

WHERE DID THE TOWERS GO

?

EVIDENCE OF DIRECTED
FREE-ENERGY
TECHNOLOGY
ON 9/11

by JUDY WOOD, B.S., M.S., Ph.D.



FOREWORD

The book you hold in your hands is the most important book of the twenty-first century. Let me explain why I say such a thing. *Where Did the Towers Go?* is a work, assuming that its content and message are properly and fairly heeded, that offers a starting point from which those who genuinely want to do it can begin, first, to rein in and then, perhaps, even end the wanton criminality and destructiveness of a set of American policies that took as their justification and starting point the horrific events of September 11, 2001.

It is now almost a decade since 9/11 took place, and in all that time no *unassailable, permanent*, or, in pragmatic terms, *politically influential* progress has been made in determining exactly and irrefutably *what took place* on that day—or what *did not* take place.

But now Dr. Judy Wood, in this unique, powerful, landmark work of forensic scientific investigation, provides us at last with that determination—She shows us *what did happen* on 9/11. Although Dr. Wood’s scientific training and understanding are deep and complex, she has the gift of being able, without compromise, to express ideas of the greatest complexity in terms readily understandable to any interested and attentive lay person.

More must be said about these subjects in a minute, but this all-important fact remains: Those who read Dr. Wood’s book fairly, openly, and thoroughly will take away with them the gift of *knowing* once and for all what happened on 9/11. They will take away the gift of knowing that they *have at last been shown the truth clearly and plainly*, no matter how different this truth may be from what they have been told for many years by supposedly higher authorities, from the government itself on through newspapers, journalists, progressive radio programs and commentators, even figures from the so-called “9/11 truth movement.” Dr. Wood’s book will give all those who read it carefully a solid foundation for the courage to believe not what they may have been told by one authority or another on any level and for many years, but to believe instead what their own minds, their own eyes, and their own reason tell them—That is, scientific truth as revealed through close forensic study of *all* of the evidence that has been left behind. As Dr. Wood says again and again, she arrives at truth through the study of *evidence*. The truth is not what anyone, no matter who they are, might say it is. To the place where the evidence leads, and to that place alone—*that* is where the truth is.

Where Did the Towers Go? is not the work of a day. In her first chapter, Dr. Wood tells us that her study of 9/11 really began on that calamitous September day itself, when she “realized that what was being seen and heard on television was contradictory and appeared to violate the laws of physics.” This means, as I write these words, that Dr. Wood has been a student of 9/11 for eight-and-a-half years. Yet the *preparation* for that study took even longer. Dr. Wood, after all, holds a B.S. in

Where Did the Towers Go?

Civil Engineering, an M.S. in Engineering Mechanics (Applied Physics), and a Ph.D. in Materials Engineering Science—degrees that speak to nothing less than an adult lifetime dedicated to scientific analysis and observation.

Dr. Wood's areas of special focus within physics and engineering will strike readers also for their obvious suitability to study of 9/11. Dr. Wood's M.S. thesis involved the development of a Fizeau interferometer to study the effects of material defects on the thermal expansion behavior of composite materials. Her Ph.D. dissertation (in words from her web site) "involved the development of an experimental method to measure thermal stresses in bimaterial joints using moiré interferometry." Careful readers of *Where Did the Towers Go?* will quickly understand the remarkable compatibility between the subject of Dr. Wood's dissertation and its applicability to her analyses of 9/11. The same is true of certain of the courses she taught when she was a member of the faculty at Clemson University. These included Experimental Stress Analysis, Engineering Mechanics, Mechanics of Materials (the Strength of Materials), and (though not at Clemson) Strength of Materials Testing.

It's difficult to imagine an academic preparation *more* logically relevant to a study of 9/11 than Dr. Wood's—to a study, that is, not of the history of 9/11, not of the origins of it, not of the motives for it, but, simply, solely, and only to a study of what *happened*, literally, in and to the World Trade Center buildings on 9/11.

There is another element of Dr. Wood's research that qualifies her even more exactly for work of the kind described in this book. Here is a passage from Dr. Wood's web site:

One of Dr. Wood's research interests is biomimicry, or applying the mechanical structures of biological materials to engineering design using engineering materials. Other recent research has investigated the deformation behavior of materials and structures with complex geometries and complex material properties, such as fiber-reinforced composite materials and biological materials. Dr. Wood is an expert in the use of moiré interferometry, a full-field optical method that is used in stress analysis, as well as materials characterization and other types of interference. In recent years, Dr. Wood and her students have developed optical systems with various wavelengths and waveguides. Dr. Wood has over 60 technical publications in refereed journals, conference proceedings, and edited monographs and special technical reports.

A word used here—"interferometry"—will become familiar to readers as they move into Dr. Wood's book. When preceded by "moiré," the word refers to "a full-field optical method that is used in stress analysis." The web site adds that Dr. Wood is also an expert in the use of "other types of interference." Their applicability to the study of 9/11 is made clear, again, in this description, from Dr. Wood herself, of her special areas of research:

The main focus of my research has been in the area of experimental mechanics and optical interferometry, which is referred to as photomechanics. That is, all of my graduate work and research has been in the area of interferometry to study material behavior. Photomechanics, an area of experimental mechanics, is the use

Foreword

of optical images and optical interferometry to determine material characteristics. So, it is second nature for me to see anomalies in material behavior when looking at photographic images. Also, being an experimentalist using interferometry, I have occasionally encountered unexpected phenomena that presented themselves as puzzles. Solving these puzzles has provided me with a wide range of experience with anomalous material characteristics and the interference of electromagnetic energy.

It's safe to say that less than a majority of Americans know very much about Nikola Tesla (1856-1943), the historic figure whose story must be introduced at this point. Tesla is under-recognized in the United States partly because of his victimization by profit-driven interests opposed to his work—and opposed especially to his development of a way to harness free energy.¹ Though little known in the United States, Tesla was the world's greatest pioneering genius in the early harnessing of electricity, the development of alternating current, the study of field effects—interferometry—and, as mentioned, the development of access to free energy—that is, access to and the harnessing of energy drawn from force fields or even from the plasma present everywhere in the cosmos.

Mentioning Tesla at this point is necessary for the very good reason that Dr. Judy Wood, in *Where Did the Towers Go?*, shows that the power used to destroy the WTC buildings on 9/11—a power sufficient to turn more than 1,000,000 tons of building material into dust—is power derived from force fields, or directed energy, power of the kind that was pioneeringly studied by Nikola Tesla and that now, obviously, has been advanced by others for the most destructive of purposes rather than for the benevolent, socially meliorative uses for which it is equally well suited.

