it, yeah, like it could be used for either one. So it's not necessarily that the technology is evil. It's the intent behind the use. Yeah, it's evil. So don't, don't fear your cell phone, people. Is what we're saying. Fear the sources of news that you may be looking at on your cell phone, and always make sure, as I say regularly, if you if

you go red, look at two or three articles talking about the same thing from Blue. Sure. Look at two or three articles if you live here in the States, look at two or three from like France. Look at two or three from UK source. See what the rest of the world is saying, not just the myopic view of America, look at dissenting opinions. Yeah, be willing to accept



#### Speaker 4 1:07:26

them. And that's certainly one of the pluses that you have with the internet technology. And of course, we see this with the decline in trust of the mainstream media. Yeah, they had a good for a long time. They had all the audience, they had all the resources and so on. And we're now in a situation where, you know, trust in mainstream media is flatlining and so on, and people go to these other sources, and the technology allows them to do that in exactly the way you just described. And that's great. That's really good. It does, of course, create a problem at some point in terms of, well, do you create just confusion? Yeah, and so that's an issue. But, you know, I think sort of that those things will naturally be worked through that there is a lot of confusion and so on, and the Internet sort of facilitates that. But ultimately, after that, people, people ultimately make sense of things. And I think, you know, and again, coming back to 911 or coming back to covid, JFK, I think over time, you know, awareness and understanding, you know, does strengthen. I don't think, I think we're in an increasingly sort of frightening situation in terms of geopolitical, yeah, etc, and we war, financial crash and so on. And, you know, we're living in that age. But, yeah, we'll live through that. We and people will find new ways of, you know, engaging politically, new parties and so on. And I think there will be, ultimately, this kind of pushback against the corrupted structures we have. And the technology can be useful. It can help, as you say, it can be used by the other situation. But, you know, it's a double edged sword. If we use it intelligently, it can be used to build new social movements, for example, build a new society. And I you know, that's where, ultimately, that's where we have to go in the West, because we're living in a different world now. Yeah, the West, the West, has had it good for a long time. We have dominated globally, and we're not in that world anymore. And so we're going to have to adjust, and that's going to require political adjustment, yeah,



#### Speaker 1 1:09:23

and the understanding of the fact of, as we said a couple times in this, as we say regularly, it takes time to heal over things, you know, and when you start, and even the point of scientific interest, to the point of scientific discovery, I'll bring up something that we bring up with cryptozoology and Bigfoot regularly, and that's the idea of when Anglos because settlers and colonizers had heard from locals for years about the existence of the lowland gorilla. Once scientists and Anglos actively got interested, it took 80 years for us to find the lowland gorilla and prove it exists. Did when these natives knew about it, but we were like, You're crazy. These are just stories. It took 80 years for us to find it from the point of interest. So it took a long time for people like you said, almost 20 years for people to have any kind of legitimate thought that there may be other gunman involved with Kennedy, and to accept the fact that, hey, this may be a thing. This may be a thing. And now we're coming to a point of much later down the line, people, a lot more people, having an acceptance of that, even the UFO UAP topic. At this point, people are at a totally different point than they were in 1967 20 years after Roswell. So we are just now burgeoning on 24 years of 911 people are just now getting to a fact where it's no

longer a tender point that they're willing to maybe listen to some other data at this point, because they've seen other things be pulled. They've seen things like serious it's the virtue in these

## Speaker 4 1:11:03

patients, especially for social moves. And what we're seeing here tonight with a 911 truth movement, yeah, you know, people, people expect, or people want to be opened up. You know, if we simply get this killer fact out there and so on, we'll blow the whole thing wide open, etc. Actually, it takes time. It takes a lot of social movements. You look at suffragettes civil rights, on these long generational struggles, that's right. And you know, we always and of course, this is why people in protest movements, truth movements, you know, people get battle weary, yeah, yeah. And so and demoralized, jaded, but, and jaded, but, you know, we just have to be very patient, and we must recognize that, okay, what we're doing maybe the fruits of our labor will not become apparent to a later generation. That's right. But who are we doing this for? Not really doing it for ourselves. We're doing it for our kids, that's right, and our grandchildren so on. And you know, we do the right thing. You speak the truth as you see it, and you do what we're seeing here at the at this 911 conference is there's coming together of all of these organizations which have been pushing for the truth online, and look at the progress which has been made. Senator Ron Johnson, Tucker Carlson, couldn't come tonight, obviously, because of what happened yesterday. But you know Dennis Kucinich, you know we are significant people. And that's right, they're here. They're here because of these movements who've battled for 20 years now to get the truth out about That's right. And you know, it gets it gets there in the end. Yeah, there's a great quote, truth is the daughter of time, not authority, Francis Bacon and Yep. Got to keep that in mind when you're going up against that is monsters.

