

9/11 Truth will out: The Vancouver Hearings I

by **Jim Fetzer**

“And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free” — the motto of the CIA, taken from the Gospel according to St. John, which was inscribed on the facade of its Headquarters Building in 1959.



The array of ongoing attacks on the 9/11 Truth movement has reached astonishing proportions. A **“10th anniversary 9/11 Truth ‘Hit Piece’ Roundup”** published on 12 September 2011, a year and a day after 9/11, included excerpts from and links to no less than 32 attacks, where the majority emphasize the psychological needs of those who embrace “conspiracy theories” to give meaning, coherence and security to their lives—as though the belief that your government has perpetrated crimes of such magnitude could enhance your sense of security! But logic and reason are not their strong suits, where these articles are largely bereft of considerations about photographic, witness and physical proof substantiating the conclusions that many within the movement have drawn, where those who study the evidence tend to become truthers themselves.

Attacks upon the movement from the outside, however, pale in comparison with those that arise from groups that are within the movement itself.

Richard Gage, head of Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth, reportedly tried to convince 9/11 Vancouver that it should not support [the hearings that would be held there](#) on 15-17 June 2012. Rob Balsamo, the head of Pilots for 9/11 Truth, [has denounced “No Plane Theory” \(NPT\)](#), virtually without regard for the evidence that supports it, to which Pilots itself has made major contributions. And the Judy Wood clique (which displays the behavioral characteristics of a cult), denounces anyone who has [even the least doubt of her theory](#) of the destruction of the Twin Towers, while paradoxically denying that she even has “a theory”!

In spite of efforts to undermine them, which even included [a death threat](#) directed against those who organized the conference, The Vancouver Hearings have made a powerful contribution to understanding the events of 9/11. The quality of the 19 presentations was uniformly excellent—clearly organized, well-reasoned, and thought-provoking—where the most controversial issues within the 9/11 Truth community were addressed— and effectively settled—in an effort to expose falsehoods and reveal truths. The most important outcome was the resolution of several of the major 9/11 controversies that have divided the research community, which represents an enormous step forward in bringing these factions within the movement together—provided that reason and rationality are going to prevail in lieu of ego-centric and defensive attempts to save face when confronted with overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

[The Vancouver Hearings](#) were designed to compensate for perceived weaknesses in The Toronto Hearings, which were held with great fanfare across the continent nine months earlier. [As Joshua Blakeney explained](#), there was a noticeable failure in Toronto to address who was responsible for 9/11 and why. And as I accented in [my critique of those hearings](#), alternative theories about the destruction of the Twin Towers, including the possible use of mini or micro nukes, much less directed energy weapons, were not even considered, which meant that *no comparative judgments could be rendered about which among the alternative accounts provides the best explanation of the available data because no alternatives were discussed*. That is not a scientific attitude. The desire to avoid controversial questions, such as whether a Boeing 757 hit the Pentagon, whether all four of the crash sites had been fabricated or faked, much less who was responsible and why, were not addressed, even though there is a powerful and growing body of evidence that

makes their resolution possible. The Vancouver Hearings were intended to compensate for those shortcomings.

The “Official Account”

One commentator who attended the hearings, [Ernst Rodin](#), has suggested that the difference between these events is that the Toronto Hearings were devoted to establishing that the “official account” of 9/11 cannot be sustained on the basis of the available relevant evidence, while The Vancouver Hearings were focused upon the question of who was responsible and why. But another student of 9/11, [Craig McGee](#), has come decidedly closer to the heart of the matter by observing that, unlike Toronto, there was no “partly line” in Vancouver, where the presentations were diverse and some speakers openly disagreed with others, which is right on the mark. The Vancouver Hearings were intended to confront and resolve the issues that divide us, which invited not only their discussion but even, as it turned out, open differences between speakers themselves. While Ernst Rodin implies the Toronto Hearings were more objective and scientific, frequently talking about [what can be “verified” and what cannot](#), he minimizes the science at the Vancouver and, rather oddly, does not even bother to report our research on “No Plane Theory” (NPT) or to explain our findings about who was responsible and why. In this part, I am going to address issues related to NPT and, in part II, those related to the destruction of the Twin Towers and who was responsible and why 9/11 was produced.

