

The Creators of "Loose Change" Speak

With Commentary by Mark Roberts Email suggested additions to itmatters@mail.com June, 2006

Dylan Avery, writer and director of the 9/11 conspiracy video "Loose Change," being interviewed by host Jack Blood on the radio program "Deadline Live," April, 2005. The interview is promoted on the "Loose Change" website: <http://www.loosechange911.com/>

Avery: Ha Ha Ha Ha! Have you seen how small those things [box cutters] are? Like, if I was on a flight, with, you know, at least 50 other people – because that's the smallest number I think was on 9/11* – if I was in the cabin, with 50 other people, and five people – I don't care if they're Muslim or not – stand up with box cutters and say they're gonna hijack the plane, **I'm gonna laugh in their face!**

Blood: And these pilots, I mean, we interviewed Debra Burlingame, whose brother Chick was the one supposedly flying that plane that hit the Pentagon–

Avery: Oh, that's right! I heard about that!

Blood: –And of course she is a TOTAL shill for the Republican Party, she also spoke at the [Republican National] Convention. And is it ABSURD that she went on and on about how her brother was ex-military, how she knows that her brother and the other pilots fought for their lives, against these deadly terrorists–

Avery: Yeaaah, yeah. Whatever.

Blood: (mocking an Arabic accent): It is my preevilege to keel you with thees box cutter!

Avery: Ha ha!

Blood: Didn't Rumsfeld say, right after this happened, that they had actually done this with plastic knives and not box cutters?

Avery: Yeah, he said that in the same interview where he said that a missile hit the Pentagon.

Blood: OH MY GOD! HE'S GOT A PLASTIC KNIFE!

Avery: HAHAHA!

Blood: RUN!

Avery: HE'S GOT A BUTTER KNIFE FROM BREAKFAST! OH, NO!

Blood: Take the plane, sir. We don't want any trouble.

Avery: HE'S GOING TO SCRATCH ME A LITTLE BIT! HUH HUH!

Blood: UN-BELIEVABLE! Well, that's exactly what we're saying. That's an overused term, or underused term, "unbelievable."

Avery: (Still laughing): It's ABSOLUTELY unbelievable!

Blood: (doing accent again): It's un-bee-leevable!

Avery: What's even MORE unbelievable is how people will DEFEND this!

Blood: Hold on, Dylan, we've gotta take a break....

Opening Title of "Loose Change 2nd Edition"



DEDICATED TO THE LIVES WE LOST
ON SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2001

* Avery had been "researching" 9/11 for 3 years, but didn't know that flight 93 had 40 victims, including crew. He may not know that flight 77 was the only one on which passengers described "box cutters," not knives.

Yes, let's take a break, and reflect on the fact that Dylan Avery is one of the leaders of the "9/11 Truth Movement."

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
An open letter to Dylan Avery, Korey Rowe, and Jason Bermas	6
Interview Sources	12
On the Victims of September 11, 2001	13
Dylan Avery tells 9/11 widow that the U.S. gov't murdered her husband	18
Jason Bermas lying at Ground Zero	18
"They will have to cover us if they want to cover the memorial	21
"We're simply just Americans asking questions."	23
On the World Trade Center	28
What is the strongest piece of evidence that backs up your claim?	31
"I've found that the Pentagon is the easiest sell."	36
On Flight 93	39
Partial List of Agencies Involved in the 9/11 Investigations	40
Proud Americans	47
"We wouldn't say that this was a conspiracy movie."	49
Media Relations	54
Sales, Distribution, Legal Troubles	56
On the Critics of Loose Change	60
Miscellaneous Claims & Theories	63
Avery, Rowe, and Bermas on Air America	66
Dylan Avery on Beyond the Ordinary	82
A Stroll Down Conspiracy Lane with "Researcher" Jason Bermas	85

Introduction

Dylan Avery is the writer, director, and main spokesman for "Loose Change," which is by far the most popular 9/11 conspiracy video. Avery claims that "Loose Change" has been downloaded from Google Video over seven million times. He has also sold many DVDs and he encourages his many followers to distribute free copies of "Loose Change" DVDs. He is working on a new version which he hopes will see limited theatrical release beginning on September 11th, 2006. "Loose Change" can be viewed on Google Video: <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5137581991288263801>

In April, 2006 I created a critique of "Loose Change," with the hope that it would encourage Dylan Avery to correct his video's nearly continuous string of factual errors and unsupported allegations.

My critique can be viewed as an HTML file here: <http://tinyurl.com/jnfp8> or downloaded as a doc file at the excellent website 911myths.com: http://www.911myths.com/html/other_contributions.html

I had intended to release this document in May as part of a revised version of my critique. However, Dylan Avery ran into some legal trouble then, and is in the process of editing his video to remove some footage that he apparently used without permission. Therefore I am releasing this as a separate document until a new version of "Loose Change" appears.

Louder Than Words, LLC was founded in 2005 by Dylan Avery and his friend Korey Rowe to produce and promote "Loose Change." Jason Bermas is the third major player in Louder Than Words. He does "re-search" and web work. For the past several months these three men have been touring the U.S. to promote their video, while working on the new version, and encouraging as many people as possible to join their protest at Ground Zero on September 11, 2006. The purpose of that planned protest is to bring media attention to the conspiracy theorist idea that a new, independent investigation of 9/11 is necessary to find the "real" perpetrators of the terrorist attacks.

The conspiracy theorists mostly belong to two camps:

- 1) Those who believe that elements within the U.S. government planned and executed the attacks, and
- 2) Those who believe the U.S. government knew the attacks were coming and deliberately did nothing to stop them.

Both camps generally agree that the purpose of committing or allowing the attacks was to aid in furthering a "globalist" political agenda, but there is disagreement as to who the "conspirators" are. Some say they are Zionists, some say they are Neocons, some say they are Illuminati, some say they are all of the above.

The creators of "Loose Change" are in camp 1. They claim that elements within the U.S. government murdered nearly 3,000 people on 9/11 and caused billions of dollars in damage, and are involved in a massive cover-up of their crimes.

"Loose Change" is very popular with the public, but some people within the "911 Truth Movement" believe it is damaging to their cause because the claims it makes are so extreme:

- U.S. air defenses were ordered to "stand down" on 9/11 in order to allow the attacks to succeed.
- Prior to 9/11 the rules of engagement were changed to require permission from the Secretary of Defense before shooting down a threatening aircraft.
- An unusual number of war games were deliberately held on 9/11 to occupy and confuse potential defenders.
- Flight 77 did not crash into the Pentagon. No Boeing 757 wreckage or human remains were re-

covered and identified there. It disappeared and no one knows the whereabouts of the plane or its passengers. The Pentagon was probably struck by a smaller military plane or a missile.

- Flight 93 did not crash in a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania after its passengers tried to storm the cockpit. No aircraft wreckage and human remains were recovered and identified there. Instead, flight 93 landed safely in Cleveland where its passengers were removed and presumably killed. That plane may have contained not only flight 93's passengers, but all the passengers from the other three planes as well. The actual plane, tail number N591UA, was still in use as of 2003.
- None of the many calls made by passengers on the hijacked aircraft were real. All the calls were perfectly faked by the conspirators using "voice-morphing" technology. The fakes occurred in real time as events unfolded, and were good enough to fool all the relatives of the "alleged" callers.
- At least 9 of the alleged hijackers were still alive after 9/11.
- al Qaeda had no role in the attacks. A video of bin Laden admitting his involvement was faked.
- World Trade Center buildings 1, 2 and 7 were destroyed by pre-planted explosive devices. Additional explosive devices blew up in the Twin Towers prior to the demolition charges going off. The towers did not collapse due to structural damage and fire caused by the aircraft striking them. Fires were not severe in the towers. WTC 7 sustained slight structural damage and fires.
- One of the cleanup contractors at the WTC, Controlled Demolitions Inc., may have been involved in the WTC's destruction, as well as in the bombing of the Murrah building in Oklahoma City in 1995. CDI executed an "unexplained" demolition of two 400-foot gas tanks in NYC in June, 2001.
- No inspection was allowed of WTC debris. New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani ordered all potential evidence to be removed from the site.
- Investors with advance knowledge of 9/11 made millions in the stock market.
- A document produced by prominent Neocons in 2000 called for a "New Pearl Harbor."
- Prominent U.S. politicians and military personnel avoided air travel on and before 9/11.
- Larry Silverstein, leaseholder of the World Trade Center, profited by over insuring his buildings.
- George W. Bush's brother Marvin ran WTC security operations.
- \$166.8 billion in gold was stolen from the vaults beneath the World Trade Center.
- No real investigation of the causes of the attacks was done.

All of these claims made in "Loose Change" are false, as my critique demonstrates. Many of the claims are easily disproved with just a few minutes of web searching. What do Avery, Rowe and Bermas do with the towering mountain of evidence that comprehensively refutes their claims? They ignore it. They don't acknowledge that such evidence exists. They don't acknowledge the work done by thousands of investigators. They publish rumors gleaned from conspiracy websites as facts, but they refuse to talk to any of the thousands of experts who were at any of the scenes, or who worked behind the scenes analyzing evidence. Instead, they deny that any "real" investigation took place.

In the case of the Pentagon, amongst many egregious mistakes, the creators of "Loose Change" don't think it's worth mentioning that dozens of people saw the 757 hit the building right in front of them, and reported what they saw immediately afterwards. They ignore the fact that the remains of all but one of the victims on board were collected at the Pentagon and positively identified. In the case of flight 93, amongst many other errors, the creators of "Loose Change" do not explain how passengers from four flights that departed from Boston, Washington D.C. and Newark could have ended up on a single plane in Cleveland. They ignore the fact that 95% of the plane was recovered from the crash site in Pennsylvania, and that the remains of all the people on board were collected there and positively identified.

These are apparently minor facts that should not keep the "truth" from spreading.

It would be easy to dismiss Avery, Rowe, and Bermas's outrageous claims if their video wasn't so popular. Even Roger Ebert, the famous film critic of the *Chicago Sun-Times*, reported that he finally watched as much of it as he could bear, after being bombarded by emails from "Loose Change" supporters:

"I watched the first 20 minutes of the film and, bored and unimpressed, skipped through the rest, pausing here and there. You really should take a look at it. Not because it in any way proves its extraordinary premise -- that the United States government was behind the Sept. 11 attacks -- but because it may interest you to see the kind of parody of critical analysis that convinces too many people." (April 24, 2006)

After writing my critique – in which I point out 115 false statements involving 81 errors of fact – and having it dismissed by Avery as "not refuting anything," I became interested in the question of what motivates these people to promote such absurd ideas. Do they really believe what they are saying? How can they ignore the enormous amount of evidence that proves, beyond a doubt, that their claims are false? What have they learned since they began promoting the video? What is it about their presentation that is attractive to so many people, especially to young males? How do they deal with critics, if at all? How do they intend to sustain their views in the face of overwhelming contradictory evidence?

When I started examining these questions a month ago, I thought, "These guys were surprised by the popularity of their hastily-produced video, and now they're in the awkward position of either admitting they screwed the whole thing up, or affirming a lot of ideas that they don't believe. They're not willing to swallow their pride and say, *We thought we knew what we were doing, but we were wrong.*"

I now believe that my first impression was wrong. After reviewing many hours of recorded interviews with the "Loose Change" creators, I am convinced that they believe most of the claims they make.

I think that they avoid examining their beliefs at all costs, which leads to them lying and behaving hypocritically, but I get the impression that they sincerely think that the attacks of 9/11 were the work of the U.S. government. I have also seen Avery and Bermas hawking their DVDs and presenting their ideas in person. Their presentation is very aggressive, passionate, and rapid-fire. They SWEAR that their DVD contains the "truth." They have no qualms about protesting at events attended by families of 9/11 victims. They frequently and consistently state that everything the government has said about 9/11 is a lie.