In short, Tesla's energy, imagined by him as something useful for the nurturing or even the saving of human society, has instead, since his death, been weaponized. The simple fact is that 9/11 was planned and staged as a demonstration to the world of the enormity of that power in its weaponized form.

Over the past six years, as she revealed to the public the details of her research piece by piece,² Dr. Wood often found herself the subject of extreme abuse from every quarter of the so-called “9/11 truth community.” I have followed Dr. Wood's work over those six years, and I would like to say a few words about what she has been doing and, implicitly, about the way her work has been received.

Dr. Wood is not, in actuality, herself a part of the “9/11 truth community.” Even if at one time she may have naturally considered herself to be so, this is no longer the case. The “movement”—something I have been a student of since mid-2003—has itself grown so politicized, so thoroughly infiltrated by figures and forces whose aim is to generate internal division in order to generate not progress but paralysis and stasis; that, as I said earlier, this “movement” has been made incapable, over almost a decade, of producing any *unassailable*, any *permanent*, or any *politically influential* evidence of *what really happened* on September 11, 2001.

Dr. Wood herself has been regularly and sometimes spectacularly victimized, smeared, attacked, marginalized, and misrepresented by figures and groups putatively “inside” the 9/11 truth movement. It is even the case that a student of Dr. Wood's, a

Where Did the Towers Go?

gifted young man dedicated to the purpose and progress of her work, was murdered in cold blood, as also was another similar person before him. In spite of these crimes, violations, and attacks, however, Dr. Wood remained devoted unflinchingly to her research, and here, now, with its completion and with the publication of *Where Did the Towers Go?*, she brings the paralysis and bloody in-fighting of the truth movement to an end.

She has been able to bring about this enormous achievement—for which the entire world must certainly be grateful—by refusing to speculate in “opinion” or “belief” and by refusing to argue about (or even to *raise*) subjects or questions of the sorts that for years have led to paralysis and logjam, questions such as *who* planned and executed the attacks of 9/11, or *why* they did so, or who *knew* about this or that aspect of the operation, or *when* they knew, or *where* someone was and *when* they were there, and on and on.

On the contrary, Dr. Wood has worked and works now solely and only as an observing scientist. She comes to no conclusions whatsoever other than those that emerge logically, in accordance with the scientific method in which she is trained, conclusions that cannot be logically escaped or avoided after close and objective study of *all* available evidence. At the same time, such conclusions are *never* allowed by Dr. Wood, again in accordance with scientific method, to be in excess of what is supported by the evidence.

Let us make a list of the things that Dr. Wood proves in *Where Did the Towers Go?*—proves not just beyond reasonable doubt, but beyond *any doubt whatsoever*□

- 1) That the “official” or “government” explanation for the destruction of the World Trade Center on 9/11 is, scientifically, false through and through.
- 2) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by heat generated from burning jet fuel or from the conventional “burning” of any other substance or substances.
- 3) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by mini-nuclear weaponry.
- 4) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by conventional explosives of any kind, be they TNT, C4 or RDX, nor were they destroyed by welding materials such as thermite, thermate, or “nano-thermite.”
- 5) That there was in fact no high heat at all involved either in bringing about the destruction of the buildings or generated by the destruction of them.

And now let us turn to what Dr. Wood proves *beyond any reasonable doubt*.

She proves that the *kinds* of evidence left behind after the destruction—including “fires” that emit no high heat and have no apparent source (“Weird Fires”); glowing steel beams and molten metal, *neither* of them emitting high heat; the levitation and flipping of extremely heavy objects, including automobiles and other vehicles; patterns of scorching that *cannot* have been caused by conventional “fire” (“Toasted Cars”); the sudden exploding of objects, people, vehicles, and steel tanks; the near-complete absence of *rubble* after the towers’ destruction, but instead the presence of entire buildings’-worth of *dust*, both airborne and heavier-than-air (“Dustification”)—

Foreword

Dr. Wood proves that these and other kinds of evidence *cannot* have been created by conventional oxygen-fed fire, by conventional explosives, or by nuclear fission. At the same time, however, she shows *that all of them are in keeping with the patterns and traits of directed-energy power*, of force-fields directed into interference with one another in ways following the scientific logic of Nikola Tesla's thought and experimentation—and in ways also paralleling the work of contemporary Canadian scientist and experimenter John Hutchison, who, following Tesla's lead, has for many years produced again and again and again “the Hutchison Effect,” creating results that include weird fires (having no apparent fuel); the bending, splintering, or fissuring of bars and rods of heavy metal; the coring-out, from *inside*, of thick metal rods; and the repeated *levitation* of objects.³

These same effects, similar to the Hutchison effect⁴ but on an exponentially massive scale, are what occurred at the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001. The implications of this fact, however unbelievable they may seem initially, are of a powerful and obvious importance to every living being in the world. That a power of this magnitude and intensity, a power drawn from other energy already *existing*—that a power of this enormity has been demonstrated to the world for the first time and on this scale *not* as a force potentially advantageous to human life, planetary health, and social well-being but, instead, as a *weaponized* force capable of unprecedented and incalculable destruction and ruin—this is a fact undeniably sobering to every thinking and feeling human being.

Thanks to the painstaking and unflagging work of Dr. Judy Wood—and thanks to her book, this book that you are about to read—the long debate about *what* happened on 9/11 will now end. The next step is to decide how to respond to the truth that, here, we have once and for all been shown. The implications of Dr. Wood's work are every bit as world-embracing and absolute in their importance as was the introduction of weaponized nuclear fission over half a century ago, and in fact even more so. Dr. Wood herself has referred to 9/11 as *The New Hiroshima*. To follow the now-known implications of directed energy weaponry with the greatest of care, to do so with expedience, clarity, justice, and, above all, with the aim of doing only the highest service to the well-being of mankind, the earth, and the future of both—these are the tasks laid out for us by Dr. Wood's magisterial, humane, paradigm-changing work. It is up to us—who else, after all, is there?—to take these matters up now that Dr. Wood has shown us the immensity of their importance.

She herself, near the end of her book, says something of a similar nature. It's appropriate that I close not with my words, but with hers:

He who controls the energy, controls the people. Control of energy, depending on what that energy is, can either destroy or sustain the planet.

We have a choice. And the choice is real. We can live happily and fruitfully and productively, or we can destroy the planet and die, every last one of us, along with every living being on this planet.

—Eric Larsen

—March 2010

Where Did the Towers Go?