While Rodin contends that he is only going to focus on “a few presentations that provided, at least for [him], new information”, he not only does no more by way of discussing who was responsible and why than to mention in passing [“government circles here and/or in Israel”](#) but has nothing to say about NPT, even though several of the speakers, including Nick Kollerstrom, Christopher Holmes, and I, presented extensive, detailed, and scientific evidence in its support. Moreover, since Israeli complicity in 9/11 and evidence that all four of the 9/11 crash sites appear to have been fabricated had

The “official” 9/11 flight paths

never been addressed during previous 9/11 conferences—with the exception of [Morgan Reynolds during the Madison Conference](#) in 2007—it is difficult to believe that this did not come as “new information” for Rodin. In order to appreciate the historic significance of The Vancouver Hearings, however, it may be appropriate to review the “official account” of what happened on 9/11. According to [The 9/11 Commission Report](#) (2004)—with support from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)—the key events were:

** That 19 Islamic fundamentalists hijacked four commercial carriers—Flight AA 11, AA 77, United 93, and United 175—outfoxed the most sophisticated air defense system in the world and perpetrated these atrocities under the control of Osama bin Laden, from a cave in Afghanistan.*

** That two of those planes, Flights 11 and 175, both Boeing 767s, were flown into the Twin Towers, where the combination of damage from their impacts, the jet-fuel based fires and those that endured, weakened the steel and caused both of them to collapse in about 10 seconds apiece.*

** That at 5:20 PM that afternoon, another enormous building in the World Trade Center complex, WTC-7 (also known as “Building 7”, a 47-story skyscraper, also collapsed due to fires inside the building, even though it had not been hit by any plane and had no jet-fuel-based fires.*

** That the Pentagon was hit by Flight 77, a Boeing 757 that approached on a northeastern trajectory at around 500 mph and, just skimming the ground and taking out multiple lampposts, created a spectacular fireball and extensive damage, with 125 casualties at the building itself.*

** That another Boeing 757, Flight 93, crashed in Shanksville, after the passengers heroically attempted to regain control, which we know from phone calls they made—as others had made from other planes—where this plane virtually completely disappeared into the very soft earth.*

** That the government identified the 19 hijackers almost immediately, where 15 were from Saudi Arabia and the number from Iraq was none, where these events were used to justify wars of aggression in Iraq and Afghanistan, the passage of the PATRIOT ACT, and the on-going “War on Terror”.*

We have long known that every element of this account is riddled with claims that are not only false but even impossible, which I have summarized in [“20 reasons the official account of 9/11 is wrong”](#), where [Elias Davidsson](#) has shown that the government has

never been able to prove that any of those alleged “hijackers” were aboard any of those planes; [David Ray Griffin and A.K. Dewdney](#) have shown that all of the alleged “phone calls” from all four flights were faked; and [Col. George Nelson, USAF \(ret.\)](#), has observed that, even though there are millions of uniquely identifiable component parts from those four planes, the government has yet to produce even one! And while an FBI spokesman explained why the NTSB had not conducted investigations of any of the four plane crashes for the first time in its history on the ground that “it wasn’t necessary because we saw what happened on television”, we did not see what happened in Shanksville on television and the only frame purporting to show what happened at the Pentagon features a plane that is too small by half to have been a Boeing 757. What we did see on TV of events in New York is laden with anomalies.

Proving False Claims True

The title of Col. Nelson’s study, [“Impossible to Prove a Falsehood True”](#), is relevant here, because *falsehoods can mistakenly seem to have been proven true when their premises are false because of suppressed evidence, manufactured evidence, or other forms of fakery and fabrication*. A great deal of the proceedings that took place during The Vancouver Hearings, therefore, had the function of a formal certification of the deceit and deception that characterizes the official account of 9/11, not because we did not know that it was riddled with false claims and was based upon fabricated evidence but because of the importance of further certifying that to be the case with qualified experts, who confirmed that:

(1) *Flights 11 and 77 were not even scheduled that day and the planes corresponding to Flights 93 and 175 were not formally taken out of service until 28 September 2005;*

(2) *no Boeing 757 hit the Pentagon, but one appears to have been flown toward the building and swerved over it as explosives were set off to simulate a plane crash;*

(3) *Flight 93 was over Urbana, IL, after its alleged crash in Shanksville, PA, and Flight 175 was over Pittsburgh, PA, long after its alleged hit on the South Tower;*

The 19 9/11 “patsies”

- (4) *all four of the alleged “crash sites” were fabricated, where different forms of fakery were used in each instance in an effort to conceal how had been done; where,*
- (5) *the Twin Towers appear to have been destroyed by a sophisticated arrangement of mini or micro nukes exploded in a sequence intended to simulate a collapse;*
- (6) *9/11 appears to have been a “national security event” approved at the highest levels of the U.S. government and executed with the assistance of the Israeli Mossad.*