Especially disturbing are the interviews involving Jason Bermas, the "researcher" who all involved tout as the most knowledgeable about 9/11 and about history in general. He may be the most ill-informed, consistently wrong person I have ever come across. Top that off with his willingness to believe just about every conspiracy theory, including that the Apollo moon landings were a hoax, and you have the worst possible contributor to a "documentary." (That's right, I forgot to mention that "Loose Change" began as a work of fiction but transmuted into a "documentary.") At the end of this document is most of an interview with Bermas. In it, he not only mentions 18 conspiracy theories, he believes that most of them are connected to each other. To live in his world must be confusing and frightening.

.....

An open letter to Dylan Avery, Korey Rowe, and Jason Bermas

Gentlemen,

As someone who takes you and your work seriously, I am asking you to pause and to step away from the details of that work for a moment, in order to gain some perspective. I know that this is a lot to ask. You are all extremely busy promoting your video and working on the new version for theatrical release.

You claim to be seeking the “truth” about 9/11. That claim is hypocritical in the extreme. I have shown you that every major claim you make in “Loose Change” is false. You managed to get everything wrong. My assertions are backed by abundant evidence. Your claims are not. You continue to promote those claims, and in some cases you are straying farther and farther from the truth as time goes on.

Your contradictory claims do not comprise a coherent hypothesis of what happened on 9/11. You show no willingness to face the existing evidence or to do actual research. For your new video, rather than interview experts who were involved in the 9/11 investigations, you have been interviewing other conspiracy theorists, as shown by the hour-long preview you recently released and your comments after attending the recent 9/11 “Truth Conference.” Although you constantly call for a “real” investigation, you refuse to talk to a single one of the thousands of experts who have investigated the events of 9/11, and whose conclusions comprehensively refute your conjectures.

If it’s affirmation, not truth, that you seek, why not save your money and just interview each other?

You sometimes complain that people dismiss your work because you are in your twenties. You may want to consider the ammunition you give your critics by your cowardly behavior and complete incompetence in the realm of “re-search.”

Yes, you are behaving like cowards. (I have no doubt that each of you is the kind of person who would rush into a burning building to save someone in need. That’s not the kind of courage I’m talking about.) You are intellectual cowards. You claim to be seeking the truth, but you refuse to even look at the evidence that’s right in front of you. You largely restrict your “research” to information gathered in the first confused days after 9/11. You rely on the horribly inept and deliberately deceptive reporting of other conspiracy theorists. The moderators on your internet forum delete the accounts of people who present evidence that contradicts your claims. You publicly mock the people who reveal your errors. You publicly mock all legitimate investigators.

Worst of all, you publicly mock the victims of 9/11 who agree with the “official version” of events, a version that has the inconvenient qualities of being coherent, comprehensive, and supported by facts gathered by thousands of qualified

investigators who worked with primary sources. That's as opposed to your version of events, which is incoherent, exclusive of all data that you don't like, and is not supported by any of the investigators who worked on 9/11 issues.

It's instructive to look at the progression of what you consider to be the "most powerful piece of evidence" in favor of your conspiracy theory. In the first version of "Loose Change," it was the "pod theory." When that was laughed out of town, you dropped it and began promoting the "no 757 hit the Pentagon" foolishness for the Second Edition. Well, most of the "Truth Movement" has problems with that idea, so now you've chosen the collapse of WTC 7 as your strongest "evidence." What will it be next month?

Likewise, in the first version of "LC," flight 93 **did** crash in Pennsylvania. In your second version, it landed in Cleveland. There happens to be zero evidence for it landing in Cleveland and 100% evidence for it crashing in Pennsylvania, but that doesn't matter at all to you. You found a more entertaining and "mysterious" story, and went with it, the evidence – and the victims – be damned. Why are you behaving this way?

Another form of intellectual cowardice you practice all the time is your mantra, "We're just asking questions." That's false. You constantly make specific accusations, but you don't feel the need to back them up with evidence. When challenged, you retreat to the "just asking questions" excuse. I've taken the time to answer many of your questions, but you're not interested in answers. You're interested in milking a conspiracy theory. See the section "We're simply just Americans asking questions" for many examples of your accusations.

You like to couch your rhetoric in patriotic terms. "Loose Change" ends with a long shot of the U.S. flag waving. You use the phrases, "Restoring the Constitution," and "bringing America back." Really? Let's have a look at America if the laws of the land were based on your rules. Imagine that the laws of the land were based on your rules. Imagine that you were accused of murder.

- By your rules, you would be considered guilty until proven innocent.
- Rumor and hearsay would be valid evidence against you.
- The "investigation" into the crime would be done by hacks with no relevant expertise.
- The burden of proof would be on you, the accused.
- The mountain of factual evidence proving your innocence would be inadmissible.

Is that your vision for America?

On June 10th, in a post on an internet forum discussing the absurdity and lack of awareness of 9/11 conspiracy theorists, I sarcastically wrote, **"Who will be the first to compare Dylan Avery to Martin Luther King Jr...?"**

<http://forums.randi.org/showpost.php?p=1697300&postcount=2345>

The next day, June 11, you posted this new literature on your blog, and said it would be included in your DVD packaging:



Part of your text reads, **"We will be there in order to educate the police, fireman (sic), family members, and citizens who are still unaware that 911 was indeed an inside job!"**

It is incredibly inappropriate for you to use the images, not only of Martin Luther King Jr and the Civil Rights Movement, but of the Black Power Movement. Mr. Avery, you have laughed along during **two** radio interviews with far-right wing, militia-promoting, anti-multiculturalist John Stadtmiller. Like you, he expresses the desire to see certain people tried for their crimes once the U.S. is "retaken" by "patriots." Apparently he thinks that one of the first to be tried should be Morris Dees, **Director of the civil rights organization The Southern Poverty Law Center.**

<http://www.splcenter.org/intel/intelreport/article.jsp?aid=414>



Worse than that, the three of you spent an hour being interviewed by Eric Hufschmid, who proudly calls himself not merely a Holocaust denier, but a "HoloHoax Exposer." During that interview you respond to Hufschmid's criticism that you don't place enough blame on the Jews by saying, **"Take our word for it: we're**

well aware of the Illuminati and the New World Order, and we're well aware that there are people who want an all-Jewish state. We realize that all these things exist, but that's not what we're about. Your video, and Alex Jones's video, cover these things beautifully, and there's no need for us to cover these same topics. ...I just hope you can support us." Jason Bermas tells Hufschmid, This not just about Cheney and Rumsfeld and those guys. But by piercing them, **we're hoping to get to the bottom of this [\[Zionist\]](#) criminal network that you talk about.**

Sucking up to a Holocaust denier? How low can you go? I submit that if you need people like Stadtmiller and Hufschmid to advance your message, there's something very wrong with your message.

Do you really think you have earned the right to use Dr. King's words and image?

And what is the purpose of that flyer? To encourage people to join your **protest** at the Ground Zero **memorial** on September 11, 2006. Later in this document we will find many more quotes like this one:

Avery: "I'm organizing the biggest protest ever for this year at Ground Zero on Monday ([September 11](#)). We've got a few hundred people already, and we're trying to get it to a few thousand. This is gonna be the mainstream media event of the year! The major media everywhere is gonna be there, and if they wanna cover the memorial, they're gonna have to cover us, because there's so many of us in numbers. And that's the first step. Because if we don't do it this year, the mainstream media is going to be able to continue to ignore us. If nothing happens, a year later we're just gonna go to the White House and wait there until something is done." (2)

You may be joined on 9/11/06 by thousands of supporters, but judging by your past behavior, I know two things that will be missing: facts that support your allegations, and respect for the victims of 9/11. If that's your choice, then I'll be by your side the whole day, quotes in hand, making sure the media and the public see how selfish and ignorant your message is.

From the "Loose Change" DVD package

What if September 11th was not a surprise attack on America, but rather a cold and calculated genocide by our own government?

We were told the twin towers were hit by commercial airliners and subsequently brought down by jet fuel. We were told the Pentagon was hit by a Boeing 757.

We were told that Flight 93 crashed in Shanksville, Pa. We were told that 19 Arabs from halfway across the globe, acting under orders from Osama Bin Laden, were responsible.

What you will see inside will prove without a shadow of doubt that everything you know about 9/11 is a complete fabrication.

Provocative words. I'll bet that text sold a lot of DVDs. Unfortunately, what I found inside the DVD package is that almost everything **you** know about 9/11 is a complete fabrication. Did you really not expect anyone to check?

Let's take a look at one simple claim you make in "Loose Change Second Edition," which is that approximately \$166.8 billion (\$166,800,000,000.00) worth of gold was stolen from vaults beneath the World Trade Center. You imply that the aircraft attacks were a diversion that allowed the thieves to escape with the gold, but that the thieves' timing was off and that some of the gold was found in a dump truck on a ramp beneath the WTC. In my critique I showed you that these claims are completely wrong, and that the \$230 million of silver and gold (the vast majority was silver) beneath WTC #4 was all recovered from the locked vaults where it was stored.

I also point out to you that \$167 billion in gold is far more than the entire U.S. gold reserves, and would be about 56% of the world's supply as of September, 2001.

Okay, you screwed up and didn't take the five minutes necessary to check your story. That's an easy correction to make.

But you've done the opposite. In recent interviews, which I transcribe in this document, and in which all three of you participate, you claim that the stolen gold may amount to more than **\$1 trillion** (\$1,000,000,000,000.00). That is several times the amount of the entire world's gold reserves. If that gold existed, and if each getaway truck carried 10,000 lbs of it, it would have taken over 22,000 truckloads to move it.

That's one small example of how your methods have failed and continue to fail.

Do you intend to present this kind of "research" in the upcoming version, which you say will be released in some theaters? Mr. Avery, you've said that the new version will be "100% airtight." Pardon me if I'm skeptical. You're STILL claiming that flight 77 didn't hit the Pentagon and that flight 93 didn't crash in Pennsylvania. In fact, you and Mr. Bermas took the time to come to New York to PROTEST and distribute DVDs at the premiere of the movie "United 93," an event attended by families of that flight's victims. I was there. I observed your disgraceful behavior. (More on that episode below.)

We're talking about the events of September 11, 2001 here, guys. Does the truth matter to you at all? Is any of this sinking in? Are you going to stay on

this path, which has already led to ridicule and which can only lead to more? Don't you want to be able to hold your heads high in the future and not be snickered at? Buck up, guys. Take a step back and review what you're doing. You're making public fools of yourselves. And it's one thing to be foolish, another to be arrogantly foolish.

Since you don't appear to have read my critique, I would like to sit down with all three of you for a day and go over your claims. I'll show you exactly where you go wrong, why your sources are bad, and you will hopefully leave the exchange with enhanced critical thinking skills. If you choose not to believe the evidence I present, I will direct you to other legitimate sources of information.

But if you choose to continue spreading misinformation and baseless allegations, I will continue to expose your dishonest behavior.

I'm not saying that facing the facts will be easy. But the longer you wait, the harder it will be.

Keep in mind that the people in the media who have supported you may be far more interested in money and ratings than in your message. Controversy sells. Their attention does not validate your claims. As long as the Alex Joneses, Daniel Otts and John Stadtmillers of the world are around, nutty theories will flourish on the airwaves. You accuse the mainstream media of bias, but what could possibly be more biased than some of the media sources you commonly cite, and those who uncritically interview you and praise your video?

I hate to see good people back themselves into a corner. You have the chance to apply your energy to useful goals. The events of 9/11 raised many legitimate issues, and there will always be politicians whose feet need to be held to the fire to be sure those issues are being addressed.

I hope you will accept my offer. How could it possibly harm you to look at some facts about 9/11? My email address is itmatters@mail.com

Sincerely,
Mark Roberts

.....

"The truth is out there, and it's so easy to find." –Dylan Avery (19)

"It's going to be a very good year for the truth." – Dylan Avery (5)

Most of this document consists of excerpts of interviews with the three Louder Than Words members, predominantly with Dylan Avery. I separated the various quotes into categories, to better follow the thought processes involved. Near the end is a nearly complete interview involving all three men, which will give you an idea of how they present their case in an extended format. And of course there's the Jason Bermas interview, which is a truly bizarre read.