¹ For an excellent introduction to the story of the maligning of Tesla and the suppression of his work, see Rand Clifford's excellent "From Reptiles to Humans: A Three-Brain Odyssey" <http://www.starchiefpress.com/articles/article42.html>

² <http://drjudywood.co.uk/>

³ <http://www.thehutchisoneffect.com>

⁴ Although the two, the Hutchison Effect and the phenomena seen on 9/11, share parallel origins in physics and produce results that are similar in some observable ways, there is no question of their being accurately or fairly called the same thing. Just as Tesla never developed *his* ideas with the thought of weaponization, neither has John Hutchison worked with such a thought in mind.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

*Faced with intolerable ideas, or with intolerable acts, people in very large numbers have begun simply denying them, declaring them “unreal” and thus with a word striking them out of existence. . . . But the pattern itself of not seeing is inescapable, evident to anyone who looks. —Eric Larsen, *A Nation Gone Blind*¹*

For the record, I do not believe that our government is responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01 – nor do I believe that our government is not responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01. This is not a case of *belief*. This is a crime that should be solved by a forensic study of the evidence. Before it can be determined *who* did it, it must first be determined *what* was done and *how* it was done.

The order of crime solving is to determine

- 1) *WHAT* happened, then
- 2) *HOW* it happened (e.g., by what weapon), then
- 3) *WHO* did it. And only then can we address
- 4) *WHY* they did it (i.e. motive).

Let us remember what is required to convict someone of a crime. You cannot convict someone of a crime based on *belief*. You cannot convict someone of a crime if you don't even know what crime to charge them with. If you accuse someone of murder using a gun, you'd better be sure the body has a bullet hole in it.

And yet before noon on 9/11/01, we were told *who* had done it and *how* it had been done, this before any investigation had even been conducted to determine *what* had been done. As of this publication only one person²—myself, Dr. Judy Wood³—has conducted a comprehensive investigation to determine *what* happened to the World Trade Center (WTC) complex, a question that is part of a federal case I filed⁴. It might be surprising for readers to learn that The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) did not analyze *what* happened to the WTC, the very first step in any scientific forensics investigation. That is, NIST did not analyze the *collapse* of the World Trade Center towers, *despite* the fact their report is entitled, *NIST NCSTAR 1—Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*. NIST's mandate from Congress was to

1. Determine why and how WTC 1 and WTC 2 collapsed following the initial impacts of the aircraft and why and how WTC 7 collapsed.⁵

Yet two pages later, in a footnote, the NIST report says that

The focus of the investigation was on the sequence of events from the instance of aircraft impact to the initiation of collapse for each tower. For brevity in this report, this sequence is referred to as the “probable collapse sequence,” although it does not actually include the structural behavior of the tower after the conditions for collapse initiation were reached and collapse became inevitable.⁶

The NIST report,⁷ that is, merely offered a probable [hypothetical] ‘collapse sequence’

Where Did the Towers Go?

purporting to explain the sequence of events leading up to the ‘collapse’ of the WTC towers. Yet NIST did not “determine *why and how* WTC 1 and WTC 2 ‘collapsed’ following the initial impacts of the aircraft,” which was their mandate. Had NIST determined “*why and how*” the towers were destroyed, they would have first determined *what* happened by dealing with phenomena that are empirically confirmed to have occurred. As is glaringly evident, they did not do this.

I challenged NIST⁸ on their scientifically-flawed report,⁹ noting that the images presented in their report, as well as their “probable [hypothetical] ‘collapse’ sequence” violated the laws of physics. In their written reply to me they openly acknowledged that they had not analyzed the collapse.¹⁰

As stated in NCSTAR 1, NIST only investigated the factors leading to the initiation of the collapses of the WTC towers, not the collapses themselves.¹⁰

That is, the NIST personnel admitted their report to be a fraud. Their position is that if they did not analyze the “collapse,” they need not address why their “probable [hypothetical] ‘collapse’ sequence” in fact violates the laws of physics. They are willing to accept responsibility only for saying that the building obeyed the laws of physics *before* it was destroyed. This document, in which NIST states that it did not analyze the “collapse,” is part of my legal case and is available in documents posted on my website.¹¹

A large portion of the sub-report, NCSTAR1-6, contains information that *appears* to be the product of a detailed analysis of what happened after the building’s destruction was initiated. But in response to my informing them that their *apparent analysis* violated the laws of physics, NIST, as said, stated that they had not analyzed the collapse, despite thousands of pages giving the *appearance of an analysis*. It is incongruent for NIST to report on something that they acknowledge they did not analyze. The entire NIST report, including its title (*NIST NCSTAR 1—Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*), is a deception.

Dr. Morgan Reynolds, in the case he filed,¹¹ addressed how this crime was *not* committed with airplanes. Remember, to convict someone of a crime, you need to prove *how* the crime was committed. It may surprise you to learn that there is no actual, verifiable evidence confirming that airplanes crashed at any of the four locations on 9/11/01. However, as Dr. Reynolds shows, there is an abundance of evidence to the contrary.¹¹ That does not mean there were no airplanes. It only means that no evidence of the alleged airplanes was found at the crime scenes. It also does not mean that eyewitnesses were dishonest or did not see what they believed were airplanes. But what this does mean is that there is a significant contradiction between the physical evidence and the story we were given. You cannot legally convict someone of murder using a gun if the body has no bullet holes in it, no matter how many people thought they saw the accused shoot the gun. Once again, you cannot convict someone of a crime based on *belief*. Otherwise magic tricks could be used to convict anyone of a crime, and we end up in a similar situation to the original Salem witch hunts, where people were tried and executed without there being any evidence of the accusations made against them.

Author's Preface

Many people have speculated as to *who* committed the crimes of 9/11 and/or *how* they did so. But without addressing *what* happened, speculation of this kind is nothing more than *conspiracy theory*, a phrase that also describes the box-cutter story we were given before noon on 9/11/01. My own research, *not* speculation, is a forensics investigation of *what* happened to the WTC complex on 9/11/01. I don't address *who* did it, nor am I concerned with that question. Before issues of that kind can be addressed, we must first determine *what* happened, and that is the objective of my research. By definition, research that is purely empirical cannot be about and has nothing to do with *conspiracy theory* of any kind. The fact that others (in the mainstream media, the alternative media, and the so-called "9/11 truth movement") promote various theories about 9/11 is irrelevant to my research. On the other hand, to determine *what* happened, we must address *all* of the available evidence. Anyone declaring *who* did what or *how* they did it before they have determined *what* was done is merely promoting either speculation or propaganda. The popular chant, "9/11 was an inside job," is, scientifically speaking, no different from the chant that "19 bad guys with box cutters did it." Neither one is the result of a scientific investigation supported by evidence that would be admissible in court. Neither identifies *what* crime was committed or *how* it was committed.