#### <u>^</u> 1:12:44

Absolutely what we're involved

## Speaker 1 1:12:46

we are living in a world of I want to live in a world of monsters. I want to thank you for your time. And that is a beautiful quote to go out on just for this day of coverage, because it really is the fact of we've got to give it time. We've got to we've got to put in the good research, not the immediate fix research. The immediate fix research is like trying to chase a headline, chasing a headline it and waiting for facts on a situation. You know, you may get the clicks, but you didn't get the facts, is the problem. So thank you so much for your time. I greatly appreciate it on this very, very busy conference. Let everybody know where they can go to find out more about your work, where they can go to get involved peers, for sure.

#### Speaker 4 1:13:27

I mean my, as I say, International Center for 911 Justice website, Journal of 911 studies. So a lot of material related to 911 there. I'm also editor of propaganda and focus, which has a wide range of articles on all things related to propaganda. I'm on Twitter social media. I have an

academic profile, so look me up on Google Scholar, and you'll see my academic publications. Quite a lot of those are available. Some are, of course, paywall behind academic journals, but quite a lot of are available. So go to any of those places, but my Twitter handle actually has most of my sort of major links to organizations and so on. So people can go there and then, and then pursue their interests from there. But the main one given today, and why we're here today, International Center for 911 justice and then the journal for 911 studies.

## Speaker 1 1:14:16

Absolutely, thank you so much for your time. Once again, it's been more than a pleasure. Absolutely, while you are online, checking out all the amazing work of piers Robinson, as well as the International for Center for 911 justice at IC nine eleven.org everybody make sure to stop on by as well Richard gage nine eleven.org and curious realm.com that is where you can like, follow, subscribe. That's where you can find all of our amazing coverage from events like this. When we come back from this commercial break, we will continue with our coverage here on site from turning the tide 911, Justice Conference right here in Washington, DC, right after this, folks, you.

## Speaker 3 1:15:09

The key to good science is good research. At the heart of good research is a good data set with the field observation and encounter log from curious research, you can easily keep track of your investigative information all in one place, making it easier to review cases and readily see comparisons and contrasts between them, whether out in the woods, watching in a back room, gathering EVPs or using high tech gear to track UFO, UAP activity, this easy to carry pocket sized scientific data log is the perfect companion for any field researcher. You can find your copy of the curious research field observation and encounter log@amazon.com or visit the official curious realm store at curious realm.com forward slash store to reserve your copy for yourself, your family or a mind that you want to open that website again is curious realm.com. Forward, slash, store.

- Speaker 5 1:16:22 You Well.
- Speaker 1 1:16:27

hello everybody, and welcome back to the curious rooms. Continuing coverage of returning the tide 911 Justice Conference here in Washington, DC, we have the pleasure of being joined by Matt Campbell, who was one of the presenters here. How did you first come to the 911 movement, and what were you here presenting about?

Speaker 6 1:16:47

Well, I lost my brother on the North Tower, 100 and sixth floor, and it's been a long journey for