Although in this document I often comment on the claims being made, this is NOT meant to be a thorough examination of those claims. For that, I refer you to my "Loose Change" critique, which also has a list of decent list of links to 9/11 myth-debunking sites and to many of the official investigation documents. The best single internet source for 9/11 debunking is 911myths.com.

My comments will be in *blue italics*. **Bold** text means the emphasis is mine. When the emphasis is by the speaker, it is in ALL CAPS. Some abbreviations: LC is "Loose Change," CT is "conspiracy theorist" or "conspiracy theory," CD is "controlled demolition." In some cases involving multiple Louder Than Words interviewees, it was hard to tell which of the three men was speaking. I apologize if I misattributed some quotes.

Where quotes are followed by a number in parentheses, the corresponding sources are listed below.

- 1) The Edge AM Daniel Ott with Dylan Avery May 13, 2006 www.theedgeam.com/interviews/audiofiles.htm
- 2) Eric Hufschmid telephone interview with Avery, Rowe & Bermas 4/28/06 www.erichufschmid.net/Avery-Rowe-Bermas-Hufschmid-phonecall.html
- 3) Black Ops Radio interview with Avery May 14, 2006
- 4) CBC TV Canada interview with Avery May 17, 2006 <http://resurrectingthelede.blogspot.com/2006/05/loose-change-author-on-canadian.html>
- 5) Video interview with Avery April 30, 2006
http://wnymedia.net/video/DylanAveryInterviewLooseChange_300k.wmv
- 6) WingTV audio file with Avery
http://911underground.com/WING_TV_2004_11_01_Dylan_Avery_interview.mp3
- 7) Republic Broadcasting Radio interview, John Stadtmiller with Avery 12/6/05
<http://mp3rblive.com/stadt05.html>
- 8) Press Release Arizona tour http://s15.invisionfree.com/Loose_Change_forum/index.php?showtopic=4527
- 9) WingTV segment re: Naudet brothers legal action against Avery May 30, 2006
- 10) Fox News Binghamton story on LC <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ms13FpoTv8search=dylan%20avery>
- 11) Loose Change review: Changelinks Progressive Newspaper www.changelinks.org/loosechange.htm
- 12) Alex Jones interview with Avery 1/19/06
- 13) Republic Broadcasting Stadtmiller with Avery & Jayhan 8/9/05
http://mp3rblive.com/stadt/050820050809_Tue_Stadtmiller/.mp3
- 14) Article: DavidCogswell.com May 23, 2006
- 15) Loose Change Second Edition Extras Ground Zero September 11, 2005
- 16) Deadline Live radio interview Jack Blood with Avery 4/7/05 <http://www.loosechange911.com>
- 17) The Brothers Plue podcast 12/29/05 http://www.plueballs.libsyn.com/index.php?post_id=44295
- 18) Loose Change Second Edition West coast Premiere May 2, 2006 Part 1
<http://video.google.com/vidplay?docid=810472779099754665>
- 19) Beyond the Ordinary Radio interview with Avery & Rowe
- 20) Beyond the Ordinary Radio interview with Avery & Bermas
- 21) Beyond the Ordinary Radio interview with Bermas
- 22) Air America Phoenix Fred McChesney interview with Avery, Rowe, Bermas 4/15/06
www.truthseekers.org/uploads/Loose_Change_guys_on_radio_911TruthSeekers.org.mp3
- 23) LC2E review: <http://www.911blogger.com/2005/12/loose-change-second-edition-full.html>

On the Victims of September 11, 2001

Dylan Avery on the passengers aboard flights 77 (Pentagon) and 93 (Pennsylvania):

They didn't die on these planes as we are told. There is actually some evidence that some of these people were already dead before 9/11. (1)

.....
Phil Jayhan, "Loose Change" original producer, being interviewed along with Avery:

I'm not sure about, you know, what they did with the airplanes, and how they pulled off the whole operation, but flight 11 (north tower) and 77, those two flights didn't exist. (13)

Dylan Avery makes no objection to this statement.

.....
"Loose Change Blog" entry by Dylan Avery, April 25, 2006

Oh, Paul Greengrass. Say it to my face.

Greengrass is the director of the film "United 93" which received wide critical and popular acclaim.

So...Paul Greengrass' **atrocitiy of a film** opens the Tribeca Film Festival tonight at 7:30 PM.

Avery had not seen the film, as its premiere was that evening.

WHERE: Ziegfeld Theatre 141 West 54th Street New York City, NY

WHEN: Tuesday, April 25, 2006

6:30 PM Filmmaker **and Family Arrivals**

7:30 PM Screening Begins

We'll be there. How 'bout you guys?

EDIT: Let me clarify...we're not actually going to watch it. We're going to make our presence and our objections to this big-budget whitewash known, which are echoed by anyone who didn't lose a family member on Flight 93.

*I have never heard of anyone objecting to this film, aside from 9/11 conspiracy believers. **And how about those who did lose family members, Mr. Avery? They aren't worthy of your respect?***



Jason Bermas, left, argues with an NYPD officer about being restricted to a "protesters zone" at the premiere of "United 93," which was attended by victims' families. April 25, 2006

In response to Avery's blog post about "United 93," a "Loose Change" fan made this comment, which displays typical conspiracy theorist logic:

"I actually saw the movie yesterday, and being a firm believer of the inside job, I think they did a very good job unfortunately. If someone sees this movie before Loose Change, it would make it twice as hard to try and make yourself disbelieve the Government's story. The movie makes the events much more real to the viewer, it's a shame what this movie will accomplish." Posted by **UNSCleric** on Saturday, April 29, 2006 at 7:02 AM

.....
On the conspiracy theorist idea that the fires in the WTC weren't very hot:

Host: What about the people looking outside the hole in the towers. I mean, if it was hot enough to melt the beams, how is it people were waving from the impact area?

No one has ever claimed that the fires had to be hot enough to melt steel in order to bring down the already severely damaged buildings.

Avery: **I mean, you have Edna Cintron, which is actually the woman who is looking out the gash in the World Trade Center. I mean, this woman is standing there, I mean, she's just looking out the hole, and I mean, there's supposedly 2,000 degree inferno right behind her, and, I mean, she's able to stand here and look out this hole and wave for help. I mean, her clothes aren't on fire, I mean, her clothes aren't even singed from what we can see. (1)**



North Tower



North Tower

.....

Host: You're saying a plane didn't hit the Pentagon. But there are 59 families who are missing loved ones. What do you suggest happened to the people who were on this plane?

Avery: **I mean, hey, man, I can't sit here and lie about the family members and say that either the passengers were in on it, or that the family members are government agents. I mean, I'm not saying that. I mean, these people who lost their loved ones, I mean, their loved ones are obviously dead, they're obviously gone, I mean, I'm not saying that they're on a payroll somewhere, I mean, I'm just trying to ask questions, I'm not trying to accuse anybody of covering something up, well, I mean, I'm obviously accusing the government of covering something up, but, I mean, I'm not trying to implicate the passengers, because, I mean, they're just as innocent as anyone else, man."** (4)

.....

Avery: **Well, probably not in the case of flight 93 – if flight 93 existed, that is...** (16)

.....

Avery on flight 77: There were a number of employees of Raytheon, which is the developer of the Global Hawk, there was actually three members of Boeing on that plane, um, EMS Solutions, which I think is a company that develops ballistic and cruise missiles. **There's a lot of different theories about this, but it seems like either these people were a part of 9/11, and they told them, like, 'Yeah, get on this plane, we're gonna take you to a conference, and that was the end of that. Or, they were already in the wing of the Pentagon,** because , you know, the Navy is the one that got hit, and they were either already in that wing and they just made them passengers, but, I mean, there's really no way to absolutely tell.

The other thing which I didn't get to mention in the movie, **which I'm going to,** is a little kid by the name of Bernard Brown Jr., a eight or nine-year-old boy [\[he was 11\]](#) who on the morning of 9/11 was going on a National Geographic field trip with his class, and on that morning his father, Bernard Brown Sr., who works in the Navy wing of the Pentagon, sat his son down and had a talk with him about death, because his son was scared about flying on the plane, **or whatever.**

And Bernard Sr. was like 'Hey, don't be afraid to die, because everybody's gonna some day," **and his son got on flight 77 and we know what happened to that. Oh, actually, we DON'T know what happened to flight 77, but we do know what happened to Bernard. And Bernard Brown Sr., according to his wife, took an UNUSUAL day off from work to go play golf. Like, this is a man who never took a single day off of work, and after telling his son not to be afraid to die, he takes a day off work to go play GOLF, and had he not been on the golf course, he would have been killed.**

Host: Has anybody tried to question him?

Avery: "Um, me and Phil [\(Jayhan, "LC's" original producer\)](#) were actually considering tracking him down and getting him on the phone, **to talk to him about 9/11 and see if anything slips. But I think he was either deeply involved in it, and talking to him on the phone might not be such a hot idea, or talking to him about sending his son to die might be a bad idea.** Since that article was published...by MSNBC, I believe nobody's actually tried to contact him, and **we actually haven't heard from him since.** (6)

*Who hasn't heard from the father of the dead boy, Mr. Avery? **You and Phil Jayhan?** Does carrying the Olympic Torch count? http://www.dcmilitary.com/army/pentagram/7_01/local_news/12979-1.html*

.....

On the "Loose Change" Forum, which was started by Dylan Avery and is moderated according to his wishes, a section devoted to discussion of the "alleged" passengers.



.....

On flights 77 and 93

Bermas: The other big question we get all the time is, "Well, where did the people go?" And our answer to that is, the fact is, we really don't know. And we really need a serious investigation to find out.

But...**the people are really secondary.** (18)

.....

.....
Avery, about the planes and the victims on them: **I would like to think that these four planes are still flying around.** (1)
.....

Bermas: We need whistleblowers. **Members of victims' families** and people like you and I need to come forward to get whistleblowers to come forward. (11)
.....

On flights 77 and 93

Bermas: Well, honestly, the thing is with the bodies and the people is, **WE didn't say those people are on the planes, so we shouldn't be the ones to have to prove it. The government is the people saying these bodies and these people are on these planes, come and show us the pictures. Show us the body parts.** Show us some identification that these people you know, were actually there. I'm not saying that a lot of these people weren't alive or weren't real, but it just comes to the fact that there are no bodies there. So explain to us why not, because there's seriously a problem. (22)

Bermas omits the fact that the remains of every passenger but one (a two-year-old) were recovered from the crash scenes and positively identified. In addition, personal effects from many passengers were recovered and returned to the families of the victims. Remember, Bermas is the "researcher."
.....


On Todd Beamer's "Let's roll" phone call from flight 93:

(Avery, Rowe or Bermas): **It's a total joke.**

(Avery, Rowe or Bermas): **It's fiction.**

Host: **It's an American slogan to get us motivated to do something about terrorism.**

Avery: **It was a war cry.** (22)
.....



Loose Change Second Edition Closing Message

Ground Zero, September 11, 2005. Dylan Avery is proud to be videotaped trying to convince a 9/11 widow that the U.S. government murdered her husband.

Avery: I would love to give you a copy of my documentary "Loose Change." **...The reason I'm doing this is because I believe your husband deserves the truth. I believe your husband – I want to be honest with you – our government killed your husband. Without a doubt."**

Widow: He was murdered... *[she has already made it clear that she believes the Islamic terrorists were responsible]*

Avery: **It was cold, calculated murder. But it was not some guy in a cave thousands of miles away. I know it's very hard to accept, but I've been researching this for three years, and I have seen so much, so much proof, it's just like, it's overwhelming. I mean, it comes to a point where you just see all this in front of you and you say, 'No way. There's no way what our government is telling us is true.'**

At 22:20 on the video

Avery: **Do you know who ran security at the World Trade Center? Marvin Bush.**

Widow: Oh, no, I didn't know that.

Avery: **Go figure, right? (Laughs) It always comes back to a Bush! (Laughs) (15)**

False. Marvin Bush did not "run security" at the World Trade Center.