These conclusions—with the possible exception of how the Twin Towers were destroyed—now appear to have been established beyond a reasonable doubt, because there are no reasonable alternatives. The solitary exception (regarding how the Twin Towers were destroyed) is that the use of nukes may have been complemented by one or another kind of directed energy weapon. But any alternatives that posit the primacy of conventional weapons, [thermite/thermate/nanothermite](#)—which could have been used for limited special purposes—or continue to maintain [a collapse of any kind](#), after The Vancouver Hearings, no longer deserve serious consideration within the 9/11 Truth movement. [Those theories have been defeated. They are not even physically possible.](#) Indeed, the “official account” of 9/11 is littered with violations of the laws of aerodynamics, engineering and physics, which means that it is not only false but cannot possibly be true.

An unusual aspect of The Vancouver Hearings is that they were conducted within a quasi-judicial framework in which each of the speakers was sworn in by one of the hearing’s panel of two judges, with the expectation of subsequently submitting evidentiary statements for the panel to use as the foundation for the preparation of formal indictments of those who appear to have been responsible for these atrocities, comparable to the [Luala Lumpur Tribunal’s indictments](#) of George W. Bush and Anthony “Tony” Blair. The evidentiary submissions and indictments that are based upon them, some of which have recently appeared on Veterans Today, including Susan Lindauer’s [“Confessions of a former CIA Asset”](#), may well become the most enduring legacy of the hearings. Let us begin with events at the Pentagon and follow up with the fabrication of the four “crash sites”, then turn to how the Twin Towers were destroyed and who was responsible (including Israeli complicity) and why, which no other 9/11 conference has ever addressed.

(1) What didn't happen at the Pentagon

According to the “official account” of 9/11, the Pentagon was hit by a Boeing 757 that approached on a northeastern trajectory at around 500 mph and, just skimming the ground and taking out multiple lampposts, created a spectacular fireball and extensive damage, which caused 125 fatalities within the building itself. The public needs to understand that events that violate the laws of aerodynamics and of physics are scientific impossibilities, where ground effect—the accumulation of a pocket of compressed gas—would make it impossible for a Boeing 757 to fly closer than 60-80' feet of the ground and that the effects of a plane traveling at 500 mph hitting stationary lampposts would be the same as a stationary plane being hit by lampposts traveling 500 mph: they would rip through the wing, the fuel stored there would burst into flames, the plane would twist around and its tail would have broken off, while the plane cartwheeled into the ground. The “official account” is not even aerodynamically or physically possible, where arguments that are based upon scientific laws among their premises properly qualify as “scientific reasoning”.

The [first speaker to address the Pentagon](#) was Enver Masud, founder and CEO of The Wisdom Fund, recipient of the 2002 Gold

Award for [THE WAR ON ISLAM](#), now in its 5th edition. An engineer by profession, he was residing near the Pentagon and observed its condition immediately after the hit,

which he wrote about in [9/11 UNVEILED](#) (2nd edition), perhaps the best brief introduction to 9/11. Enver Masud not only explained that Hani Hanjour, the alleged pilot, could not have executed the flight path of “Flight 77” into the Pentagon, but that the plane itself would have undergone G-forces that would have caused it to crash into the lawn. He offers the witness testimony of personnel inside the building, including [April Gallup](#), but that other witnesses outside the building, such as CNN’s [Jamie McIntrye](#), also contradict the “official account”. Among his other important points, he explains that the Pentagon Damage Assessment Report does not comport with the crash of a Boeing 757 and that the Flight Data Recorded provided to Pilots for 9/11 Truth by the NTSB does not show the plane leveling off for its approach to hit the Pentagon.

Barbara Honegger, Former White House Policy Analyst and, for more than a decade, Senior Military Affairs Journalist at DoD’s science, technology and national security affairs graduate university, she authored [OCTOBER SURPRISE](#) (1989) and “[The Scarlet A: Anthrax Links to 9/11](#)”, presents [compelling evidence](#) that the central fact of the Pentagon attack on 11 September 2001 is the same as at the World Trade Center: inside-the-building explosives, which no foreign terrorists could have had the access to plant, which, by itself, makes the “official account” of the Pentagon attack a fabrication on its face. Physical evidence and eyewitness testimony converge to show that internal as well as external explosions went off just after 9:30 a.m., when the official narrative maintains that Flight 77 was still miles from Washington and did not approach the building until 9:37:46, where these primary explosions went off at locations far removed from the official “plane penetration path” in Wedge One, including in Wedge Two, and in the innermost rings well beyond the alleged C Ring “exit” hole. Honegger’s study thus confirms and reinforces the presentation by Enver Masud.