me, obvious reasons, but i a started to question the events of 911 probably the end of October 2001 triggered by an article written by the late John Pilger journalist. They basically said something on the lines of or the title of this. The article was, this, war is a farce, and I think we were sort of two three weeks into what was going on in Afghanistan, yeah. And, you know, he just made me think differently about what had happened. I was still obviously processing and in shock what happened with my brother, yeah. But it was, you know, his basic questions were, you know, what's going on with what what we're doing in Afghanistan? And the Brits had obviously joined with America. And it was like 15 of the 19 alleged hijackers were Saudi they seem to have done most of their training in Germany and America. Yep. What are we doing in Afghanistan? Yeah. And you know, the end of the article was as a quote by someone who lost a loved one. And it was like, this is all being done in my name. Yeah, you know a loved one's name, absolutely and and so I started to question things, and I'd say, probably by the summer of the following year, so in 2002 I started to have some serious doubts. I think early part of that year, there was some discussion of starting suits against the Saudis. So convinced my father to sign up to that lawsuit. So he's with Motley rice. But then really, I mean, a lot of books started to come out, between 2003 2004 and I was very much interested in the sort of paper trail of stuff, intelligence failures and stuff like that, absolutely, and really wasn't until, I think building seven came on my radar, my background, sort of maths and physics and stuff. And that really caught my attention in probably 2007 and I mean, by this stage, I'd been down lots of rabbit holes, as you do, yeah, and not necessarily just limited to 911 but it was probably sort of 2009 that I really started to think, okay, the towers have come down in a similar manner that building seven, obviously different the way they look, essentially blown up. So rather oddly, my brother had an inquest, and an inquest in the UK is held in a Coroner's Court, just essentially who, where and and when, but more importantly, how did that person die? So he had a joint inquest with 10 people in 2013 it was adjourned for for various reason, and it really was pathetic. I mean, they spent a couple of minutes discussing my brother's life and death. It was a cut and paste of from America, about four pages, I think, of evidence was put in front of the coroner. And, you know, boom, rubber stamp. Um. Yeah, that was it. There was no actually investigation into how he died, which, by law, they're supposed to do that. So at around the sort of same time, I had connected with people in the sort of you'd call it 911 truth in the UK. Okay, I'd been living in abroad for a while, but I came back, and I started to sort of okay. I mean, I was aware of a lot of the evidence that was out there, but it was like, Okay, I'm actually now in contact with some people who had contacts with people in the States. And it was like, Okay, maybe there's a route to try and reopen my brother's inquest, because there is a mechanism in UK law that if you've got new evidence, if you can show that it's justice, you can reopen an inquest. It was a standard approach that families use. So I started to think, okay, maybe, you know this is a way of doing it, and putting evidence in front of the coroner, forcing them to actually investigate my brother's death. And so, cut a long story short, it took a long time for me to raise the necessary funds, get the energy to go and do this. And in 2021 we submitted a two and a half 1000 page application to the attorney general, because you have to ask for permission in the UK. So you basically asked the Attorney General, or England and Wales permission to reopen an inquest. And normally, if you can show insufficiency of inquiry, if you can show some new evidence which may conceivably perhaps change the outcome, they would grant a new inquest. It's fairly standard. Like I said, a lot of families use this and for a long wait, they denied it. And so basically the reason why to get to the chase of why I'm here, it's essentially to talk about my ongoing legal battles with the UK justice system, to do with my brother's death, but in an event that happened over in America. Yeah. And so I've come here to basically talk about my journey and my battle with the UK authorities, yeah, but it's essentially, I think, the same people all around the world the

#### Speaker 1 1:22:11

complicity of of hiding information or rubber stamping things to just get them,

## Speaker 6 1:22:17

I mean, and you Know, they are blocking what I'm trying to do, and, you know, which is to get a proper investigation into my brother's death, yeah? And, you know, it's been a long process, yeah, I am now fighting very, I'd call it almost abstract bits of law that have got nothing to do with the inquest, per se. It's to do with, I mean, my battle at the moment is there's a kind of archaic power that the attorney general has, which is, they're above the law. You cannot at the the judiciary, the courts examine their decisions where they have to give their their permission. And so the section 13, one, 1b of this of the coroner's Act, which is this mechanism to be open an inquest or ask for permission, is basically they're saying that we're non justiciable, which basically means you can't get the courts to look at our decision. So we went to the High Court, which is a fairly, you know, senior court in the UK to argue this issue. This was in June this year, and we lost. But the there was two judges and one judge when he gave the ruling, basically pointed out this is essentially, I'm paraphrasing here because he didn't write this. This is a ridiculous state of affairs. We've got this anomalous situation whereby certain decisions that the Attorney General makes are can be scrutinized by the law, and yet something as kind of low level as an inquest is being blocked. And I should make it clear that the Attorney General doesn't play this Get Out of Jail Free card all the time, you know, they seem to be using it, or they seem to use it historically when it suits them to cover up some malfeasance, or, you know, something another authority or body has done. And I can cite two examples which I gave in my speech, which is Bloody Sunday in 1972 the British Army shot dead 13 unarmed civilians. And for decades, the families tried to get through this mechanism, inquests into a loved one's death. And I mean, it wasn't until, I think it was 2010 from memory, there was a sort of Savile inquiry. And after that, only after that did any sort of limited prosecutions take place. But but the point being there is the families were denied because you once they say, No, there is no recourse for the families to challenge that decision. Another example is the Hillsborough football stadium soccer you call it over. Here, yeah, disaster where 96 fans were crushed to death. I remember that. And they had an inquest a few years after the the disaster, and they returned a verdict of accidental death and but key evidence was withheld. They also had an artificial cut off time that after, I think the disaster happened at 250 in the afternoon, at 315 they said they wouldn't consider any evidence afterwards, because someone ruled that everyone was already dead. And so any testimony from first responders who were trying to resuscitate victims, and they were victims still alive, they basically said, Oh, they're brain dead, and it's very controversial, obviously very upsetting for the family, yeah. And again, the Attorney General used this power to to block to get a new inquest for the families. And again, it wasn't until an independent inquiry, I think it was called the Hillsborough report was released, I might get a day wrong, 2012 where they said, Okay, no, we need to have new inquests. And they returned a verdict of unlawful killing. The reason why this was covered up, the police were complicit, and the government complicit, covering up what went on? So for me, what I'm trying to do is really important, because it's not just for 911 which obviously is very important. It's for any family who someone might they might have died suspiciously in a, you know, police cell, or whatever the circumstance. And you feel that there's been a whitewash, but more importantly, new evidence has come to light. Yeah, what? As it stands at the moment, the Attorney General has this, you know, superpower, which is, I'm above the law, and their decisions can't be reviewed. So where I'm at right now is, and it's, I mean, literally, less than a week ago, we've been given permission to appeal at the Supreme Court, which is the only good in the UK that