.....
Ground Zero 9/11/05 Jason Bermas is videotaped lying while arguing with volunteer firefighter Paul Isaac Jr, who objects to Bermas promoting "Loose Change" at Ground Zero on the anniversary of 9/11.

Bermas: **I don't know one person here. Not one person.**

He's standing right next to Dylan Avery, and he certainly knows the cameraman, who has been with him all day.



*Jason Bermas, left; Dylan Avery, beneath flag; Paul Isaac Jr., right
From "Loose Change Second Edition" Extras*

Isaac: **Maybe you should take this up in a court of law, and not at people's funerals. Why are you insulting these people?**

Bermas: Because I'm not going to wait 40 years for the truth to come out, sir.

Bermas, to a stranger: The Bush family fortune came from Nazi gold. His grandfather, **Prescott Bush, was a Senator, okay? From '35 to '51 he was Averill Harriman banking corporation's CEO, and the Nazi's top banker. ... We're with the truth.**

For a take on this conspiracy theory, let's ask some real Nazi-haters, the Anti-Defamation League, which fights against anti-Semitism:

"Rumors about the alleged Nazi "ties" of the late Prescott Bush, the grandfather of President George W. Bush, have circulated widely through the Internet in recent years. These charges are untenable and politically motivated.

Despite some early financial dealings between Prescott Bush and a Nazi industrialist named Fritz Thyssen (who was arrested by the Nazi regime in 1938 and imprisoned during the war), Prescott Bush was neither a Nazi nor a Nazi sympathizer."
http://www.adl.org/Internet_Rumors/prescott.htm

12:50

Bermas to a stranger: The CIA, at 8:30 in the morning, running four drills with hijacked jets running into buildings. **Everybody knows NORAD stood down that day.** First time in history. ...They don't see four [hijacked jets on their radar screens]. They see 20!

He's making that up. No such drills involving fake hijackings took place on 9/11. There is no evidence that NORAD "stood down." Bermas is spreading falsehoods to strangers at Ground Zero on the anniversary of 9/11.

FEMA's here the night before because they're running a bioterrorism drill! What else needs to be said?

Wrong. FEMA was to begin a drill in NYC on the 12th. The idea that they arrived before 9/11 is based solely on a mistake about the day of the week made by a stressed-out FEMA supervisor during an interview. The story is easily checked.

I've got a hundred more points that I could make on the matter. But the bottom line, meat and potatoes, it's in the video evidence. Bottom line. It's there. **And this was an inside job, up and down.**

13:20

Bermas to a stranger: **Do you know who was the head of security here? Until 9/11? His last day was 9/10. Head of Securacom. Marvin Bush! Marvin Bush was the head of security here!**

He's making that up. Marvin Bush was on the Board of Directors of Securacom, which provided some WTC security amongst many other jobs, until June of 2000. Bush had nothing to do with running security at the WTC.

Want to know who took his place? Deputy Director of the FBI John O'Neill. The only man in the FBI that had the balls enough to go after al Qaeda...his first day is on September 11th, and he's killed, and silenced! What else needs to be said? Why was that not brought up in the [9/11] Commission?

Because it's false, Mr. Bermas. Have you ever checked a fact? O'Neill's position at the WTC had started weeks before 9/11. He died in the south tower after reentering it to help with rescue efforts. (15)

.....

Avery: I have those lingering moments when I start to doubt what I'm doing, you know, 'What if I'm wrong? What if I'm absolutely wrong? **But then I get like a hundred emails from family members saying, "I just want to tell you I really support what you're doing, and we lost our friends on 9/11 and we've been searching for the real truth since then, but the 9/11 Commission lied to us."**

All these people got screwed SO BADLY by the government, and the government basically told them to get lost. I mean, **they paid them off, they gave them their hush money**, and said, 'You can't sue us now.' And that was it. And you heard from like three family members since, you've heard from Ellen Mariani and like two or three others. (5)

.....

Avery: **And I think it's kind of ridiculous that Rudy Giuliani is being called as a witness. Who did he lose on 9/11? Like, who personally did he know that he lost? I mean, granted, I'm sorry he was the Mayor, but, he wasn't there. I mean, he was there in New York City, but he was there after the fact.** (5)

.....

Avery: **Nothing's been 100% confirmed, but these people existed, and we get 20-30 emails a day at least from people who lost relatives on 9/11, and I couldn't call them liars, I mean, that would just be ridiculous for me. The more emails I get from family members, the more I'm convinced that the passengers on these flights were more or less real, and more or less real people. The only question is, where did they go? And my theory is as good as yours, because I simply don't know.**" (1)

.....

How to Show Respect for the Victims of 9/11 on September 11, 2006

"They will have to cover us if they want to cover the memorial"

Avery: **Ground Zero this year is gonna be nuts. It's gonna be so insane. I mean, I can't wait. I mean, we're gonna have thousands of people there.** (19)

Avery: **If the media wants to cover Ground Zero, they're going to have to cover us.** (1)

Rowe: **If we get so many people down there, the news media, if they want a wide shot they HAVE to cover us.** (19)

Avery: The biggest thing that we're really trying to get going, is for people who know about this to show up at Ground Zero on 9/11 this year. It's a Monday. We're going to be there early. **And every major media outlet in the world is going to be there. And this is our chance to break through. Instead of being viewed as conspiracy nuts, or wackos, and people need a real cause.** (19)

Bermas: **There's gonna be every major media outlet in the world at Ground Zero, and if they want a wide shot, they're gonna have to cover us, and a hundred signs that say "9/11 Was an Inside Job," and everything else. And if nothing else is done a year later, and there's no kind of progress in a real investigation, some kind of real prosecution so we can get these upper echelons of people, then in 2007 we're going down to the White House, and we're not leaving until something is done.** (8)

Avery: **I'm organizing the biggest protest ever for this year at Ground Zero on Monday.** We've got a few hundred people already, and we're trying to get it to a few thousand. **This is gonna be the mainstream media event of the year! The major media everywhere is gonna be there, and if they wanna cover the memorial, they're gonna have to cover us, because there's so many of us in numbers.** And that's the first step. Because if we don't do it this year, the mainstream media is going to be able to continue to ignore us. **If nothing happens, a year later we're just gonna go to the White House and wait there until something is done.** (2)

Rowe?: Just another point: We're going to be at Ground Zero this year, wearing "Investigate 9/11" shirts, **and every major media outlet in the world is going to be there. The five-year anniversary. We love fives, tens and twenties. The five-year anniversary is gonna be huge.** It's Monday. September 11th, 2006, and we need to be there in solidarity. **We need to be handing out DVDs, information. We don't need to be yelling at people. We need to respect these dead people and bring their murderers to justice,** and that is the bottom line. And this is our opportunity. **The news media won't be able to ignore us. They will have to cover us if they want to cover the memorial.** If there's enough of us there, we can really make an impact. We're pushin' it nationwide. We're gonna be on a nationwide tour all summer. (22)

Avery: I mean, we don't want people to think we're selling out. We've got the T-shirt designs up on our website so people can print them out. I mean, **we want hundreds upon thousands of people at Ground Zero wearing these t-shirts.** (22)

If we could just get one person out of every town in the United States (to show up at Ground Zero), I mean, how many people would... (22)

If we could get 100 people from every state, I mean, WOW! (22)

.....

Bermas: We're going to be down at Ground Zero, Monday, September 11th 2006. ...We have to make it so the establishment has to sit up and take notice and do something. **I'm hoping that they'll underestimate us...they were able to squelch the protests at the G8 summit.** (22)

.....

Reviewer: "I found the section with Jason Bermas at ground zero to be a great show of his character, and I was very impressed with his abilities to rattle off facts back to back to back." (23)


"I got a big mouth, I guess." (22)



*Bermas hawking his conspiracy theories to strangers at Ground Zero, 9/11/05
From "Loose Change Second Edition" DVD extras*

.....

"We're simply just Americans asking questions." Dylan Avery (3)



Advertising, from loosechange911.com

.....

Avery: **I'm just trying to ask questions, I'm not trying to accuse anybody of covering something up. Well, I mean I'm obviously accusing the government of covering something up.** (4)

.....

Avery: **I want to be honest with you – our government killed your husband. Without a doubt.**
From Loose Change Second Edition DVD Extras

Avery: **We're just trying to tread lightly, man, that's all.** (2)

.....

Avery: Like I said, **I'm just trying to get people to ask questions**, and to not assume that everything our government says is 100% true. (19)

When millions of Americans realize that we were lied to and duped and murdered by our own government, people are going to be upset! People are going to take to the streets. And I don't want a violent American revolution, but it's probably going to happen. (1)

.....

Avery: **People who are in the military, and people whose lives depend on the military are not exactly going to be eager to accept this information**, and I don't blame them if they aren't. **I'm basically saying their bosses killed 3,000 people**, I mean, that's hard for a lot of people to accept.

I think we have more people in the military and in positions of power who are on our side and aware of this information than aren't. Granted, they may not be out in public saying so, but I'd like to think if they watched our movie they'd say, 'Oh, yeah, that makes a lot of sense.' " (1)

.....

Avery: **I'm simply trying to ask honest questions of my government.** (1)

Avery: **It's ridiculous. I mean, if you look at every single assassination attempt or terrorist attack against the United States, I mean it always, it almost always, comes back to our own government. It's FRIGHTENING! It's truly frightening! And I don't want to believe these kinds of things, but I mean, the more you look into it, you can only hide for so long.** (3)

Bermas: **Terrorism in this country has always had government backing.** (11)

.....

Avery: Well, I tried to, I tried to stick to the things that were as solid as possible, and tried not to speculate. **Tried to give as little answers and as many questions as possible.** (1)

Avery: **The government wasn't supposed to be responsible for the murder of 3,000 people. ...It's uncanny for anybody to walk away from this and still say, "Yeah, our government's innocent, you know, they had no idea."** (4)

...The cell phone calls were fake. No question about it. *From "Loose Change."*

.....

As I continued to discover more and more evidence, it became apparent that everything we thought we knew about 9/11, everything we were told, was a complete fabrication. **It was during this process that I decided to make a documentary asking the hard questions."** (8)

Avery: **There's obviously some form of government that's controlling things that we aren't aware of.** (1)

.....

Avery: So people hear what the movie's about, for them to automatically dismiss it as a leftist conspiracy theory, or Democrats Bush-bashing, that's not it at all. **We don't mention names once, and if we do, we're mentioning them for a reason.** (3)

A few minutes later, in the same interview:

My conclusion, if I was going to bring anybody into court for 9/11 it would be Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz, and I'd probably bring George Bush in, because I'm sure he knew, at least he had an idea what was coming. I'm not gonna say that Bush planned 9/11, because that's a helluva claim to make, and I don't think Bush is that smart. I think Dick Cheney is the number one person in the administration who knows the most, and I think if we're gonna have a trial, he'd be the first person I'd bring in. If you look at this evidence and watch this movie, there's no other way that things could have happened the way they did without our government having some sort of hand in it. (3)

Avery: **Just because we go and point the finger at the U.S. government solely, it's because those are the people we can bring into court. We can't go to a judge and say, "We want to bring the Zionists into court, we want to bring the criminal network into court. We'd get laughed at, man! You have to name names, you have to name Dick Cheney, you have to name Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz. You have to bring specific people in to court and then work your way up from there.** (2)

Bermas: **I can only bring so many people into court. You start with Cheney, Wolfowitz, and Rumsfeld, because Cheney signed that memo, and those are the – Secretary of Defense, Assistant Secretary of Defense, and at the very least they'd have to know after the fact. At the VERY least, with all this evidence, they'd have to know after the fact, and I'd have to take them to court. And from there, we just gotta work our way out, because officially, they're saying this attack cost less than half a million dollars to run. And that's kind of an out for them, because they don't need big money. It can't be followed back there. But again, until we bring this stuff to court, and a good number of our population realizes how corrupt our government can be, we're not going to be able to trace that money.** (2)

.....

Avery, on the 9/11 Commission: **Twelve of the scummiest people in the country.** (1)

.....

