

Zahir Ebrahim's Open Letter to 9/11 Truth Chiefs

To: Steven Jones <hardevidence@gmail.com>, Kevin Ryan <kncryan@msn.com>, Frank Legge <flegge@iinet.net.au>, Niels Holger Harrit <harrit@nano.ku.dk>, Richard Gage <rgage@ae911truth.org>, Kevin Barrett <kbarrett@merr.com>, Judy Wood <lisajudy@nctv.com>

Cc: Salem-News.com newsroom <newsroom@salem-news.com>

Subject: Zahir Ebrahim's Open Letter to 9/11 Truth Chiefs

Dear recipient,

Peace be with you. I am resending this revised and final version of my Comment on Judy Wood's 'New Hiroshima' to the addressed recipients as an open letter because in it, I am explicitly expressing my humble 0.2 cents worth of opinion on the credibility of Steven Jones et. al.'s work. Please be advised that I have no affiliation with either Judy Wood or with any of the recipients of this email, nor have I ever met her or anyone else from among the recipients. I don't know any of you personally. What interests me as an ordinary justice activist suffering the largesses of "imperial mobilization" are two aspects of your public role in this HOW topic of 9/11. Specifically,

- 1) evidence which betrays motivation of its exponents ; and
- 2) authenticity of evidence-stream which you publicly bring to the fore in your respective exponentiations which directly impact public opinion.

Anyone who impacts public opinion is of interest to me. I always examine both the aspects noted above simultaneously. I drew this inspiration from the famous Bernard Lewis of Princeton who wrote in his book "The Crisis of Islam – Holy War and Unholy Terror" the following shrewd sentence as justification for writing his vile book with that equally vile and specious title: *"Terrorism requires only a few. Obviously the West must defend itself by whatever means will be effective. But in devising means to fight the terrorist, it would surely be useful to understand the forces that drive them."*

I have ever since been inspired by the idea that it is always *"useful to understand the forces*

that drive them” in order to examine the forces which drive anything, any mantra, and every individual who brings a mantra. The work of any individual or group or organization or institution is not divorced from the forces which drive them if Bernard Lewis' prescription is correct. The British Svengali and former OSS operative used this notion to seed falsehoods in the form of fabricating motivations to make the “*clash of civilizations*” believable to the ignorant public in America and the West. I employ it, judiciously always, to unlayer and uncover deceit of people like him who shill for empire, either overtly or covertly.

Since the remains of 9/11 are no more preserved as crime scene evidence, except in copious images and videos, those who bring their eruditeness to the fore as either self-appointed crime-scene experts, or as experts appointed by the establishment, are part of the evidence themselves. If they stand discredited, or if their motives are suspect, so is their evidence stream unless other unimpeachable sources for that evidence-stream is found. If they are incestuously the only source, the evidence lives or dies solely by the credibility of its exponents. One is not separate from the other, and those who separate them in innocence, may, I hope, become better informed by reading my article below. This is a well known rejection criterion to reject evidence from those who commit fraud, or have committed fraud in the past, or are known to be allied with those whom they purport to give evidence against, or are known to promulgate deception.

If anyone has ever been on Jury selection, they would have surely observed the emphasis by the prosecution team as well as the defense team to discredit the other team's witnesses. Holocaust™ is entirely about blanket acceptance of witnesses and testifiers without examining their integrity and motivations, and not about evidence. Whereas, 9/11 has uncannily become entirely about blanket acceptance of evidence without questioning either the validity of that evidence, or the motivations and integrity of the testifiers who bring forth that evidence, just as in the former case. I find that similarity very intriguing.

Because, if one were to ask *cui bono*, one is not surprised. Each case serves an agenda which is other than uncovering what really happened in those respective crimes against humanity. The former, with the TM, serves the agenda of sustaining the legitimization of Zionism in the mind of the goyem, and the endless extortion of both sympathies and restitution monies from them. The latter serves the agenda of sustaining “imperial mobilization” one way or another. From certain vantage point, it can be rather hard to distinguish between the two monumental crimes of recent memory the import of which continues to direly resonate globally today.

Of course, it is also obvious that passing the aforementioned rejection criterion of discrediting the witness does not automatically constitute an acceptance criterion for the evidence-stream, and that is also a universally accepted practice. Acceptance and rejection criterion are two distinct and separate things.

This fact is especially important in the forensic unraveling of a crime whose hard evidence has been rapidly removed, a monumental crime which is a priori known to be wrapped in layers of deceit, false clues and red herrings to serve imperial agendas, one whose import is so "transforming" that it must not be unraveled within the time frame that its obfuscation is needed to accomplish all faits accomplis seeded by it, and whose continued obfuscation is required in order to complete the intended transformations. I don't think anyone can sensibly disagree with any of this.