So let us consider the body of empirical evidence that must be explained in order to determine *what* happened.¹² What is presented here is not a theory and it is not speculation. It is evidence. Here, then, is the evidence of *what* happened on 9/11/01.

¹ Eric Larsen, *A Nation Gone Blind: America in an Age of Simplification and Deceit*, <http://www.ericlarsen.net/nation.excerpt.html>

² Only non-classified documents in the public domain are considered.

³ B.S. (Civil Engineering, 1981) (Structural Engineering), M.S. (Engineering Mechanics (Applied Physics, 1983), and Ph.D. (Materials Engineering Science, 1992) from the Department of Engineering Science and Mechanics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia, http://drjudywood.com/articles/a/bio/Wood_Bio.html

⁴ United States District Court, Southern District of New York, Docket Number: (07-cv-3314), United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Docket Number: (08-3799-cv), Supreme Court Docket Number: (09-548), <http://www.supremecourt.gov/Search.aspx?FileName=/docketfiles/09-548.htm>. But this case presents a dilemma for the courts as it involves *someone's* classified technology, no matter whose classified technology it was. A civil case involving classified technology cannot be held behind closed doors without publicly acknowledging this fact. Perhaps this is why the United States Court of Appeals, in their written decision, respectfully acknowledged that the law (FERA) applied to this case, but "for the ease of" dismissing the case, they were ignoring this law. See: http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.shtml

⁵ NIST NCSTAR 1 – *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*, September 2005, E.1 Genesis of this investigation, p. xxxv (p. 37), http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm

⁶ NIST NCSTAR 1 – *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*, September 2005, E.2 Approach, p. xxxvii (p. 39) footnote[!], http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm

⁷ NIST NCSTAR 1 – *Final Report on the Collapse of the World Trade Center Towers*, September 2005, http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm

⁸ http://ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619

⁹ To my amazement, I was the first person to challenge NIST on their report's absence of an analysis to "determine *why* and *how* the WTC 'collapsed,'" which qualified me to file a qui tam case for science fraud. http://ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/PROD01_002619

¹⁰ Response to Request for Correction from Dr. Judy Wood, dated March 16, 2007, http://ocio.os.doc.gov/ITPolicyandPrograms/Information_Quality/ssLINK/PROD01_004161, <http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/>

Where Did the Towers Go?

Qui_Tam_Wood.html

¹¹ *http://drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.html*

¹² *<http://drjudywood.com/wtc/index.html#index>*

If you listen to the evidence carefully enough, it will speak to you and tell you exactly what happened. If you don't know what happened, keep listening to the evidence until you do. The evidence always tells the truth. The key is not to allow yourself to be distracted away from seeing what the evidence is telling you.¹

Empirical evidence is the truth that theory must mimic.²

¹ My own motto.

² A powerful statement by someone who has taught me well.

By Eric Larsen A
REVIEW OF
WHERE DID THE TOWERS GO?
EVIDENCE OF DIRECTED FREE-ENERGY TECHNOLOGY ON 9/11

BY DR. JUDY WOOD, B.S., M.S., PhD.

(The New Investigation, 2010; 540 pp.;
ISBN: 978-0-615-41256-6; \$39.95.)

What a complete, unmitigated disaster 9/11 and the ten awful years following it have been— ten years of murder, crime, lawlessness, deceit, stupidity, and blindness that are only now meliorated, at long last, by the publication of Dr. Judy Wood's unique, revelatory, and unequivocally welcome book, *Where Did the Towers Go? The Evidence of Directed Free-Energy Technology on 9/11.*

Allow me to make full disclosure now, so that those (and, believe me, there are many) who will choose not to read further can quit right away and save time.

I, me, Eric Larsen, wrote the Foreword to Dr. Wood's book. I wrote it partly because I have known for many years about Dr. Wood's research; partly because I have followed the website that Dr. Wood has maintained (<http://www.driudvwood.com/>): and partly because I was lucky enough to be given the *opportunity* to write that Foreword.

It wasn't just an opportunity but a high honor. To give an idea of how great an honor it was, here is the first line of what I wrote:

The book you now hold in your hands is the most important book of the twenty-first century.

Let me go further and quote the two sentences also , since the same obligation pertains now as did when I wrote them—the obligation for me to explain why I said so unqualified a thing and what I meant by it. Here's what I meant, and still do:

Where Did the Towers Go? is a work, assuming that its content and message are properly and fairly heeded, that offers a starting point from which those who genuinely want to do it can begin, first, to rein in and then, perhaps, even end the wanton

criminality and destructiveness of a set of American policies that took as their justification and starting point the horrific events of September 11, 2001.

As everyone knows, 9/11 has been "the justification and starting point" for all manner of destruction, loss, crime, and horror. Without 9/11, there would have been no "Patriot Act," no abuse of FISA and stripping away of privacy rights, no Military Commissions Act of 2006 with its setting aside of Habeas Corpus, no implementation of Northcom and deployment of our own military forces on domestic American soil (for use against *who*, you might ask?), and no trashing of Bill of Rights and Constitutional guarantees, no programmatic and precedent-setting weakening and eliminating of right and guarantees so that the very concepts of "citizenship" and "freedom" have been emptied out to the point where setting up concentration camps inside the U.S. is now *legal* and not a one of us would have any recourse whatsoever if it were decided that we should be thrown into a cell in one of them and forgotten forever.¹

Without 9/11, there would never have been any fake and opportunistic "Global War on Terror," would never have been Guantanamo as we know it now, never have been official programs of torture or fake demonizing of Islam in order to justify wars in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Somalia, or to justify overt plans for the murder of U.S. citizens living in places like, say, Yemen.

There's more, much more. The complete list of atrocities, crimes, and inhumanities triggered by or justified by 9/11 could fill whole chapters, even books. By using 9/11 as propaganda—by using it as trigger, excuse, justification, or catalyst—the U.S. has betrayed itself, its principles, and its people, and has made itself the world's most dangerous enemy of all mankind and also of Earth herself.

How can it conceivably be, given these facts, that we, a nation of people who presumably have minds of our own—how can it be that we have done nothing to stop this hideous parade of monstrosities and horrors? In the Foreword to Dr. Wood's book, I wrote:

It is now almost a decade since 9/11 took place, and in all that time no *unassailable*, *permanent*, or, in pragmatic terms, *politically influential* progress has been made in determining exactly and irrefutably *what took place* on that day—or what *did not* take place.