Avery: **I would like to see George Bush walk out of office and into a jail cell. Or at least into a court room. I don't think he deserves a jail cell. I don't know what he deserves, but...I would like to know for a fact who was responsible and I would like to take it from there.** (5)

Host: I mean, my gosh, can you imagine if you had that amount of money, you probably could have made a full length motion picture and distributed it to theaters.

Avery: **Yeah, it would have probably been in theaters by now, and Bush would probably be in a jail cell. ...Hang him from the torch on the Statue of Liberty.**" (7)

Host: **They should be lynched for this!**

Avery: **You're right. You're absolutely right.** And the fact that people would much rather come home and watch 'American Idol' than stand up and fight for their country, it's absolutely baffling. (3)

Avery on George Bush: **"I'd like to think he's just being manipulated by his higher-ups."** (1)

Avery on the Bush Administration: **I mean, it's the biggest group of criminals we've ever seen in this country. It's just so blatant.** (5)

.....

Host: **Dylan, does George Bush hate you for this?**

Avery: **I would imagine he does. Well, he may not hate me for it, but I'm probably just another thorn in his side.**

Host:: **Do you think you're on some kind of list now?**

Avery: "I would imagine so. I can still fly safely, so I'm not on the no-fly list, but **I'd like to imagine that I'm on some list somewhere.**" (1)

.....

The classic conspiracy theorist fallacy: there's no need to do the necessary work in the real world to find answers when I can hide behind the self-righteous, self-perpetuating mantra, "Why isn't anyone addressing my questions?"

Host: **I don't think it's our job to explain what this is. Our job is to say, "Here's a question. Why isn't anyone addressing the question?" This is what we get wrapped up in quite a bit, Dylan, is we have to prove our whole conspiracy theory, but I see this quite the other way around. I see the government, the Bush administration needs to prove their conspiracy theory.** As we rolled through this video today, it seems like their theory, their conclusion of events, their company line of what happened on 9/11, is full of holes. It's like Swiss cheese.

Avery: Well exactly. A theory is something that, um, believe – correct me if I'm wrong, **but a theory is something that hasn't been proven YET. It's merely an idea, right? The official story is a theory, 'cause they can't prove it.** (16)

The word "theory" is often misused by CTs. They seem to think that a series of assumptions amounts to

a "theory" that's on par with a theory that is substantiated by a mountain of facts. A theory that is comprised of 5% fact and 95% speculation is not equal to a theory that is 95% fact and 5% speculation. For more on theories: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory>

Host: Your video and others does a pretty good job of proving that their THEORY isn't wrong, so that becomes NOT a theory in this case, but again you're refuting another theory. (??!!)

Avery: **Exactly.** (16)

.....
On the 9/11 Commission

Avery: **A total joke. I mean, every single member of that Commission was compromised.** I mean, Keane, I mean, the head of Amerasia, I mean, like all these people, like, one guy co-wrote a book with Condoleezza Rice. I mean, there's ties to Enron, I mean, the Iran-Contra scandal, I mean, you name it, these people...this is not a bipartisan independent investigation. This is not a group of people you appoint to investigate the worst tragedy in the history of the United States. **These are a couple of people you hire to cover up something, I mean, that's what they did in their past.** One of the guys worked for Phillip Morris, defending them, and saying that cigarettes were okay, and he's going to defend 9/11 and say that 9/11, 'Ooh, hey, we dropped the ball.' (5)

.....
Host: Well, yeah, not the America our forefathers founded. We've been taken over. I wouldn't call it a bloodless coup, either. There's been a lot of blood shed, obviously 3,000 people lost their lives, and whenever we talk about September 11th, believe me, that weighs heavily on my mind. We can't forget, just because we criticize the government, folks, doesn't mean that we do not have compassion for **the people that were sacrificed. And I think it was a sacrifice, an illuminati sacrifice on that day of September 11th.**

Avery: **Absolutely. I mean, they died for something that they didn't understand.**

Host: **Cleansing by fire.** (16)

.....
Host: Is that your feeling, that if there is a conspiracy, that the underlying reason is to get us into a war in Iraq?

Avery: There were so many pieces that had to fall into place for 9/11 to happen, and for all those people who were involved to keep quiet about it, they had to have incentive, so....

Host: That leads me to my next point. **How many people do you think it took to pull off 9/11?**

Avery: **Total? A couple hundred. I don't know, it's the first time I've really thought about it, so I'm giving you an estimate.** *The first time he'd thought about it? This interview is from 12/29/05.*

Host: Okay, okay, let's say it was 200 dudes who pulled it off. **Where the hell do you find 200 dudes that evil? You know, without that level of conscience?**

Avery: **In America? That's the easiest! You've got to realize it's not only money, it might be for power. People might have been blackmailed or tricked into doing these things and then after realized what they might have done. A lot of people that I think were involved in pulling off 9/11 didn't really realize what they had done until it was too late. I think it involves**

a lot of different aspects operating individually without knowledge of each other to pull off 9/11. (17)

Avery: **We're just trying to keep it simple, man. (2)**

Avery: It's interesting, because **what they told us on September 11th, and what they told us on September 12th were two completely different stories.** ...these things were so in our face, it was SO obvious that day that it happened, that night they already started damage control. ...From the time the first plane hit to the time the towers collapsed, they were already blaming bin Laden. (3)

Bermas: **What have they told us that has panned out, to be true? Name one thing?**


And some people say to me, 'Well, they didn't lie about 9/11' and I say, **'Well you have just haven't done your research.** Because that is just not the case. **They lied about everything about 9/11.** (22)

Host: Well you could make the argument very clearly that they were unprepared because they never thought that this kind of thing would ever happen, and when it's this significant, they would drop the ball.

Well, that's not necessarily true. I mean, on the morning of September 11th they were holding up to 15 war games which basically simulated exactly what happened on September 11th. I mean, they were simulating hijacked jetliners crashing into the Pentagon and the World Trade Center. They were drilling that, 15 different versions that morning. And they've had drills before that, they had drills in 1999, they had drills in October, 2000, which drilled a 757 hitting into the Pentagon. I mean, the government definitely knew these attacks were coming, at the very least. (4) *Completely false, as is explained later in this document.*

Avery: **Take our word for it: we're well aware of the Illuminati and the New World Order, and we're well aware that there are people who want an all-Jewish state. We realize that all these things exist, but that's not what we're about. Your video, and Alex Jones's video, cover these things beautifully, and there's no need for us to cover these same topics. (2)**

Bermas: It's hard for older people to even LOOK at us when we talk and think that we have anything worthwhile to say, 'cause we're in our twenties.



On the World Trade Center

Host (*about the "pod / missile" theory in the first version of "Loose Change"*): You start off the video with something that people have been talking about for years, (*since 2004*) and you have, I think, some of the best footage of this, multiple angles of this mystery flash that goes off before the plane hits the south tower, the second plane. You want to explain what's behind this flash, at least in your opinion?

Avery: **Um, in my opinion that flash. Ah...I guess it's from a missile, I guess. That would be the best way to describe it.**

Host: Well here's the thing. If you analyze the footage...before impact of the plane you will see a mysterious flash. Of course, it wasn't reported in the mainstream media, it wasn't investigated in the **phony 9/11 Commission CFR whitewash investigation** of 9/11. But it is very provocative, and it does indicate that perhaps there was a preliminary explosion...which would explain a number of things: the large blast that we saw, of course **it would also explain how the plane didn't just bounce off the World Trade Center.**

Avery: **It went right through it.** (16)

.....
Avery gains confidence in the "pod" theory:

Host: It does explain a number of things. I never know where to go with this. This is just so extraordinary that I even have to get to the apex of my open mind to absorb it sometimes. (16)

"Yeah, you're right. **I think it's probably the most powerful piece of evidence out there.**

Host:: **Have you found ANY viable explanation for this flash?**

Avery: **"No. There's none."** (16)

.....
From the "Pot, meet Kettle" department: Avery loses confidence in the original producer of "Loose Change," who got him mixed up in the pod business.

About Phil Jayhan: He said he found the missile. He said that Deb (Simon) found the bomb on the wing. **THERE'S NO BOMB ON THE WING! It's just Phil! It's Phil looking at videos and seeing what he sees and you can't make him think anything else.** I've tried talking to him about that "laser" footage. I mean, Phil, it's a piece of goddam paper. I've got the raw footage from Cameraplanet. I'm telling you it's a piece of paper. But he's like, 'No, it's a laser and I can prove it.' " (2)

.....
Host: Phil Jayhan also influenced Dave van Kleist's video ("In Plane Sight")

Avery: **Well, yeah, at the time I thought it (*the "pod"*) was valid evidence. That's why I left it out of the second version.** (2)

The "Pod" is by far the most controversial aspect of the 9-11 movement.

After including it in the original Loose Change, certain groups and persons made it their personal duty to e-mail us and let us know just how bad of an idea it was.

However, much to their chagrin, the segment was not deleted because of them.

Rather, it was deleted in lieu of the new introduction.

We had all intention of including the sequence on this DVD, however, due to space limitations, it has been left on the cutting room floor.

We mean no disrespect to Phil Jayhan, Dave VonKliest, or anyone else who has stood by this evidence.

Avery: **Now granted, somebody was wiring the towers for demolition, don't ask me. I don't even know how they would begin to pull that off. So you got me lost on that one. Granted, it is a large thing to pull off...**

Host: One thing I didn't understand, you talked about the [flashes of] light that you saw from outside the windows, before the building was collapsing to that level., there was visible explosions. You remember that part?

Avery: Yeah, I remember that part

Host: **Well, I didn't see any evidence that that's not normal.** You know, when you have such high pressure buildup, that you wouldn't see some light flashes. And I thought that there was a little bit of a lack of the stipulation that you were making, about that kind of stuff, about how the explosions created certain kinds of effects, things like that. **Did you talk to a lot of people like physicists and stuff like that when you were working on the movie?**

Avery: **I didn't really get to actually talk directly to physicists, because a lot of physicists don't really want to talk to a 22-year-old kid about that kind of stuff. I had to rely on other people's research.** *Ever hear of a high school physics teacher or a college physics professor?*

Host: **In addition there's some video of stop-frames of windows blowing out below the ...if you had tons and tons of rubble coming down and putting pressure on parts of the building that have never had that kind of pressure on them...**

Avery: **If you look at what you're seeing coming out of the side of the towers, they can't be**

mistaken for anything else, because they're very tight, very controlled, and again, you've only seen the first edition, so... when you use the second edition, I found another video that shows, like, a bomb going off on the 20th floor of the south tower, right at the start of the collapse. **I understand what you're saying, because people have brought that up before, but it's just not possible.** (17)

Of course he's just making that up. See my "Loose Change" critique for an examination of that claim. Perhaps he should have made the effort to speak with someone knowledgeable after all.

.....

(After a post-screening audience question about the possibility of remote-controlled planes being used in the attacks.)

Bermas: **Well he evidence that the planes were not the ones they suggested they were is pretty evident.** We don't have [inaudible], we don't seem to have anything identifiable at the Pentagon. And the video of the second plane hitting the tower, all we see it the gray underside of the plane, which should be blue. On top of this, the Pentagon and the 2nd WTC planes pulled high G-force maneuvers that did not seem possible anyway. **...I think the evidence is quite strong that they probably switched drone aircraft during war games, and hit the buildings with separate aircraft.** *Bermas wins my award for having the lowest standards of imaginary evidence in history.*

Bermas *[About flight 175]*: **Just the evidence that it's a totally gray plane, and it's supposed to have markings on it, and not one video on one of the clearest days ever in New York, after all that evidence, can show me that it's a...(to Avery) what airline is it?**

Avery **(under his breath): United**

Bermas: **A United Airlines plane, is pretty evident.**



United Flight 175, the plane Bermas says, in 2006, is "totally gray."

.....

Avery: That's what Giuliani did. He blocked off a crime scene and destroyed the evidence. ...**and completely denied any investigators from coming in. ...nobody was allowed to go in there, nobody was allowed to look at the steel, I mean, FEMA couldn't even go in there.** (1)

He's wrong about every bit of that.

.....