Nor can anyone sensibly disagree with the fact that 9/11 was one such monumental crime which fits the aforementioned attributes to a "T". A supreme crime analogous to Hitler's 'Operation Canned Goods' used as pretext to commit the supreme international crime of aggression, to "*goosestep the herrenvolk across international frontiers*" (as noted at Nuremberg) for the exact same purpose of acquiring a "greater Lebensraum". Just that in this case which plagues us today with an even greater tour de force of evil, Lebensraum is "world government".

All this is brazenly obvious today and surely known to everyone of the recipients. If anyone denies any of it, please deny it publicly (and leave me a pointer to it) so that the public can also judge your knowledge of the world, your sophistication and objectivity in analyzing current affairs and the historical chain of events that has brought us here, and your inherent biases in which you cradle your worldview and thus your pursuits. Which ones among you are exponents of Zionistan I would surely like to know. Who among you seeks World Government, I would also like to learn that (see footnote [19]).

Therefore, henceforth, as presumably entirely genuine and objective scientists pursuing a hard scientific inquiry into a crime which, one ab initio accepts, is wrapped in layers upon layers of deception by its very nature, let me know why anyone should believe Jones et. al.'s evidence-stream, or disbelieve Judy Wood's evidence stream that is entirely drawn from public-domain sources which challenges the former and spotlights some new aspects which were hitherto unknown (at least to many people like myself).

Please make the case – and this is an entirely different case from that which any of the

recipients have ever been called to make, namely, it is an ab initio case of why should one believe the evidence-stream and analysis being presented. But do try to not bring my humble limitations into the mix by calling me ignorant, or lacking in due diligence. Therefore, If you wish to respond henceforth, I enjoin you to make your arguments in public and publish them – my article is published here (<http://www.salem-news.com/articles/april262011/woods-hiroshima-ze.php>).

And I thank you in advance for a useful public response, especially one that shrewdly examines why one might rationally accept anyone's evidence stream, and specifically addresses fig 5 vs. fig 6 issue noted below. Namely, which figure is fraudulent, and which is authentic, and consequently, on what basis might one determine whether 9/11 destructions were a low temperature or a high temperature event. Something seen flowing from windows, and/or glowing in an image/video, is not evidence of heat, only of low viscosity and its color temperature. I am sure the recipients as scientists and engineers are aware of this and know the difference between color temperature and heat-content. In Photoshop for instance, one can produce any color temperature – as you all know – and make things vicariously look hot or cold. We interpret these color temperatures based on our everyday experiences on what we expect looks hot and therefore can easily be fooled even if deception is not the purpose. Therefore, from that flow of some fluid and/or its color temperature, to leap to "hot" as in heat – please provide the evidence if you are Jones et. al. (or their partisan with any technical expertise), and why one might disbelieve Judy Wood when she says "not hot" based on all the photographic evidence-stream she presents, if you are among her many detractors.

Is Judy Wood's evidence fraudulent? Is her reasoning specious? How - when firemen are seen in public-domain photographs walking around in traditional work-boots on what is supposed to be very very hot molten stuff? As I understand it, Judy Wood has shown that the Jones evidence is fraudulent, at least in that one instance of fig 5 vs. fig 6 (see footnote [17] for details). Which is it? Please prove by evidence and the logic of the observation which can address both supporting as well as contradictory evidence, and not by assertions, not by suppressing what isn't convenient, and not by disparaging the inquiring minds who want to probe further beyond the polished credentials.

Prove everything ab initio – no assumptions – beginning with authenticating everything you bring to bear as evidence. Why should one believe Steven Jones et. al.'s private experimentation and their un-authenticated material evidence acquisition published in a pay-for-peer-reviewed journal in which anyone can publish pretty much anything if they have \$800

to spare? Evidently, most consumers of Steven Jones et. al.'s work believe it because of claims to being “peer reviewed” in Bentham Open's online publication. Unfortunately, it can also be a nice scam – if one wanted it to be – since it remains unverifiable, because one can always claim peer-reviews are done anonymously! I also simultaneously recognize that publishing anything which goes against the ruling powers and the establishment's mantras is very difficult indeed, while gibberish can be trivially published if it supports the agendas of empire (see footnote [25]).

Therefore, genuine researchers must seek out other ways of venting their discoveries. And, knowing how hard it is to publish for any would be Galileo, it is also obvious that the Machiavelli will insist on bringing peer-reviewed scientific publications to them (as was the case with Noam Chomsky) before they would even look at the idea that anyone other than Osama Bin Laden could have done 9/11 (see my letter to Noam Chomsky when Steven Jones' “peer reviewed” paper came out, sending a copy to him). It is the false attribution of being genuinely peer reviewed as is done for instance in an IEEE journal, to bring the research respectability which is the new problem for me in Steven Jones et. al.'s work. I will openly state it here that in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I now suspect it to be false projection in order to gain respectability. I clearly see the Hegelian dialectic: publish first before I take you seriously (Chomsky) vs. I have published so now I must be taken seriously (Jones). So let's see the process behind “publish” and also authenticate what was “published”.