can actually over overturn, yeah, it's not encumbered by previous cases. They know that this is anomalous, which is, like I said, very strong legal term the way it was described in the in the ruling. And so my hope is that, first of all, the Supreme Court will grant our hearing. They will essentially undo this ridiculous, archaic, almost regal power that the attorney general has, which is there above the law. I mean, the only other person in England who's above the law is King Charles the third. I mean, it's that. It's that ridiculous, yeah, without getting into the Royals and stuff,

- 1:27:36

  you know, and the ridiculousness of, yeah, and you don't have it over
- 1:27:39 here. Oh, no, we have
- 1:27:43 it, but they're just not blood Royal.
- Speaker 6 1:27:47

So, you know, it's in when it gets to the screen court. Let's assume we're there. If they can overturn that, if they can basically rule that, no, I'm sorry, you're in particular. I mean, we're only interested in quests, yeah. But you know, section 13, 1b applications, ie, inquest applications, you cannot hide behind this. We're above the law. If we can get that changed, then I can get my judicial review of the decision, because the Attorney General said no to a new inquest, and I absolutely know on paper we win that all day long. We are so far above the fairly minimal bar that no pun intended, of what you need to do to persuade an attorney general to have a new request, which is essentially show that there was no inquiry. I mean, there was no evidence, yeah, of an inquiry whatsoever by the UK authorities. And I remember that by law, they have to do this. And secondly, we have all this new evidence of controlled demolition of explosives, etc, which obviously wasn't put in front of the coroner, and it deserves to be have its day in court. Yeah, and I should add, I mean, it's a, I'm a Brit, and I know litigation in the US is all about the money and all the rest of it. I mean, this is litigation that's not it's purely litigating to get a new investigation into my brother's death. That's what I'm trying to do,

- Speaker 1 1:29:05

  yeah, not seeking settlement anything, just actual true justice,
- Speaker 6 1:29:10
  yeah, yeah. And so, because it's a court of law, so it's not just having, you know, so you have

coroners here, but yeah, they just say, Whatever the cause of death, we have something similar, but it's actually in a court of law, so there's a lot of which is fascinating, you know, but it's not adversarial. You're not looking to seek blame, yeah? So it should be just a true fact finding investigation.

#### Speaker 1 1:29:36

Yeah. We're just trying to get actual data on what killed this person. Yep, and you know that brings about a point of with the Attorney General, specifically and the denial of the inquest. Do they have to tell you why they've rejected it? And did they tell you why they rejected it? Those two were very integral.

#### Speaker 6 1:29:59

They don't. Have to, but it's typical that they would give reasons. They didn't really have any reasons, and the reasons they gave were almost just almost ridiculous, the way that they phrased so they would rely on reports that we know wasn't put in front of the coroner. So they're saying, well, the coroner was right to make right in making that decision because of the NIST report. The coroner never looked at the NIST report. There is no evidence. So you know, they were saying things like that, but they also were just, you know, very disparaging and dismissive of the evidence. But we know they didn't engage with the evidence, because you normally, if you have a refusal letter from, you know, from a decision from the Attorney General, say, you said, you know, we found traces of something in someone's blood, and say, Well, yeah, you know, someone's died. And, like I said, Please sell or something. There'd be reasons why they would reject that. Yeah, that gives some sort of reasoning. Yeah. There's no reasoning whatsoever, apart from basically saying they can't imagine, it's too fan fanciful this idea that explosives bought the tower down. They also said weird things like, and we don't see how that would change the verdict of how my brother died. And it's like, think there's a big difference between a building collapsing naturally explosion or being killed by explosives. And yeah, yes, one of the things that I brought up