Avery on the south tower: **You've got almost an intact core, and maybe a small fire inside.**

Wrong. <http://wtc.nist.gov/NISTNCSTAR1-6D.pdf>

.....

Host: What is the strongest piece of evidence that backs up your claim?

Avery: Man, um, the strongest piece of evidence I would have to say would be the collapse of World Trade Center building 7. This was a 47-story office building, 300 feet away from the north tower. At 5:20 p.m. on September 11th this building fell straight down into its own footprint in six seconds, which if you do the math, is basically in absolute free-fall.

No, it did not fall in absolute free fall, nor did it fall straight down into its own footprint. See below.

I mean, this was a controlled demolition. I mean, there's no way of avoiding it, I mean, the simple fact is, how could al Qaeda, or anybody else, have rigged building 7 for controlled demolition, which is a process that takes months of planning? (1)

Excellent question. Now take the next step.

Avery on WTC building 7: **Barely even in the damage range...It wasn't hit by a substantial amount of debris.** (1)

Wrong. And if you're using WTC 7 as your new "best evidence," you're in trouble.

Here's a quote from FDNY Chief of Department Daniel Nigro, who was calling the shots on the scene :

"The biggest decision we had to make was to clear the area and create a collapse zone around the severely damaged [WTC 7] building. A number of fire officers and companies assessed the damage to the building. The appraisals indicated that the building's integrity was in serious doubt."
[Fire Engineering, 10/2002]

Boyle: So we go there and on the north and east side of 7 it didn't look like there was any damage at all, but then you looked on the south side of 7 there had to be a hole 20 stories tall in the building, with fire on several floors. Debris was falling down on the building and it didn't look good. ...There was no hydrant pressure...Then this other officer I'm standing next to said, that building doesn't look straight.

Firehouse Magazine: When you looked at the south side, how close were you to the base of that side?

Boyle: I was standing right next to the building, probably right next to it. Firehouse: When you had fire on the 20 floors, was it in one window or many? Boyle: There was a huge gaping hole and it was scattered throughout there. It was a

huge hole. I would say it was probably about a third of it, right in the middle of it. <http://www.firehouse.com/terrorist/911/mag...e/gz/boyle.html>

Early on, we saw a bulge in the southwest corner between floors 10 and 13, and we had put a transit on that and we were pretty sure she was going to collapse. You actually could see there was a visible bulge, it ran up about three floors. <http://www.firehouse.com/terrorist/911/mag.../gz/hayden.html>


WTC Building 7 appears to have suffered significant damage at some point after the WTC Towers had collapsed, according to firefighters at the scene. Firefighter Butch Brandies tells other firefighters that nobody is to go into Building 7 because of creaking and noises coming out of there.

[Firehouse Magazine, 8/02]



Figure L-23a. Pedestrian bridge and debris on Vesey Street after WTC 1 collapsed.

Pedestrian bridge leads to WTC 7 just out of frame to the right. Building 5 is on fire at left, 6 at center. Avery claims that building 7 was "barely even in the damage range."



View from behind WTC 7 (northwest corner of WTC 7 is at left) from Barclay Street, looking towards WTC 6. Verizon building is at right. Note the size of the ejected column in the foreground compared to the fireman. Avery claims that building 7 was "barely even in the damage range."

Below: WTC 7 did more than fall into its own footprint. It nearly destroyed 30 Broadway.



.....

Avery: The twin towers themselves, the north and south towers, both came down in complete free-fall. Which means that 200,000 tons of steel, 425,000 cubic yards of concrete, had to pulverize instantaneously and fall straight to the ground with no resistance whatsoever. (10) *Avery gets five things wrong in those two sentences.*

.....

Host: The south tower registered as a 2.1 earthquake on seismometers, and the north tower as a 2.3 earthquake. What else have you found out about those spikes?

Avery: Well, they're two very sharp, very sudden spikes...they don't gradually rise up, it's one short cut-ter, like one short explosion going off, and then it tapers down for about a second or two. **And a lot of people that study those seismographs, they said that's basically the kind of stuff they register when they test atomic bombs.** You see a very short, very sharp spike, and then it tapers off. (6)

Who are these "people that study those seismographs" who've led you to think that perhaps nukes destroyed the towers? There were no "very sharp, very sudden spikes," and the actual people whose job it is to study those seismographs say you're completely wrong.

"There is no scientific basis for the conclusion that explosions brought down the towers. That representation of our work is categorically incorrect and not in context."

– Arthur Lerner-Lam, Lamont-Doherty seismic center, Palisades, New York.

.....

Avery: Marvin Bush was one of the principals of a company called Securacom (now Stratesec.) Securacom provided the security for Dulles International Airport, it was either American or United Airlines, and from the early 1990s up to 9/11, at the World Trade Center. **Marvin Bush was running security at the World Trade Center. I mean, that should send up a red flag away.** (16)
We've already covered that baloney.

.....

Avery: The government changed its explanation for the tower collapses six times. (16)
Okay, present your evidence for that statement.

.....

Host: There's one more thing I'd like to bring up that you've brought to the forefront that nobody else really has, in focusing on the amount of gold that was underneath the towers there, and I'm just wondering if this was one of the most elaborate bank heists in history.

Yeah, I'm not going to go out on a limb and say that's the reason they did it, but the gold was definitely a key motive. I mean, the fact that they supposedly had up to a trillion dollars in gold, and yet they only find a couple hundred million, I mean, that's a serious [math problem?] right there!

After Avery is off the air:

Host: That's an important point. SO much gold was down there, and I know there were a few stories floating around about this, but there was very little in the way of coverage. It did make me wonder how this was going to be addressed. Were they going to have the army stand around there while they dumped the gold? ...Yeah, from what he's saying, a major shortage in the gold situation there. **And when you consider what's happening with gold right now, boy, I'd like to get my hands on the person sitting on that loot!** It's definitely going up. (3)

.....

Host: **[About the gold stored below the WTC] A hundred and something billion, admittedly there, I mean, gold doesn't just disappear. And then there's just no discussion about it now. You ask the media, and they go, 'We're not gonna talk about those Federal Reserve vaults. Dylan?'**

Avery: **Yeah, we actually cover that in the conclusion to the second edition, we go over the gold that was missing and the empty dump trucks, and the convoy of cars that was found under World Trade Center four. No bodies recovered, which means that basically, these people got out of their trucks and started running. I mean, how did they know the south tower was gonna collapse?** (12)



"I've found that the Pentagon is the easiest sell." –Dylan Avery (13)

.....

Bermas: **What hit the Pentagon? The speculation is there, but all's we're saying is that a Boeing 757 did not hit the Pentagon. It's absolutely impossible.** (18)

.....

Avery: **There's no 757 at the Pentagon. It just simply isn't there. IT DIDN'T HIT THE PENTAGON, OBVIOUSLY, AND THERE'S NO TRACE OF IT AT THE PENTAGON, SO WHERE DID IT GO?** ...If you check the independent pictures and video that was shot right after the Pentagon was hit, you've got a hole that was NO MORE than 16 to 20 feet in diameter on the outside wall of the Pentagon, and that is the ONLY damage to the outside. Again, a 16 to 20 foot hole. **IT'S KIND OF LIKE THE GOVERNMENT TELLING US THAT A 757 COULD BASICALLY DISAPPEAR INTO A GARAGE DOOR.** (1)

See my "Loose Change Viewer Guide" for a comprehensive refutation of that claim.

.....

Host: A quick question about the Pentagon. You've done a lot of exhaustive investigation there. Are you convinced that that was not that jet, that it was some other military jet, for lack of a better term?

Avery: **Am I convinced that it wasn't flight 77, basically? Yeah, hands down.** There's no way that a 757 created that hole, it vaporized in mid-air, except people could identify [inaudible] of the passengers, but they still found pieces of fuselage, but they can't show us the video, you know, it's like they keep picking and choosing their evidence, and sorry, there's no way a 757 created that hole. There's just no way. (3)

.....

Blood: I don't know, but I do know this: the **primary witness** who saw the plane go into the Pentagon turned out to be a Jeff Gannon patron. He was funding GOP USA and Talon News! He's the best witness they have for seeing a plane crash into the Pentagon.

Avery. Yeah, exactly. You know, they say there's a lot of witnesses who say they saw, you know, a Boeing 757 fly into the Pentagon, but you gotta remember a lot of those people also WORK in the Pentagon. **And either that's what they were told to say, maybe they were told to say it was a drill, I don't know. But you have to take these things into consideration.**

Blood: There's a lot of things that never happened before, that happened on 9/11. (Plane "vaporizes" at the Pentagon, three steel skyscrapers fall "from fire")

Avery: **Those are magical Muslims.** They can do what they want. They can change the laws of physics. (16)

.....

Avery: You've got Jamie MacIntyre at the Pentagon saying, hey, there's no plane here...

He's referring to CNN's Pentagon correspondent, who said nothing of the sort. MacIntyre was responding to a question about a plane crashing somewhere NEAR the Pentagon.

"And I took a look at the huge gaping hole that's in the side of the Pentagon in an area of the Pentagon that has been recently renovated, part of a multibillion dollar renovation program here at the Pentagon. I could see parts of the airplane that crashed into the building, very small pieces of the plane on the heliport outside the building. The biggest piece I saw was about three feet long, it was silver and had been painted green and red, but I could not see any identifying markings on the plane. I also saw a large piece of shattered glass. It appeared to be a cockpit windshield or other window from the plane.

From my close-up inspection, there's no evidence of a plane having crashed anywhere **near the Pentagon. The only site, is the actual side of the building that's crashed in."**

.....

Host: I guess without anyone in the military or anyone else revealing any more footage, it's kind of a gray area, except for the small bits of evidence that we do have, just from the quick footage, is what people have to rely on.

Avery: That's ridiculous. **You've got 84 videos of a jet hitting the Pentagon, and you can't show one? ..I mean, we pay for the tape that that video is recorded on. It's legally ours!**

Avery is referring to the CT claim that the U.S. government has 84 videos of the Pentagon attack. That claim is false. According to the response to the FOIA request that resulted in the release of the Pentagon footage after the Moussaoui trial was over, only one video showed anything of the attack. Investigators had gathered videos from security cameras in the surrounding area for review, but apparently none showed the attack. That's not surprising in the least. Security cameras tend to point where they're needed, not at buildings far away. The Pentagon itself is protected by "live" security.

Host: And of course the only answer is, that by releasing it, it would show a conspiracy to defraud the public.

Avery: Yeah, essentially. I'm waiting for them to release a fake video that shows a 757 hitting, but I don't think it's going to happen. There's no way they can fabricate that kind of video. I would LOVE to see it."

Host: I thought it astounding that anything, anything at all hit the Pentagon, never mind the Twin Towers, you could see they might not be ready for that. But you would think, and **one would have to assume, that the Pentagon had orders for every defense to be stood down.**

Avery: **...It's the most heavily guarded airspace in the world. That's confirmed.**

I've observed that the CT use of the word "confirmed" is an excellent indicator of a false statement.

Host: **What about automated missile defense systems?**

Avery: **Oh, yeah. The Pentagon's got 'em on every section of the lawn. I mean, you've got SAM [Surface-to-Air Missile] sites all OVER the place!" (3)**

Heavily guarded airspace? Automated missile defense? SAM sites? No. The Pentagon is an office building in a major metropolitan area, not a military base. It is just over 4,000 feet from the end of a runway at Reagan International Airport. Avery's comic-book world once again does not correspond to reality.



.....

On Karl Schwarz, from whom Avery got the idea that the plane that hit the Pentagon was a military ground-attack aircraft. It takes only a few minutes of "research" to prove that Schwarz's claim is completely ridiculous.

Karl Schwarz, man, he's just a person who I had the chance to run in to, and **I used his research, because I thought it was valid, kind of.** ...The A-3 Research, the JT8D is kind of fishy. **That's why we're leaving it out of the "Final Cut."** (*"Loose Change" version to be issued 9/11/06*)

At the time I thought it was legitimate. It raised good concerns, and I mean, I didn't want to put it in the second edition, we had some internal conflict and we just put it in. I'm not disagreeing with you. **We were going to take it out of the second edition, but we left it in at the final minute.**

In the Final Cut we're going to whittle it down to things that are absolutely provable. We need to make it 100% airtight. **We can't have things like that** [*Karl Schwarz engine part analysis*] **in there.** (2)
April 28, 2006 (see date of next quote)

.....