Dennis Cimino, who spoke on Sunday morning, addressed issues related to the FDR data, which, according to the NTSB, was from Flight 77. With an A.A. in electrical engineering, 35-years in EMI/EMC testing and field engineering; FDR testing and certifications specialist; Navy Combat Systems Specialist; 2,000 hours, Pilot in Command, Commercial Instrument Single and Multi-Engine Land Pilot, Eastern Airlines 727-200, Second Officer, his presentation fit with others about the Pentagon. As Rodin accurately reports, “the most interesting aspect was his analysis of the AA77 FDR. It revealed that there could not have been a struggle in the cockpit because at no time was the autopilot

disengaged which would have inevitably happened under those circumstances. Furthermore, the preamble of the FDR file, which normally carries identifying information of the plane it came from, had 000. This indicated that the file did not originate from AA77." Dennis and I co-authored a study, [‘The ‘official account’ of the Pentagon attack is a fantasy’](#), which he asked me to move to my blog after it unexpectedly disappeared from Veterans Today. Here is what Dennis had to say:

[YouTube - Veterans Today -](#)

Dean Hartwell, who holds a Bachelor's Degree in Political Science, Masters in Public Administration, and law degree, J.D., is also the author of [DEAD MEN TALKING: CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNMENT LIES](#) (2009) on JFK, RFK and 9/11 and of [PLANES WITHOUT PASSENGERS: THE FAKED HIJACKINGS OF 9/11](#) (2011). If Flight 77 did not hit the Pentagon, after all, then what became of its passengers? As Dean observes, Bureau of Transportation Statistics records, which were first discovered by Gerard Holmgren, reveal that neither Flight 11 nor Flight 77 were scheduled to fly that day. But if those flights were phantoms, then the passengers were imaginary, too. As he illustrates in his [evidentiary submission](#), the most famous passenger alleged to have been killed that day was the popular right-wing political commentator, Barbara

Olson. Her husband, Ted, then the Solicitor General of the United States, gave three different versions of his claim that she had called him twice from the airplane, even though we know from the research of A.K. Dewdney and David Ray Griffin that calls from those planes would have been impossible in 2001. Even the FBI would eventually confirm that Barbara Olson had not had any conversation with her husband during 9/11. Dean's study removes a psychological obstacle to concluding that Flight 77 did not hit the Pentagon and that the "official account" is a fraud.

(2) The fabrication of all four crash sites

Since the presentations by Nick Kollerstrom (on Saturday morning) and by Christopher Holmes (on Sunday morning) can perhaps be best appreciated within the more general framework of how we know that all four of the "official crash sites" were fabrication, I shall begin with my own presentation, "[Fraud and Fakery in the 'official account' of 9/11](#)". As Dean observed, BTS records show neither Flight 11 (which officially hit the North Tower) nor Flight 77 (the Pentagon) was scheduled to fly that day. FAA Registration records, which I also display, show that the planes associated with Flights 93 (the Shanksville crash) and Flight 175 (the South Tower hit) were not de-registered (or formally taken out of service) until 28 September 2005. Which raise the following questions: How could planes that were not even in the air have crashed on 9/11? and how could planes that crashed on 9/11 have still been in the air four years later? In addition, [Pilots for 9/11 Truth](#) has established (on the basis of studies of air/ground communications) that Flight 93 was in the air but was over Champaign-Urbana, IL, after its alleged crash in Shanksville and that Flight 175 was also in the air but, long after its alleged hit on the South Tower, was over Harrisburg and Pittsburgh, PA. All four crash sites involved forms of fakery.

This is such stunning information, which completely pulls the rug out from under the "official account" of 9/11, that I am in a state of disbelief that Ernst Rodin [does not even mention, much less discuss](#), these findings. It also clarifies and establishes the position known as "No Planes Theory" (NPT), which might be better described as "No 'official plane crashes' theory" or, as Morgan Reynolds has proposed, "[No Big Boeing's Theory](#)". Properly understood, NPT consists of the conjunction of the following four propositions:

(1) Flight 11 did not hit the North Tower;

(2) Flight 77 did not hit the Pentagon;

(3) Flight 93 did not crash in Shanksville;

(4) Flight 175 did not hit the South Tower.