We—that is, we the potential resistance or opposition to U.S. criminal policy—have been spinning our wheels for a complete decade. There are a lot of reasons for this wheel-spinning, including various programs of very skillful and extraordinarily devious cover-up after cover-up after cover-up of the central question of *what did happen* on 9/11. For, as long as that central question remains unanswered, or for as long as that question can be *caused* to remain

¹ "Consider where we've come. Torture is legal. The stripping of habeas corpus is legal, not just for outlanders but for citizens. With the Bushiscti's change of the Insurrection Act, and with that change's attendant weakening of Posse Comitatus—*Treblinka* would now be legal in America. *Treblinka* is now legal in America." From my book, *The Skull of Yorick*, chapter 4, "The Aftermath of the Great Crime of 9/11: America Aids in the Staging of its Own Murder," page 24 (from The Oliver Arts & Open Press).

obfuscated, blurred, muddled-up, in doubt—as long as *that* situation continues, the wheels will continue to spin and people won't quite know what to do. Dr. Wood is very well aware of this fact. Her own way of putting it is that before accusing someone of a crime, you've got to know *what* crime they committed. In her Author's Preface, she writes:

You cannot convict someone of a crime if you don't even know what crime to charge them with. If you accuse someone of murder using a gun, you'd better be sure the body has a bullet hole in it.

That kind of clear, cool, commonsense logic is rare among the many who for ten years have talked a very great deal about 9/11, although it's obvious that in Dr. Wood such good sense resides in abundance. Here's the opening of her Author's Preface:

For the record, I do not believe that our government is responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01—nor do I believe that our government is not responsible for executing the events of 9/11/01. This is not a case of *belief* [Dr. Wood's emphasis]. This is a crime that should be solved by a forensic study of the evidence.

Yes. To say that George did *not* do X hardly means that Al *did* do X. Even worse is to imagine that someone's £>e//e/that George did or didn't do X has any necessary relationship to the truth or the fact of the matter at all. Dr. Wood will have none of this substitution of "belief" for "thinking." She is a scientist, and a very highly educated one, with "a B.S. in Civil Engineering, an M.S. in Engineering Mechanics (Applied Physics), and a Ph.D. in Materials Engineering Science" (again from my Foreword). Scientists, as all know or should know, proceed in their thinking not according to belief or desired outcome but according solely and only to what the empirical evidence they have gathered, studied, and observed *allows them to conclude or makes it inevitable for them to conclude*.

This means also that in undertaking a "forensic study of the evidence" left behind after the 9/11 disaster, if that study is to be scientifically valid, the researcher must analyze and study not *some* of the available evidence, not *most* of the available evidence, but *all* of the available evidence.

To my knowledge, no one other than Dr. Wood has done this. She alone has persisted unflaggingly in her study of *all* available concrete, empirical evidence, has assiduously avoided any and all argument about 9/11 that may be based on politics, desire, belief, emotion, or preset theory but instead has stuck indefatigably, solely—and, I must say, courageously—with the gathering of and the forensic analysis of *all* the evidence left behind after the 9/11 events.

No wonder it has taken Dr. Wood a considerable time to complete her enormous task of, first, finding and gathering every last shred of available evidence, then of organizing her findings, and after that preparing the entirety in book form—in a volume of 500 pages that contains not just the exhaustive primary text itself but many, many hundreds of photographs, maps, drawings, graphs, charts, illustrations, explanatory passages, not to mention powerfully relevant—and

revelatory—historical scientific background material (chapter 17, "the Tesla-Hutchison effect") and even a "Glossary and Supplemental Information" section that includes, among much else, the terms Dr. Wood has invented or adapted in order to describe in as connotation-free a way as possible the unusual and unfamiliar phenomena she has observed—words like "Cheetos," "Donuts," "Lather," "Fuzzballs," "Sillystring," "Toasted Cars," "Weird Fires"—but that also includes highly technical plates and charts such as "Melting and Boiling Temperatures for Selected Elements" and "Tritium Values," these being relevant to Dr. Wood's discussion of the molecular dissociation of materials that, as she proves, took place during the apparently chaotic but in actuality diabolically precise destruction that took place on 9/11.

What emerges, for the reader, from all of this? What emerges is a lucid, clear, riveting, thorough, spell-binding, page-turning, eye-opening description and analysis of that terrible day —Dr. Wood has referred to it as the "new Hiroshima"—when the fearsomely destructive power of directed-energy in weaponized form was demonstrated to the world, and when, at the same time and however bitterly and ironically, the liberating promise of free energy as a means by which both Earth and all humanity might be saved from certain destruction was also demonstrated for everyone in the world to see.

And just what, then, will readers find upon buying, opening, and reading *Where Did the Towers Go?* They will find an immensely informative, engaging, detailed, thorough, and humane portrayal of the events of 9/11. They will find the telling of a calamitous, hideous, and horrifying story that, thanks to the clear eye and conscientious mind (and enormous heart) of the teller, is made a testament of homage to all those who suffered and died while at the same time remaining a scientific and forensic descriptive analysis of what actually happened that day: That day when directed-energy weaponry was brought to bear on the World Trade Center buildings, destroying them completely while at the same time leaving almost no rubble, producing no high temperatures of the kind conventionally associated with explosives on the one hand or molten materials on the other, and leaving behind a surreal aftermath of tumbled and overturned firetrucks, scorched cars, missing engine blocks, hundreds of thousands of sheets of unburned office paper floating down to rest, still unburned, amidst flames that have little or no heat of the kind that is produced by oxidization, and an absence of the seismic shock that would be expected from "collapse" at free-fall speed of buildings weighing many hundreds of thousands of tons, including the North Tower, South Tower, World Trade Center Seven, and other WTC buildings that underwent destruction.

In the story of 9/11 as told by Dr. Wood, everything is observed, analyzed, and evaluated for *exactly what it is*, and therefore almost nothing is the way we have been *told* it was. Readers will find for themselves Dr. Wood's proof that the extremely minimal amount of rubble (the hurried shipping of mass amounts of steel to China is a falsehood and red herring) left behind after the disappearance of the towers indicates that the vast tonnage of these enormous buildings *never did reach the ground* but instead, through a process of molecular dissociation

(Glossary: "Molecules separate or even repel each other"), the buildings' mass was turned to dust in a shorter time than would have been required for that same mass, in solid form, to have reached earth.

The seismic evidence, fastidiously laid out for the reader in prose, charts, graphs, and maps, shows the same reality: Even were WTC1 and WTC2 actually to have "collapsed" at free-fall speed (a speed that physics proves unattainable but that's used by Dr. Wood for argument's sake), they would have required a *minimum* of ten seconds for that process to be completed, whereas no seismic signal from weight hitting the ground exists for more than *eight* seconds, while in the case of the 47-story WTC7, which disappeared with equivalent speed, there is even less seismic disturbance recorded, bordering on none.