Host: **And you point out in your DVD the different engine parts that conflict with the official...I forget what number or model it was, but they don't exactly use those same parts and you point that out.** (*He's referring to the "Karl Schwarz" theory described above.*)

Avery: **"Uh, yes."** *May 14, 2006* (3)

.....

Host: You're saying a plane didn't hit the Pentagon. But there are 59 families who are missing loved ones. What do you suggest happened to the people who were on this plane?

Avery: **I mean, hey, man, I can't sit here and lie about the family members and say that either the passengers were in on it, or that the family members are government agents. I mean, I'm not saying that. I mean, these people who lost their loved ones, I mean, their loved ones are obviously dead, they're obviously gone, I mean, I'm not saying that they're on a payroll somewhere, I mean, I'm just trying to ask questions, I'm not trying to accuse anybody of covering something up, well, I mean, I'm obviously accusing the government of covering something up, but, I mean, I'm not trying to implicate the passengers, because, I mean, they're just as innocent as anyone else, man.**" (4)

On Flight 93

"The cell phone calls were fake. No question about it." From "Loose Change."

.....

Host: **You mentioned "Let's roll." That came from one of the gentlemen who made one of the fake cell phone calls on the day of 9/11. You challenge that theory extensively in your video "Loose Change." Tell us about how it is impossible, literally impossible, for all of these people to magically make cell phone calls on the day of 9/11. What might have happened?**

Avery: **The cell phone calls made from the aircraft couldn't have happened.** (16)

False. They neglect to mention that some of the calls were made at low altitude, and others were made using the planes' installed Airfones. Airfones are cell phones. In "Loose Change," conversations from at least six different Airfone calls are quoted, then we are told that none of those calls happened.

A "researcher" tested 5 cell phones on 3 trips in a light plane at up to 32,000 feet and found that the calls couldn't have been made.

False. A pilot who also happens to be a 9/11 conspiracy theorist took 2 phones on 4 trips at up to 8,000 feet in Ontario, Canada, and attempted to extrapolate meaningful data from that.

Avery: The government changed its story and now says that calls were made on Airfones.

False. Their story didn't change. Yours did.

Blood: How high were the airplanes flying? Of course, the airplane in Pennsylvania is the one in question primarily, but how high were they flying at the time of the cell phone calls and do we know how fast they were going?

Avery: **Well, probably not in the case of flight 93 – if flight 93 existed, that is** – but a lot of the other planes were going at cruising altitude, let's say, [flights] 11 and 175, let's say that the flight paths that they showed us were actually true, and that they were going at cruising altitude and then descended before they got into Manhattan. That means they're flying at over 33,000 feet in the air, at over 500 miles per hour.

Over some of the most densely populated areas in the U.S. At least 7 calls were made on Airfones. Remember, these calls would also show up on the telephone billing records. Additionally, some of the calls were connected until the planes crashed. I'd say that was low altitude.

Avery: **And you have people at Shanksville saying there's no plane here, and people just brushed it off!** (1) *Who said that? Certainly not Wally Miller, the Somerset County Coroner, who spent two weeks on his hands and knees collecting human remains. At Shanksville alone, over 1,100 people from SEVENTY-FOUR agencies and organizations were ON THE SCENE. On 9/11 these included:*

- 8 Police Departments
- 7 EMS Services
- 8 Fire Departments
- 10 Emergency Management Agencies
- NTSB
- ATF
- FBI
- CISM

- Red Cross
- United Airlines

That's just on the first day. So everyone in those organizations was either fooled or is lying, right?

In order for your conspiracy theory to be true, someone had to fool tens of thousands of people in the following organizations whose observations, investigations, and conclusions explicitly refute yours:

*the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA),
the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)
the Structural Engineering Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers (SEI/ASCE),
the National Council of Structural Engineers Associations,
the New York City Department of Design and Construction,
the Structural Engineers Association of New York,
the National Fire Protection Association,
the Society of Fire Protection Engineers,
the American Concrete Institute,
the Building and Construction Trades Council,
the American Institute of Steel Construction,
the Masonry Society,
the Pentagon security staff,
The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
hundreds of steelworkers, some of whom built the WTC,
the Council on Tall Buildings and Urban Habitat,
United Laboratories,
the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory,
Controlled Demolitions, Inc.
Bovis, Inc.
Tully Construction
AEMC Construction
Karl Koch Steel Consulting, Inc.
The United Steelworkers of America
the Armed Forces Institute of Technology
the Federal Advisory Committee,
several DNA labs,
Numerous Forensic Pathologists,
Numerous Forensic Anthropologists,
Numerous Forensic Dentists,
Numerous Forensic Radiologists,
the National Medical Response Team,
the International Association of Fire Chiefs
the New York City Police Department Emergency Services Unit
the Fire Department of New York,
the New York City Office of Emergency Management,
the New York State Emergency Management Office,
the Arlington County Fire Department,
the Arlington County Sheriff's Department,
the Arlington County Emergency Medical Services
the Arlington County SWAT Team,
the Arlington, VA Police Department,
the Fairfax County Fire & Rescue,
the FBI's Evidence Recovery Teams,*

*the Montgomery County Fire & Rescue,
the Alexandria, VA Fire & Rescue
the District of Columbia Fire & Rescue
the Metropolitan Airport Authority Fire Unit
the Military District of Washington Search & Rescue Team
the Fort Myer Fire Department,
the Pentagon Fire Unit,
the Pentagon Medical Unit,
the Pentagon 2-person Helicopter Crash Response Team
the Pentagon Defense Protective Service,
several FBI Hazmat Teams,
several EPA Hazmat Teams,
the Virginia State Police,
the FEMA Virginia-1, Virginia-2, Maryland-1 and Tennessee-1 Task Forces
the DOD Honor Guard
the US Army Reserves of Virginia Beach, Fairfax County and Montgomery County,
the Virginia Department of Emergency Management
the Washington, D.C. Fire Department,
the California Incident Management Team,
the Shanksville, PA VFD,
the Somerset County Coroner's Office,
the Somerset County Emergency Management Agency
the Westmoreland County Emergency Management Agency
the State of Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency
the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
the Pennsylvania State Funeral Directors Association
the Pennsylvania Region 13 Metropolitan Medical Response Group
the Pennsylvania Department of Health and Human Services,
the Salvation Army Disaster Services,
the National Emergency Numbering Association
the 911 operators who took the calls from passengers,
the American Red Cross,
the National Guard in D.C., NYC, and PA.,
the Air National Guard,
the Federal Bureau of Investigation,
the United States Secret Service,
the Central Intelligence Agency,
the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms,
the New York Port Authority Police,
the New York Port Authority Construction Board
the National Law Enforcement and Security Institute,
the World Trade Center security staff,
the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner for the City of New York
United Airlines,
American Airlines,
the Office of Emergency Preparedness
Several Federal Disaster Mortuary (DMORT) Teams,
Several Federal Disaster Medical Assistance Teams,
the Fairfax County Urban Search and Rescue Team,
the Virginia State Police
Many other Urban Search and Rescue Teams
the FEMA Incident Support Team,*

*the FEMA Emergency Response Team,
the FEMA Disaster Field Office.
the US Department of Defense,
the US Department of Justice,
the US Department of State,
the National Response Center,
North American Aerospace Defense Command,
the National Military Command Center,
the Federal Aviation Administration,
the National Disaster Medical System,
the HHS National Medical Response Team,
the Counterterrorism and Security Group,
the US Army's Communications-Electronics Command,
the Northeast Air Defense Sector Commanders
three E-4B National Airborne Operations Center planes,
the C-130H crew in D.C.
the Falcon 20 crew in PA,
SACE Prime Power Assessment Teams,
SACE Structural Safety Engineers and Debris Planning and Response Teams,
the Federal Aviation Administration,
the National Transportation Safety Board,
the New York Flight Control Center,
the Air Traffic Control System Command Center in Washington,
the Cleveland Airport control tower,
the Congressional Joint Intelligence Committee,
the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States
the New York Times,
the Boston Globe,
the Wall Street Journal,
the Washington Post,
Newsday,
United Press International,
Associated Press,
CNN,
ABC,
NBC,
CBS,
etc., etc., etc.*

NONE OF THESE ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT YOUR THEORY.

.....

Avery: And let's not forget that flight 93 is still flying high. There's a person who tracks flights for a living. Every flight he takes, he records in his log, and he found a plane, I believe it was in March, 2003, a plane with flight 93's serial number at Chicago's O'Hare airport. (13)

*From "Loose Change:"*David Friedman, a United Airlines employee who records all of his flights. The tail number, N591UA was spotted on Flight 1111, a United Airlines 757.

And no one who works on that plane, flies that plane and has to fill out maintenance reports for

that plane has noticed that the tail number is the same as the crashed plane? The FAA records the tail numbers of every plane on every commercial flight. The tail number for the aircraft used for flight 1111 is N594UA, not N591UA.

.....

Scenes from Shanksville




Debris was scattered over a wide area



GOVERNMENT
EXHIBIT
P290061
01-455-A

M-CSP-00009600



Flight 93 Flight Data Recorder



Flight 93 Crew Log



300 Volunteers gather for a final sweep of the site for remains and debris, three weeks after 9/11

Final Sweep Aircraft Debris Collected



Final Sweep Human Remains Collected



Mr. Avery, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Bermas, United flight 93 did not land in Cleveland.

Proud Americans

I'm not a liberal or a Democrat or a Republican. I'm not even registered. –Dylan Avery (3)

.....

Host: So let's remember where the onus is here, where the responsibility for the truth is here. You know what I always find fascinating, Dylan, is, **here we are, just citizens of the United States, and it's up to us to do the investigation.**

Avery: **Exactly. And we're not making nearly as much as they are. I mean we're doing it, with, like, well, I hate to be corny, with loose change in our pockets. (16)**

.....

Bermas: **A lot of our institutions were built from Nazis. (21)**

.....

Bermas: ...And we're taking it, as Americans, I mean, **this Coca-Cola generation just continues to disappoint.** I can't believe it at points. I mean, I really just cannot believe it. It is, it is unbelievable to me. (21)

You know, *American Idol* finals are on tonight. People can't wait to jump on that. You know, what kind of sneakers I'm wearing, the dress, down to the brand on the bottle of shampoo they have. That's what people care about. You know, they'd rather not be bothered 'cause they've lived so comfortable the last 30 years. And they have a nice family, and it hasn't really affected them that much. They pay a little bit more for gas, they get a little more angry, but, you know, **they couldn't even imagine a horror like I'm describing right now. (21)**

.....

Well, again, I'm not doing anything extraordinary, I'm just doing my job as an American.

.....

Avery: **We're going to try to make this America again, if you guys don't have a problem with that. (22)**

.....

Bermas: I'm trying to motivate people, because they just seem to be so asleep. They want to watch American Idol. They're so concerned with what car they're driving, what house they're living in, and they're really not taking a look at how this country is being eroded. (19)

.....

Host: We're so oblivious, you know?

Avery: **Yes, absolutely. But that's the sad part about America, and we're trying to change that. ...That's the idea, to get people up in arms, and to get the truth out there by any means necessary.**

Host: **Doesn't it seem to you that we're like that story, where if you put a frog in lukewarm water, and very slowly raise the temperature, it won't jump out, and it will be boiled?**

Avery: **Yes, that's actually a very fitting analogy.**

Host: Unless people like you start building a fire underneath us, it's not a very good destiny that we're facing.

Avery: No, not at all. My peers are the ones that are going to be making the future...so I should be educating them more than anyone.