NPT does not mean that no planes were involved in 9/11, since Pilots' study of the FDR data suggests and CIT's witness research has confirmed that a large plane—presumably, a Boeing 757—flew toward the Pentagon on a due east trajectory (as opposed to the acute northeast trajectory of the “official account”), far too high to have hit any lamp-posts and, instead of hitting the building, swooped over it, as the trucker buddy of a friend of mine from JFK research had told him, while explosives were set off to simulate the crash of a plane. They appear to have left nothing to chance, where 125 casualties died when these events took place in the West Wing.

Shanksville is [a relatively trivial case](#), but New York is another story. Christopher Holmes, Ph.D., who is a clinical and forensic psychologist, the director of the Zero Point Institute and author of [THE MADNESS OF HUMANITY](#) (2011), gave a presentation inspired by a psychological and forensic examination of Simon Shack's “September Clues” studies, which he elaborates upon in [“Fabled Airplanes”](#). Christopher began with a searching exploration of a blow-up of the alleged entry hole in the facade of the South Tower, observing that features are present that should not be present and that other features are absent that should have been present if a real plane had entered the building. It was a stunning and effective discussion. He amplified with an analysis of other indications of video fakery — which could include fake videos of real or fake planes but also real footage of fake planes — which provided powerful proof that no real plane had actually entered the building on 9/11. In fact, given the laws of physics, that would have been an impossible event.

This is such a remarkable situation—where many, even within the 9/11 Truth commu-

nity, remain convinced that violations of the laws of physics occurred on 9/11—it may be worth expanding upon this issue. As [Pilots has confirmed](#), the plane was traveling faster than a standard Boeing 767 could fly. That has inspired some to infer that it must have been a “special plane”. But no plane, no matter how “special”, could have made the effortless entry shown in these videos, especially when it was intersecting eight (8) floors consisting of steel trusses connected at one end to the core columns and at the other to the external steel support columns, where each floor was filled with 4-8” of concrete and, at 208’ on a side, represented an acre of concrete apiece. Imagine the effects were a commercial carrier to encounter *just one of those floors in flight!* A real plane would have crumpled, its wings and tail broken off, with bodies, seats and luggage falling to the ground. Instead, it effortlessly passes through its own length into the building in the same number of frames that it passes through its own length in air. Its jet fuel should have exploded during its collision with the facade. How could a 160’ plane traveling over 500 mph have possibly come to a screeching halt within 48’ and not blown out the other side? The answer is, “It could not!”, which is one more indication that we are viewing videos that record a fantasy encounter.

The question thus becomes not whether we are witnessing some kind of video fakery but how it was done. Nick Kollerstrom, Ph.D., an historian of science, who has published on Sir Isaac Newton, and Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, founding member of the UK’s 9/11 Truth movement, member of the New York Academy of Sciences and author of [7/7: TERROR ON THE TUBE](#) (3rd edition, 2012), in his presentation, [“Did a Phantom Plane hit the 2nd Tower?”](#), may have answered that question. Consistent with the BTS and FAA records that I have cited, Kollerstrom discusses the research of Richard Hall, who conducted a [3-D study of the flight path](#) found in the videos of the plane, where he was able to establish locations and times for its approach toward the South Tower. He subsequently discovered the existence of a RADES military radar track of (what he presumed to be) the same plane, except that its trajectory was 1,400’ to the right of the video image. He discovered that the same phenomenon occurred in relation to the Naudet Brothers film of the North Tower hit, where the RADES radar track was again 1,400’ to the right and, as in the first instance, missed the tower. His account, which I believe to be correct, is that a real plane (probably cloaked) was used to project a holographic image of “the plane”, where the sound of the real plane was taken to be coming from the projected image, which could be flown faster than a

Boeing 767, could enter the towers in violation of Newton's laws and without exploding and come to a screeching halt, virtually instantaneously.

9/11 Truth Will Out

Ernst Rodin's **repeated insinuations** that The Toronto Hearings were objective and scientific, while The Vancouver Hearings were not, is palpably false. *The difference is we were willing to consider the alternative theories that have caused so much division and distress within the 9/11 community and they were not. The Toronto Hearings were less scientific and objective precisely on that basis, since it is logically impossible to establish what happened in cases of these kinds without comparing alternatives.* While it is entirely appropriate for Rodin to **compare and contrast** the backgrounds of David Ray Griffin and me, where David is a theologian and philosopher of religion, he could not find the words to report that I had earned my Ph.D. in the history and the philosophy of science, in which I have published more than 20 books and 100 articles, that I taught logic, critical thinking and scientific reasoning for 35 years or that I was selected to be a Distinguished McKnight University Professor by the University of Minnesota in 1996. That he places so much emphasis on science but suppresses my qualifications with regard to scientific methods suggests he was not on the up-and-up but was performing a subtle smear of The Vancouver Hearings by minimizing both its science (with regard to faking the crash sites) and its politics (by barely mentioning Israel's role in 9/11). Reasoning that is based upon laws of aerodynamics, of engineering and of physics is scientific reasoning. And that is the kind of reasoning that was pervasive at The Vancouver Hearings.