Dr. Wood is a highly gifted observer of multitudinous varieties of evidence—manifestations of evidence that she looks at *for what they are, not for what others may have suggested, said, hinted, or believed they are*. Here are the opening five sentences of Dr. Wood's Introduction:

On 9/11, I realized that what was being seen and heard on television was contradictory and appeared to violate the laws of physics. I remember watching the TV in the faculty conference room. The TV kept playing the same film over and over, showing what appeared to be a building unraveling like a sweater. I had never seen a building unravel like a sweater, and I tried to imagine what was going on that might make it look that way. Certainly the time it took the building to go away did not make sense.

This is the same independent, thoughtful observer who has studied literally thousands upon thousands of images from 9/11, noticing things that others might miss entirely. On the broad expanse of ground zero, for example, "believed" to have had a lake of molten steel underneath it, Dr. Wood notices rubber hoses lying around, and puddles of water, the hoses not melting, the water not boiling or even steaming. Workers are seen walking around on this same expanse—and they are *not* being cooked like fricassees.

Again and again, Dr. Wood looks at images and finds in them revelatory and notable details. In "Weird Fires" (Chapter 13), most of us see flaming vehicles, but Dr. Wood notices, just above the "fire," a tree with green leaves that are un-burnt, unaffected, un-scorched, and unseared, another indication that this "fire" or these "flames" were without high heat. In "Toasted Cars" (Chapter 11), most of us see only the dreadfully scorched interior of an automobile, but Dr. Wood notices the un-"burnt" window-trim. Or most of us see only the "toasted interior of car 2723," not noticing the curious fact of the many small circular holes that have been created in the metal floor of the car, almost like holes caused by birdshot, but similar in shape to the curiously circular holes in the broken window-glass of buildings across the street from WTC1 And WTC2.

Time and time and time again Dr. Wood sees things for us that are right in front of our eyes but unnoticed. Among the most moving examples of this gifted vision may be Dr. Wood's seeing more than the rest of us do in the images of "jumpers" from WTC1 and WTC2 before those

buildings "went away." This is in the book's third chapter, called "The 'Jumpers'" and sub-titled "It Was Like Raining People." It opens this way:

Among the most horrific images from 9/11 is that of "The Falling Man," who came to represent the many people who fell to their death that day. These people are often referred to as "jumpers," but did they all, in fact, *jump*? And if they did, why did they do it? Once again, the question requires a closer look and examination.

Dr. Wood continues:

Looking at these images can be difficult. It was too difficult for me until I realized that these people are communicating to us. They want us to hear them and they want their stories told. Once I realized this, I could not look away, for I had made them a promise to look at what they were trying to tell us. In this chapter I attempt to fulfill my promise to them.

And fulfill that promise indeed she does. This chapter of *Where Did the Towers Go?* should be reprinted in every journal, magazine, and newspaper across the country and throughout the world, so immense is its sensitivity, so humane its sympathy, and so extraordinary its descriptive power. Many of the "jumpers," Dr. Wood observes, seem to be *trying to take off their clothes*, sometimes even as they are already in free-fall toward the street below. It may be, she suggests, that they are in a reflexive reaction against a pain comparable to that experienced by inadvertently placing one's hand on a hot burner. One's response in that case is instinctive and wholly involuntary, like people's responses when they are hit by "active denial" micro-wave weaponry, which may quite possibly have been akin to the "directed energy" force those in the towers were being subjected to when they became what we now call "jumpers."

Dr. Wood, however, never does and never will make any conclusion regarding the "jumpers" or anything else that's in excess of what the empirical evidence simultaneously causes and allows her to make. A prominent motif in the book is the statement that "Empirical evidence is the truth that theory must mimic," said by Dr. Wood to have been "A powerful statement by someone who has taught me well."

Certainly so. Dr. Wood makes no assertion beyond what the available evidence can cause or allow her to make—and yet her observations about the jumpers are among the most intensely fascinating and moving sections of a book that, throughout, will surprise readers by its poignancy and emotional power, all the while impeccably honoring the strictness and necessity of its scientific, forensic, empirical method.

It's not easy to close a discussion of a book as rich, broad, significant, timely, and revelatory as *Where Did the Towers Go?* The range of research reflected in the book is immense, the power of its conclusions equally so. Dr. Wood does nothing less than show us that a source of power—power reaped from energy already existing in the world around us, what is called "free energy"—does indeed exist, has a long scientific history, and can be used either for monumentally destructive purposes, as it was on 9/11, or for peaceful, non-polluting, life-enhancing and earth-preserving purposes of the kind envisioned by one of its earliest interpreters, Nikola Tesla (1856-1943).

Probably nothing has resulted in more calumny, derision, misrepresentation, and programmatic smearing of Dr. Wood than this central element of her research. Even the ever-dubious Wikipedia gets in on the act, declaring that "in pseudoscience" the term "free energy," as in the phrase "free energy suppression," refers to "a conspiracy theory that advanced energy technologies are being suppressed by special interest groups."

Every intelligent, attentive, and open-minded reader of Dr. Wood's paradigm-changing book, however, will quickly discover that Wikipedia and those akin to it are the tendentious and devious pretenders, while Dr. Wood brings to this part of her subject the open eyes and mind, the objectivity and steadiness of view, not to mention the courage, that mark her here as being, once again, the true, observing scientist.

One of the most commanding sections of *Where Did the Towers Go?* is its seventeenth chapter, "The Tesla-Hutchison Effect." The thoroughness and clarity of that chapter, the immense detail of it, not to mention its close analysis of enormous numbers of pieces of evidence—these characteristics, along with the historical background that the chapter provides, make it the foundation stone for every other part of *Where Did the Towers Go?*

I won't duplicate the entire argument of the Tesla-Hutchison chapter, or summarize it, or even try to. The case is there for all who are interested—for everyone—to see. The observable evidence is there, examples both of the curious results achieved by the Canadian experimenter and researcher himself—John Hutchison, for whom the effect is named—and examples of the great number of parallel results that are observable in materials left behind after the destruction of 9/11. Dr. Wood assembles and organizes these examples, and then she guides the reader through descriptive explanations of what *her* eye saw but that the reader's eye may have missed: The close detail, for example, of fissured metal, peeled beams, or materials ruptured *from the inside*.

