

New Federal Grand Jury on 9/11 Evidence... But Don't Get...

by [Joseph P. Farrell](#)

January 9, 2019

[Source](#)

One of the stories that made the top of the list in the many articles I received was this one, and many of you who shared some version of it were asking what I thought about it. We'll get back to that, and my concerns, but first a couple versions of the many articles that were sent; these two versions are courtesy of Mr. V.t. and Mr. S.D.:

[Federal Grand Jury To Hear Evidence That 9/11 Was A Controlled Demolition](#)

[Federal Grand Jury Will Finally Hear Evidence Of A Controlled Demolition On 9/11](#)

Many people, when sharing their versions of this story, expressed the hope that finally maybe something would be done to correct and revise the "official narrative" of burning airplane fuel being the mechanism that brought down the world Trade Center twin towers. Sadly, I think that, as usual, another agenda may be afoot, such is my cynicism at this juncture of all things having to do with fedgoovernment. Here's a paragraph from the second article that zeroes in on my concerns:

For years, hundreds of thousands of people have been calling upon the US government to investigate 9/11, and now progress is finally being made. On April 10th of this year, the [non-profit Lawyers Committee for 9/11 Inquiry](#) filed a petition with the U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of New York,

Manhattan, requesting that he present to a grand jury the extensive evidence of federal crimes relating to the destruction of three World Trade Center high rises on 9/11. The petition cited conclusive evidence, providing proof of explosives and incendiaries employed at ground zero to bring down the twin towers as well as the WTC building #7.

Now, beyond the fact that grand juries are seldom allowed to exercise their right of direct interrogation of witnesses, rather than simply allow the prosecutor to 'steer' the jury with his or her own questions, the key here for my high octane speculation today is the fact that according to the article, the filing states that only certain *kinds* of controlled demolitions will be considered, namely, the most conventional kind, i.e., that involving pre-planted explosives, demolition wiring, and so on. A brief nod is made to *other* theories of controlled demolition with the inclusion of the word "incendiaries" which doubtless may refer to the "nano-thermite" theory first advanced by Dr. Steven Jones. Granted, Dr. Jones' theory was the first *alternative* theory to emerge from the 9/11 "truth community" that did not highlight conventional explosives-drive controlled demolition. But it emerged during a time that many people were arguing, on the basis of other more anomalous evidence, that other mechanisms might have been involved. The presence of unusual nuclear residue and high background radiation counts of tritium and deuterium in the neighborhood of ground zero, plus the fact of stubborn fires that continued to burn hotly for several days (if not weeks) afterward, plus the presence of clean-up crews dressed in hazmat and apparent radiation protection clothing.. all of this led some people to posit the "mini-nukes" theory of the towers' demolition. Other even more anomalous evidence – the near total pulverization of the towers' material, the fact that some material burnt while other (lots of paper) did not, and the fact that several vehicles, some as much as a mile away from ground zero, were also burnt, and burnt in

equally highly anomalous fashion with burned out wheel rims or engines, while the rest of the vehicle showed little signs of burning – all of this led still others, such as Jim Hoffmann and Dr. Judy Wood to posit some sort of directed and/or exotic energy weapon was in play.

There are thus *four* models of controlled demolition that have been advanced in the 9/11 truth research field:

1. conventional controlled demolition by use of conventional, pre-planted explosives and synchronized detonation thereof;
2. the nano-thermite theory, similar to the above, but using military-grade incendiary nano-thermite, but also requiring pre-planting and synchronized detonation;
3. the “mini-nukes” theory, which may *or may not*, depending on the version one reads, require pre-planting within the structures; and finally,
4. the “exotic energy weapon” theory, which again, according to which version of the theory one reads, may (Hoffmann’s theory) or may not (Wood’s theory), require access to the structures.

The question is important, because as I pointed out in my book *Hidden Finance, Rogue Networks, and Secret Sorcery*, the “mechanism” or “murder weapon” is a key factor in determining who was responsible for the crime, the much more so in this case, as access to the buildings is a prerequisite in the first two theories, and may not be in the case of the last two. Additionally, as I also pointed out in my book, not only does each theory have a certain body of evidence that can be adduced in support of it, each theory runs afoul of contradicting evidence. Oddly enough, the theory that seems to make sense of *most* of the evidence in my opinion is the fourth, the exotic energy weapons theory. But as I also pointed out, if one looks at the implications of *who* was involved from the point of view of each of these theories, as one ascends from theory 1 to theory 4, the circle of people

with access to such technologies grows considerably narrower. Finally, as I also pointed out in my book, most if not all proponents of various theories seem to operate with the implicit assumption that one, and only one, mechanism may be involved. But as I pointed out in that book, it could be the case that one is looking at *several* mechanisms, each of which might imply *different* actors being involved, so that one might be looking at a kind of Agatha Christie *Murder on the Orient Express* where Hercule Poirot is confronted with a similar dilemma: multiple murder weapons, and several different perpetrators, each with their own motivations and agendas for committing the crime. In the case of 9/11, by the time one gets to the “exotic energy weapons” hypothesis, one is looking at a very restricted group that would have access to such technologies, and they may not be state actors at all; consider only the deep corporatization of the “deep state” and its near total control over advanced technologies, and that point should hit home with especial force.

Which brings us back to the filing: it will be noted that the filing appears to consider only the first two theories, and to reject the last two, and in doing so, it may be rejecting evidence leading to the deepest “players” in the foul crime. And hence, the exercise could be seen, not as an exercise to “get to the truth,” but rather, as a “limited hang out”, since many people simply no longer accept the official airplane fuel narrative.

The question is: why the limited hang-out, and why put it forward *now*? The answer to these questions may be the most disturbing aspect of today’s high octane speculation. In the recent spate of anomalous fires in California, many people have posted pictures of anomalous fire damage: houses are burnt, while nearby shrubbery and trees are not; plastic playground equipment is intact, while all around has been burned to the ground; vehicles show the same type of damage that Dr. Judy Wood laboriously assembled in her research; and

perhaps most importantly (and the most important neglected point), some people are simply *missing* from those death lists: they are neither dead, nor listed in any other category; they're simply *gone*. To put it country simple: there are evidential parallels between what happened in New York City on September 11, 2001, and what we've been seeing in California. That may indicate that the same, or similar, technology is in play, and lest we draw attention to that curious fact, best to advanced a limited hangout, gain control of the narrative once again, and deflect attention away from consideration, not just of 9/11, but of those fires as well.

See you on the flip side...