YouTube - Veterans Today -

A few lesser bones to pick with Ernst Rodin: he belittles [Splitting the Sky](#), who is one of Canada's most famous and admired human beings. When I read his comparison of this [magnificent Native American](#) to "a somewhat elderly rather agitated hippie on the stage addressing the audience in what is best described as a rant", I became concerned that this man was not going to give The Vancouver Hearings a fair shake. In my opinion, STS has more integrity in his least digit than Ernst Rodin in his whole being. For all of his deference to [The Toronto Hearings](#) as adopting the better strategy of staying with less encompassing and (what he takes to be) more firmly supported positions, implying that they were "empirically based" while our hearings were "speculative", he went out of his way to minimize the scientific findings that prevailed during The Vancouver Hearings, not only with respect to alternative theories of how the Twin Tower were destroyed but meticulous and detailed studies of what didn't happen at the Pentagon and extensive and scientific documentation of the fabrication of all four "crash sites", which anyone can judge for themselves. The closest that I can come to a charitable interpretation of his remarks is that Rodin understands the nature of scientific reasoning no better than those who ran The Toronto Hearings, who displayed their disposition for control-

ling debate and by restricting the discussion of alternatives.

Since reasoning involving laws of aerodynamics, of engineering and of physics qualifies as “scientific” and these studies were chock full of empirical data with observations and measurements as well as thought experiments, there appears to be no good reason for Ernst Rodin to have completely ignored these historic findings. *If the four crash sites were fabricated or faked (albeit each in its own different way), where two planes were not even in the air and the other two remained in the air four years later, then not only the American people but the nations of the world have been subjected to an enormous scam. And we demonstrated that all four crash sites were fabricated or faked.* The dimensions of the hoax are almost impossible to exaggerate, where Hollywood-style special effects were combined with pseudo-flights and imaginary passengers. Bear in mind: *if none of these planes crashed, then there were no dead passengers; and if there were no dead passengers, then there were no Islamic terrorists to hijack the planes; and if there were no Islamic terrorists to hijack the planes, then there was no justification for the “war on terror”, the invasion of Afghanistan, the destruction of Iraq, or the passage of the PATRIOT Act, the creation of the Department of Homeland Security and the Transportation Security Agency.* They are part and parcel of the massive scamming of the world that is known as “9/11”.

NOTE: The destruction of the Twin Towers and who was responsible and why will be addressed in Part II.

Jim Fetzer, a former Marine Corps officer, founded [Scholars for 9/11 Truth](#), organized its first conference in Madison in 2007, published its first book, [THE 9/11 CONSPIRACY](#) (2007), and organized and co-chaired The Vancouver Hearings with Joshua Blakeney.

Related Posts:

- [9/11 J'accuse: Zelikow, Cheney, Rumsfeld, Bush, and O'Brien](#)
- [Inside Job: More Proof of 9/11 Duplicity](#)
- [9/11: Planes/No Planes and “Video Fakery”](#)
- [Fear of ridicule leads to damaging partition of 9/11 Truth movement](#)

- [A 757 Actually DID Hit the Pentagon! Trust Us, We're Truthers!](#)

Short URL: <http://www.veteranstoday.com/?p=218884>

The views expressed herein are the views of the author exclusively and not necessarily the views of VT or any other VT authors, affiliates, advertisers, sponsors or partners. [Legal Notice](#)

Posted by [Jim Fetzer](#) on Sep 7 2012, With 4889 Reads, Filed under [9/11](#), [Editors Picks](#). You can follow any responses to this entry through the [RSS 2.0](#). You can skip to the end and leave a response. Pinging is currently not allowed.

COMMENTS

To post, we ask that you login using Facebook, Yahoo, AOL, or Hotmail in the box below.

Don't have a social network account? [Register](#) and [Login](#) direct with VT and post. Before you post, read our [Comment Policy - Feedback](#)