In Table 15, on page 349, Dr. Wood provides a list of "Characteristics of the Hutchison Effect and the WTC remains." I won't re-create the whole list, but, among others, it contains the following:

Slow Bending of Metals, Shredded Metal Structures, Fractured Metal Structures, Peeling appearance, Fusion of Dissimilar Materials, Thinning and Rapid Aging, Lift or Disruption,

Toasted-Looking Metal, Circular holes in material, Rounded Holes in Glass, Lather,
Fuming, Transmutation, Weird Fires, Melting Without Heat, Metal Luminance Without
Heat

For reasons doubtless best known to them, those who have placed themselves in opposition to Dr. Wood's research and work—and now in some cases in opposition to the unmolested public circulation of *Where Did the Towers Go?*—have often chosen this segment aspect of her studies as a target for smear and calumny. John Hutchison, perhaps because he holds no academic affiliation, has been attacked as a quack and showman, although if such were really the case I find it curious why the military both of Canada and the U.S. would have shown such interest in his work as they have or why researchers would have attempted—sometimes successfully—to repeat his experiments.

The suppression of breakthroughs in the exploration and mastery of free energy has a long history, beginning with Nikola Tesla himself, whose transmitting tower in Shoreham, New York, built (1901-1905) with financial support from J. P. Morgan, "was planned to be the first broadcast system, transmitting both signals and power without wires to any point on the globe" (<http://www.teslasocietv.com/biographv.htm>). The effort ended poorly. "Because of a dispute between Morgan and Tesla as to the final use of the tower... Morgan withdrew his funds. The financier's classic comment was, 'If anyone can draw on the power, where do we put the meter?'" (same source)

Near the same time as the construction of Tesla's Wardenclyffe Laboratory and transmitting tower on Long Island, George Piggott, in his own laboratory, achieved the lévitation of small silver balls (*Where Did the Towers Go?* p. 352), while Edward Leedsalnin, "a Latvian emigrant. . . known for his unusual understanding of the interaction between magnetism and gravity,"

single-handedly built the home he called Coral Castle, in Florida City, cutting and moving limestone pieces weighing up to 35 tons using simple tools and a chain hoist that could not in "real" terms support such a load. (*Where Did the Towers Go?* .p. 352)

In 1953, another inventor and experimenter, Thomas Townsend Brown (1905-1985), proposed that a consortium of major universities and research institutes join together in what was to be called "Project Winterhaven," the purpose being to continue "Research on the Control of Gravitation." "In exploring the 'electro-gravitic couple,' Brown had already brought about the lévitation of materials in his own experimentation, but he was convinced there was much more to be learned about the process he had begun to control," a process that he "felt certain. . . would make possible enormous advances not only in communication but also and more notably in propulsion." In his proposal for the project, he wrote:

It is believed by the sponsors of Project WINTERHAVEN that the technical development of the electrogravitic reaction would usher in a new age of speed and power and of revolutionary new methods of transportation and communication. Theoretical considerations would predict that. . . top limits of speed may be raised far beyond those of jet propulsion or rocket drive, with possibilities eventually of approaching the speed

of light in "free space." The motor which may be forthcoming will be essentially soundless, vibrationless and heatless. (*Where Did the Towers Go?*, pp. 355-356)

It is impossible for any reader today, especially one who was also alive in 1953, in the time of the newly-accelerating and ever-accelerating corporatizing of America, to be surprised that so promising an exploration of a non-polluting and renewable energy source as Project Winterhaven represented would in fact have come to no fruition, or that Thomas Townsend Brown would have ended his life in relative obscurity.

Oil-for-profit interests ruled and reigned in 1953, just as we all know they still do—providing reason for scientists, writers, and researchers like Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison to be maligned, sidelined, and made ignorable by smokescreen, trickery, and deceit. And yet at the same time as the Earth-rapists' do all they can to kill off public awareness of free energy and to smear and tamp down socially-conscious research into it, there are others who are ever so eager to find out everything they can about it and to carry on secret programs of research into it. Who? Well, the militaries of the world, for one.

And so we have the schizoid situation of seeing, on the one hand, organized calumny and programs of deceit aimed at figures like Dr. Judy Wood and John Hutchison for exploring the free-energy tradition of Nikola Tesla, while, on the other hand, we have the demonstration, on 9/11, for all the world to see, of just exactly how horrendously destructive *weaponized* forms of directed free-energy can be.

The inescapable conclusion is that those who are dictators and controllers of the world have galloped ahead in their work of weaponizing free energy while those seeking, in the tradition of Tesla, to explore the benefits of free energy for humanity are ridiculed, silenced, and persecuted.

It is time to bring this piece of writing to an end. It is time for a conclusion. And I conclude that any intelligent, interested, and open-minded reader of *Where Did the Towers Go?* will come away from the experience of that reading with something of extraordinary value. Another passage from my Foreword:

Those who read Dr. Wood's book fairly, openly, and thoroughly will take away with them the gift of *knowing* once and for all what happened on 9/11. They will take away the gift of knowing that they *have at last been shown the truth clearly and plainly*, no matter how different this truth may be from what they have been told for many years by supposedly higher authorities, from the government itself on through newspapers, journalists, progressive radio programs and commentators, even figures from the "9/11 truth movement." Dr. Wood's book will give all those who read it carefully a solid foundation for the courage to believe not what they may have been told by one authority or another on any level and for many years, but to believe instead what their own minds, their own eyes, and their own reason tell them: That is, scientific truth as revealed through close forensic study of *all* of the evidence that has been left behind. As Dr. Wood says again and again, she arrives at truth through the study of *evidence*. The

truth is not what anyone, no matter who they are, might say it is. To the place where the evidence leads, and to that place alone—that is where the truth is.

Readers of Dr. Wood's book will see for themselves evidence of lévitation (overturned firetrucks and automobiles, testimony from people again and again that they were lifted up, transported thirty feet or sixty feet, then let down again); will see for themselves evidence of the *absence of heat* on 9/11 (unburned paper; the EMS worker whose coat, sneakers, and hair caught on fire as she ran but who had no injuries beyond bumps and bruises the next morning); evidence of molecular dissociation (automobile engine blocks simply *missing*); evidence of the alteration, including the liquification, of materials without the *heating* of materials (writes Dr. Wood: "Things that are hot glow, but not everything that glows is hot"); and evidence again and again that the weight of the WTC buildings *never did hit the ground* (the reinforced cement "bathtub" that ringed the below-water-level WTC complex remained almost entirely unharmed—and yet after 9/11 the mere rolling over it of heavy machinery endangered the integrity of the cement ring, this while the unimaginable "weight" of all the great towers had not harmed it).