Because the mantra of “peer reviewed” appears everywhere on Steven Jones et. al.'s websites and it is their claim to credibility, I wish to dig deeper into this “peer review” business which their research underwent. It is evidently the primary basis for their claims before the public that it is genuine scientific research that they are doing which proves “thermite”. I must admit that I accepted this claim in the past myself without scrutiny. Not any longer. And I hope I may be forgiven if I now wish to scrutinize that claim. Their peer review process to the first order now appears exactly the same to me as climategate's so called peer reviews: incestuously assembled. I don't trust anything establishmentarians, former or current, have to say in their analysis, in this case of thermite. Additionally, I am puzzled that Steven Jones et. al. also do not assert thermite presence in any of their submissions to NIST. Please correct me if I am wrong and do point me to the submission to NIST which asserts their thermite discovery. As far as I am aware, and I am not all knowing, Steven Jones et. al. have only asserted thermite in their copious “peer reviewed” promulgations before the lay public. I am still awaiting to be corrected on this count, and I thank the recipients in advance for pointing me to an official NIST submission, to any official submission before the establishment's federal institutions, in

which the discovery of thermite, nanothermite, and its assorted brethren, have been asserted by Steven Jones et. al.

This is on top of the fact that it is possible that elements and remnants from traditional “controlled demolition” may have been found on the crime scene if the purpose was to establish “controlled demolition” in the mind of the detractors of the official NIST narratives. I want authentication of that counter narrative to NIST. This is most essential because almost all of 9/11 Truthers have been blindly assembled around the second narrative, while all the mainstream is gathered around the former. Pleading that thermite evidence before a federal agency increases the confidence in its authenticity, as doing so fraudulently is to commit a grievous federal offence which has severe penalties associated with it. But as we all know, lying to the public is for free – bigger the lie, greater the expectation of bigger prizes. Richard Gage on his website ae911truth.org had even pitched the Nobel prize for his confrere Steven Jones (see footnote [2])! Perhaps it was just the exuberance of the innocent at having discovered the wheel (see footnote [26]). Who is deceiving the public – if anyone – the public would like to know.

I remain fully cognizant of the fact that pitching unverifiable mantras couched in the gooblydook of science is also a game as old as empire (see footnotes [24] and [25]) just like striving for hegemony. By that token, I have no a priori reason to accept Judy Wood's evidence stream, except for the evidence she has gathered entirely from public sources and explicitly sourced as such. Then the burden shifts to that source from the one who has compiled it. It is possible that this evidence-stream itself was doctored at the source, or misrepresented by the compiler. Please feel free to provide cogent evidence to that effect. This is primarily the basis for my inquiry into the aforementioned fig 5 vs. fig 6 as it potentially separates the chaff from the wheat very neatly. In one shot, one can know who has mala fide intentions, who is mistaken, who was themselves deceived, and why should anyone believe him or her after that determination!

Or, at least be bold enough, and scientifically accurate enough, to suggest that this matter may remain inconclusive because the first-hand evidence from crime scene is gone and the only evidence is in the photographs. In that latter case, all evidence explanation which presumes either "hot" or "cold" is at best speculative and only resolvable indirectly by the logic of other evidence. If firemen are seen in the images walking around something which is presumed to be very very hot without burning and scorching themselves, and are attired in their regular firemen's clothing without any special heat protection which can withstand the high

temperatures that is being asserted, then the logic of incongruence automatically indicates the faulty conclusion of heat, and hence identifies the fraudsters. Does it not? Alternately, it indicates that some of the public image-evidence is itself fraudulent and/or misperceived, leading to incorrect conclusions. Which is it? Please prove your point with some cogent analysis which is empirically supported without conjectures or “trust” by way of appeal to authority. I am unfortunately all out of faith in “credentials” as sufficient proof of either authenticity of claimed empiricism, or veracity.

I sincerely believe that any genuine exponent of truth in search of what really happened on 9/11 and seeking to inform the public will appreciate this straightforward challenge from an ordinary person from among the public to authenticate whatever they assert is evidence, rather than be miffed by it. Please begin by authenticating fig 5 or fig 6, as I have already spent considerable time analyzing this and come away completely befuddled on the very basic issue of whether or not this was a high or low temperature event. I am inclined to believe Judy Wood's evidence stream as authentic. Am I being deceived?

Thank you very much for your time.

Zahir Ebrahim

[Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

[bio link](#)

[jihad link](#)

Dated: April 30, 2011 – In the tenth year of 9/11 and none are still the wiser!

Published here: <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/HL1105/S00007/zahir-ebrahims-open-letter-to-911-truth-chiefs.htm>

Source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/04/zahir-ebrahims-letter-to-911-truth.html>

Mirror URL: <http://bloghumanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/2011/04/30/zahir-ebrahims-letter-to-911-truth-chiefs/>

PDF URL: <http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2011/05/zahir-ebrahims-letter-to-911-truth-chiefs.pdf>

Enclosure: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/04/comment-on-judywoods-new-hiroshima.html>