

Reply to “Greg Jenkins interview Judy Wood: An Interview and Analysis” by Judy Wood

Dear Dr. Jones,

This acknowledges your many courtesies in letting me know of your intention to publish yet another version of the January 10, 2007, interview between myself and Dr. Greg Jenkins . The original transcript was already posted on my website. I respectfully decline to comment in detail, but would ask that you post this letter, as you have stated you would do, as a 'simultaneous letter.'

http://janedoe0911.tripod.com/Jenkins_transcript.html

The many criticisms of my interview replies serve little useful purpose at this time as the causal theory that I espouse has moved well beyond where it was in January. It is fair to say that much has happened since January that would render the criticism of the critical interview (a form of double-dipping, perhaps?) rather out of date, in my opinion. That said, I do not here claim that you should not publish the criticism if that is what you think is best for your journal.

The DEW causal theory is now pending as an official Request for Correction (RFC) within the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), that I filed on March 16, 2007, some two months after the January 10th interview. More recently, I have supplemented the RFC on two separate occasions wherein I have specifically called attention to fraud within the meaning of the False Claims Act, 31 USC @ 1329 et seq., that enables me to file law suits against certain parties, which law suits must be filed under seal and kept confidential until permission is received to say more about them.

My RFCs further reveal that NIST was assisted in the preparation of a false and fraudulent report on what caused the destruction of World Trade Center 1 and 2 (WTC1,2) by major developers of directed energy weapons; namely: Applied Research Associates, Inc. (ARA) and Science Applications International Inc. (SAIC), among other contractors who should have known that fraud was being committed.

In the case of ARA and SAIC, the extent of their knowledge is derived, in part, from having developed directed energy weapons. Between the two of them, ARA and SAIC had some 25 persons assigned to work on the NIST project, leading to the publication of NCSTAR1, the report on what caused the destruction of WTC1,2.

I can tell you that the response to my RFCs and to the revelations of fraud that they contain and the identification of major DEW contractors, that they also contain, has resulted in a new interest in and emphasis upon DEW theory that did not exist as at January 10th.

I can also reveal that the DEW theory has been presented to numerous responsible governmental officials whose work on directed energy weapons would put them in a position of knowing what effects would result from use of such weapons.

Finally, I can reveal that the queries I have caused to be submitted are being taken seriously. As this letter is being written, Dr. Jones, I can tell you that evidence of support of the correctness of DEW theory and corresponding correctness of assertions of fraud in the official reporting is accumulating rapidly with respect to both causation and fraud.

I do not find it necessary to respond directly to the interview criticism in either its original content or in the further criticism in the new letter. My line of research in furtherance of DEW causal theory has taken a different direction that neither benefits nor suffers from public criticism of the theory. Opinions on the matter differ and I respect those who have differing opinions.

Please post this letter in its entirety. If you do not, I will reveal that you invited this reply and promised simultaneous posting, then renege.

With sincere good wishes, I am

Very truly yours,
Dr. Judy Wood

A response to Judy Wood's letter in reply to "Greg Jenkins interview Judy Wood: An Interview and Analysis"

By Dr. Greg Jenkins and Arabesque

Judy Wood has made the claim that her theory has advanced beyond the reaches of scientific scrutiny since January:

It is fair to say that much has happened since January that would render the criticism of the critical interview (a form of double-dipping, perhaps?) rather out of date

In reality Wood has not changed her theory much at all. What need would there be for "double dipping" if Judy Wood had addressed our criticisms in the first place?

Amazingly, she **explicitly** claims that her research has now moved beyond the original claims that were so suspect in the first place, thus neutralizing all past and present scientific scrutiny:

I do not find it necessary to respond directly to the interview criticism in either its original content or in the further criticism in the new letter. My line of research in furtherance of DEW causal theory has taken a different direction that neither benefits nor suffers from public criticism of the theory.

Clearly, Wood is implying here that her theory is beyond critique. To vividly elucidate the fact that Wood has repeated the same points in contention, our RFC analysis references the interview analysis on several occasions, as well as Dr. Jenkins' paper "[The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World](#)"

[Trade Center](#)". Apparently, "*double dipping*" was not enough to elicit a legitimate scientific response.