The examples are immense in number and in impact, as readers will find. Again, from my Foreword:

Let us make a list of the things that Dr. Wood proves in *Where Did the Towers Go?*—proves not just beyond reasonable doubt, but beyond *any doubt whatsoever*:

- 1) That the "official" or "government" explanation for the destruction of the World Trade Center on 9/11 is, scientifically, false through and through.
- 2) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by heat generated from burning jet fuel or from the conventional "burning" of any other substance or substances.
- 3) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by mini-nuclear weaponry.
- 4) That the WTC buildings were not destroyed by conventional explosives of any kind, be they TNT, C4 or RDX, nor were they destroyed by welding materials such as thermite, thermate, or "nano-thermite."
- 5) That there was in fact no high heat at all involved either in bringing about the destruction of the buildings or generated by the destruction of them.

And yet once more:

And now let us turn to what Dr. Wood proves *beyond any reasonable doubt*.

She proves that the *kinds* of evidence left behind after the destruction—including "fires" that emit no heat and have no apparent source ("Weird Fires"); glowing steel beams and molten metal, *neither* of them emitting high heat; the lévitation and flipping of extremely heavy objects, including automobiles and other vehicles; patterns of

scorching that *cannot* have been caused by conventional "fire" ("Toasted Cars"); the sudden exploding of objects, people, vehicles, and steel tanks; the near-complete absence of *rubble* after the towers' destruction, but instead the presence of entire buildings'-worth of *dust*, both airborne and heavier-than-air ("Dustification")—Dr. Wood proves that these and other kinds of evidence *cannot* have been created by conventional oxygen-fed fire, by conventional explosives, or by nuclear fission. At the same time, however, she shows *that all of them are in keeping with the patterns and traits of directed-energy power*, of force-fields directed into interference with one another in ways following the scientific logic of Nikola Tesla's thought and experimentation—and in ways also paralleling the work of contemporary Canadian scientist and experimenter John Hutchison, who, following Tesla's lead, has for many years produced again and again and again "the Hutchison effect," creating results that include weird fires (having no apparent fuel); the bending, splintering, or fissuring of bars and rods of heavy metal; the coring-out, from *inside*, of thick metal rods; and the repeated *lévitation* of objects.

There are important things that I haven't mentioned—the presence and bizarre behavior of Hurricane Erin offshore in the Atlantic Ocean in the days preceding 9/11 and on the day itself (why didn't news and weather reports so much as *mention* the presence of this massive, Category 3 hurricane just offshore?); the recording of *thunder* at all three of the major NYC airports on 9/11, a clear-blue-skied day of "perfect" weather; the presence of an enormous high-pressure cell approaching the New York City area from the west; the dramatic fluctuations in the earth's magnetic field at key moments in the destruction of the WTC buildings, as recorded by six Alaskan magnetometer data sites.

Dr. Wood's book is of an almost indescribable importance. Her research has been denigrated and accused as incomplete, and now her *book* is being denigrated and accused as incomplete, for failure to identify (and, as Dr. Wood says, "give the serial number of") the precise, specific, exact "weapon" that was used on 9/11 "as well as the social security numbers of all who were involved." But as Dr. Wood writes,

*Empirical evidence is the truth that theory must mimic*X have repeated this statement several times in this book because its importance cannot be over emphasized. In today's culture of over simplification and standardized multiple-choice testing, many have an impulse to *name* a known technology (e.g. thermite, TNT, RDX, nukes, progressive *collapse*, HAARP, scalar weapons, torsion physics, Nazi Bell, etc.) instead of *looking* at the evidence that the use of one technology or another has left behind. ...

Some people feel they are being more *scientific* when they use the name of a *known technology* to describe *unknown* phenomena, but the opposite is true. Such an approach omits evidence that does not *fit* any known technology. For some people, the term "HAARP" or the term "scalar weapons" or the term "Nazi Bell" is used as a catchall weapon that can be blamed for whatever evidence needs to be explained, like the

ultimate "boogiemán," and without their even knowing what these weapons can do. Furthermore, if the full capabilities are classified information, they would not be publicly known. And a weapon that could produce all of the effects we saw on 9/11 would certainly not be in the public domain, no matter *whose* weapon it was. For these reasons, I have tried to focus on the phenomena, not on a trendy name of a particular technology. The evidence must come before the theory. It is understanding what the technology can do that matters, not the name of it. For these reasons, I have resisted the impulse to *name* a known technology and instead have focused on the physical evidence. There will likely be those who will not be as successful in resisting the impulse to put a *name* of a known technology on the producer of this evidence. This *namíng*, however, will only serve to pull a veil of mystery over it.

Clearly, we have been lied to for an entire decade in regard to the truth of 9/11. Just as clearly, the "9/11 truth movement" has revealed itself to be as much a part of the cover-up as it is of anything else. At the same time, knowing what really did happen on 9/11 is the only way—is the essential first step—toward any *significant* taking of positions or any *significant* political action.

9/11 was an enormity—an event greater in its importance and in the vastness of its result than was the sinking of the *Maine*, than were the manipulations that brought about Pearl Harbor, or than were the falsifications that led to the Tonkin Bay Resolution. 9/11 was the faked "attack" that "justified" the "Global War on Terror," that "justified" the demonization of Islam, that "justified" war in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Somalia, and elsewhere, and that "justified" the reduction of the United States from a free republic into a police state, albeit, perhaps, not yet an entirely realized one.

I wrote that "*Where Did the Towers Go?* is a work, assuming that its content and message are properly and fairly heeded, that offers a starting point from which those who genuinely want to do it can begin, first, to rein in and then, perhaps, even end the wanton criminality and destructiveness of a set of American policies that took as their justification and starting point the horrific events of September 11, 2001."

In our world, science and politics may be inextricable from one another. Dr. Judy Wood has shown us, scientifically, the full extent and the obscene measure of the enormous lie that was 9/11. It is now up to all of us to study the lesson she has offered us, since without having learned that lesson, it will not be possible to know how to take the next steps toward the freeing of humanity from the half-visible tyranny that now marches it toward its destruction.

Emeritus professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY, Eric Larsen is founding Publisher and Editor of *The Oliver Arts & Open Press*. His most recent book is *The Skull of Yorick: The Emptiness of American Thinking at a Time of Grave Peril—Studies in the Cover-up of 9/11*.

WHERE DID THE TOWERS GO



EVIDENCE OF DIRECTED
FREE-ENERGY
TECHNOLOGY
ON 9/11

by JUDY WOOD, B.S., M.S., Ph.D.

<http://drjudywood.com>

WHERE DID THE TOWERS GO



THE EVIDENCE OF DIRECTED
FREE-ENERGY TECHNOLOGY
ON 9/11

TO OBTAIN THE FULL HARD BACK
VERSION SEE

<http://wheredidthetowersgo.com>

<http://drjudywood.com/towers>

DVDs Available from
<http://www.checktheevidence.com/>