Host: **Well, there's really no educating a large segment of the population. It's beyond that. So you have to work with more malleable possibilities.**

I know there's high school classes that are refusing to watch 9/11 videos, supposed "official" documentaries, because their teachers try to play them, and they say, 'No, we've already seen "Loose Change" and we don't want to watch this. I mean, someone heard that from a friend who was still in high school, and, I mean, that's unreal. I mean, groups of high school students that are banding around my movie, it's kind of cool.

.....

"We wouldn't say that this was a conspiracy movie."

Jason Bermas: (21)

The Man and His Movie

If you want a more diabolical possibility, consider that Dylan Avery and/or Jason Bermas are connected to the criminal network through relatives. In such a case, their relatives may have encouraged Avery or Bermas to create this video in order to give them something to push aside "Painful Deceptions."

*Holocaust denier, moon landing hoax believer, and 9/11 conspiracy theorist **Eric Hufschmid**, 1/31/06*

Avery: I came into this movement naive, I didn't know who to trust, and now I have a better idea.

*Interview with **Eric Hufschmid**, 4/28/06 (2)*

I'm definitely a lot smarter now than I was before 9/11. (3)

***dylan avery** Myspace.com profile*

I'm just a kid who got swept up into this whole thing. I started writing the original Loose Change movie back in 2002, after meeting James Gandolfini, and four years down the line, I'm responsible for one of the most popular 9-11 documentaries out there.

Loose Change Blog entry 4/27/06 Avery: It's funny. I got rejected by Purchase College's film program twice. Now, I'm heading down to Princeton to hold a screening.

Oh...and it appears someone with the same name as me had some pretty nasty things to say back in 2003. I only bring this up because certain people seem to think this is solid evidence I'm a government plant, or a "Jew Hater." No, it's just someone with the same name. That is all.

By your rules, Mr. Avery, it is your burden to prove that you are not the Dylan Avery who hates Jews. Additionally, according to you it's impossible for a living person to have the same name as a dead hijacker. Therefore, isn't it also impossible for there to be two Dylan Averys?

Finally, let's look at some of the similarities between you and the "Jew-hating" Dylan Avery who published some very nasty things on web forums in 2003.

- *Both Dylan Averys believe the U.S. government committed the atrocities of 9/11.*
- *Both Dylan Averys believe the WTC buildings were destroyed by "controlled demolition."*
- *Both Dylan Averys believe that U.S. air defenses "stood down" on 9/11.*
- *Both Dylan Averys are fans of Cynthia McKinney*
- *Both Dylan Averys are concerned that some families of victims may have been ignored by the 9/11 investigations.*
- *The "Loose Change" Dylan Avery has done at least four lengthy interviews with people who blame the Jews, not Islamic terrorists, for 9/11.*

By your rules, you are guilty of rabid anti-Semitism. To me, you're innocent until proven guilty.

I started writing what was supposed to be a fictional story back in May, 2002 about myself and my friends discovering that September 11th was pulled off by the government. It was supposed to be a fictional story, you know, I just wanted to write something cool, something controversial. And I did my research and it turned out that what I was writing might not be so fictional.

So, over the course of two, two and a half years, it slowly evolved from the idea of a fictional feature-length movie, to a feature-length documentary actually telling the truth. And that's where it stands today. ...I didn't want to think this stuff was true. I did my homework and it was, and now I'm doing my part to get it out there. (3)

.....
"However," Avery said, "the more details and facts I began to uncover about what actually happened, the more I realized the wisdom of the timeworn '**truth is stranger than fiction**' adage. (8)

.....
"I was making the video for fun," says Dylan, **and "I released it on the Internet on a whim."** (11)

Really? Then please explain the next quote.

.....
About the first version of "Loose Change," which was 60 minutes long ("LC 2E" is 81 minutes):

Avery: **To tell you the truth, it wasn't 60 minutes at first, it was actually about 50 minutes. But then upon submitting it to the Cannes Film Festival, or actually the idea of submitting it, their guidelines stipulate that a feature film has to be 60 minutes in length or more. So, I kinda had to push myself to get it to at least that hour mark. I mean, it was close to 60 minutes, but it wasn't close enough for Cannes. And, I mean, naturally, I didn't get accepted to Cannes, but the running length stood as is. (13)**

.....
Host: **How did you chose the name "Loose Change?"**

Avery: I don't know. I was fishing different ideas back and forth with some friends for the fictional movie, and "Loose Change" just came out and it sounded right. And it was obviously the right choice. (19)

Bermas: It's called "Loose Change" because the information is out there. **The information is loose,** and there's nothing stopping it at this point. If you just open your mind for a little over an hour, I guarantee you're going to walk away wanting more. **Wanting answers. (21)**

.....
Bermas, about why more information about the involvement of the "Zionist Criminal Conspiracy" was not included in "Loose Change.": We're not as well versed, and it would be just like you say: we'd be regurgitating information. So we're gonna stick to what we know now, and put out an edition that is completely [inaudible], more than the second one is, and that's completely our own, and it's gonna be great. I just hope you can support us. (2) *Bermas is asking for the support of a Holocaust denier.*

The film's popularity inspired "Loose Change 2." "I knew there were things to change, refine," says Avery. "We wanted to make a more solid and digestible film and were getting the same suggestions [from viewers] over and over again." The result is a more polished, accessible, and entertaining version of the original, with some added visual effects and a little bit of editing. "We wanted to open the film in a more subtle way. So we took the pod flash from the intro to draw people into the film," explains Avery.
(11)

Host: **I've seen them all, and by far yours is the best on the 9/11 issue, "Loose Change 2."**

Host: **What was the intent of the second version?**

Avery: The first intent was to accommodate the suggestions of our fans. The second intent was to give it a facelift. Basically to make it look better, make it easier on people who expect an MTV presentation, so to speak. **Our third intent was to clear some things up from the first one. The big one is, where did we get the information on the hijackers? Everybody always asked us that. So in the second edition we took that even further, showed you the articles, showed you where we got them, quotes from the hijackers. We weren't able to find any actual video of the hijackers. People told us that the BBC did interview them, ...but we do have the actual quotes and the articles they came from.** (7)

They showed two articles as sources for their hijacker claims,, from September and October, 2001, before the investigation was complete. If I were Avery I wouldn't brag about showing sources for extremely dated and false information.

*More importantly, Avery neglects to mention the two biggest changes to the video: the deletion of the "pod / missile" claim, which he had formerly said was the **most** powerful piece of evidence he had, and the addition of the absolutely asinine "flight 93 landed in Cleveland" claim.*

.....
Avery: We want people to continue watching our films. We don't jump out there and talk about all the crazy stuff.

We turned down over \$1 million to make sure that this movie is handled in the right way.

We get three to five percent of people walking away and still not believing at least that there's something fishy. (2)

.....
Avery: Michael Meacher. **He's responsible for holding a screening of our movie for British Parliament, coming up.** (19)

Host: This is outstanding work that you have, that's gonna be shown in British Parliament, or hopefully, they're voting on that, you said.

Avery: **Oh, no, it's already voted, it's already gone through. It's already confirmed. It was confirmed a long time ago but we couldn't release it until now. ...If the British people can do it, maybe the American people can stand up and do it.** (3)

[Avery: Loose Change Blog Post 5.06.2006](#)

Following our conversations we now have the go ahead from Michael Meacher. He has organised a screening of Loose Change 2 at Parliament. It is now confirmed for June 14th. We will be showing it to an audience of up to 200 specially invited MP's, Members of the Lords, and lobby journalists.

[Avery: Loose Change Blog Post 5.14.2006](#)

Parliament Funk. In case you guys were wondering, yes. It's really happening... Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

[Avery, on LC Forum](#)

You guys know as much as I can tell you. and I can tell you the screening will happen, regardless. i just off the phone with the Guardian. the Monday after next (the 29th I believe) we'll be in there [in the Guardian], and the article will focus heavily on the Parliament screening, and Michael Meacher's decision to host it. they can't back down. end of story.

[Email from Meacher's assistant, mid-May](#)

"After consideration Michael Meacher is not arranging for this film to be shown in Parliament."

Monica Masson

Parliamentary Assistant to Rt Hon Michael Meacher MP

[Avery: Loose Change Blog Post 5.23.2006](#)

The Parliament screening IS going on, so stop e-mailing me to tell me it's cancelled.

[Avery: Loose Change Blog Post 6.14.2006](#)

Oh well. Suffice to say, the Parliament screening did not go through today.

.....
Host: **"Are you suggesting that this video [["Loose Change Final Cut"](#)] is going to play in national theaters?"**

Avery: "Oh, it's going to. It's already going to happen....**Unlike Michael Moore's movie, we're actually going to tell the truth about 9/11.**" (1)

.....
Avery: We're working on a version of Loose Change 3 for American theaters for 9/11. We've already got the connections to do it, now we just need to make the film to [inaudible] the theaters.

Host: **Oh, so you've already got the distribution? That's good news. That's good news.**

Avery: **Either way, it's gonna be in American theaters.** (1)

Host, referring to 9/11/06: Your film is also going to be screened then, isn't it?

Avery: Hopefully. With any luck.

Host: It's not a firm thing, then?

Avery: It's not 100% firm, but we're almost positive that we're gonna do it. **We're telling people that we're gonna do it, so we're gonna do it.**

Host: What's ahead for you, Dylan?

Avery: Um, I don't know. (19)

Media Relations

The creators of "Loose Change" have mentioned that their big "break" in the mainstream media came with a flattering 2-part series on a Binghamton, New York FOX affiliate.

Rowe?: **We were lucky enough to get on that local Fox News Channel. That was all us.** (2)

Avery, Myspace post:

And, we were on WICZ-40, a local FOX affiliate...four times... Here's **part 1**, and **part 2**.

*But here's the **first thing** that appears on Avery's MySpace page, June, 2006:*



Avery: **Yeah, something that I don't want to say I hate, but there's something about stations like AIR AMERICA, that they claim to be such left-wing radio stations. They don't actually cover the real issues.** (16)


Avery: Loose Change Blog Post 4/12/06

Tomorrow's screening at the Harken Theater, which is expected to draw approximately 500 people and be **moderated by an Air America executive (which has apparently been plugging us all morning)**, celebrates the 1 year anniversary since I released the original Loose Change.

Avery: Loose Change Blog Post 4/15/06

We're going on **Air America** Phoenix from approx. 8 PM Eastern Time to 10 PM Eastern Time. Definitely tune in, it should be a good show.

Promotion for "Loose Change" on the website of Randi Rhodes of **Air America Radio**



Talk show host Mike Malloy of **Air America Radio** said of [Loose Change], "This one is a heartstopper. When you finish watching this DVD you kind of sit there and you'll notice how quiet things are for a few minutes. I strongly recommend that you get this if you are utterly convinced that the attack on the United States was engineered by 19 terrorists boarding four jetliners...because this will shake you to your very foundations." [Loose Change Forum, May 18, 2006](#)

.....

Bermas: Don't take anything we say for gospel. Go to our evidence section, and a lot of the mainstream articles that we source in the movie are linked up. (19) [That's an odd promotion, since Bermas, Avery, & Rowe constantly bash the "mainstream media," or "MSM."](#)

.....

Rowe: That's exactly the type of thing we need, is national media exposure. (22)
[Ah, I get it. The MSM is evil until you need it.](#)

.....

Bermas: **The mainstream media is attacking us more than ever, but at the same time, a lot of people in the mainstream media are no longer attacking us**, they're kind of supporting some of our claims, and asking some of the same questions. (21)

.....

Host: **So you would say that the media is not really a Zionist thing, it's more of a European Monarchy type of thing?**

Bermas: **I would just call them a royal elite.**

Host: **But it's more coming out of Europe than America?**

Bermas: **Absolutely. Absolutely.** (2)

.....

Sales, Distribution, Legal Problems

Avery: It's a big seller! (5)

Bermas: The movie's been so popular that it's hard to keep in stock. (21)

.....

"While certainly not the only 9/11 documentary on the market, Loose Change 2, with its cutting-edge packaging, hip soundtrack, and compelling presentation of material is undoubtedly the most popular, especially among the younger computer-savvy generations.

Seen for free on the Internet, the film is receiving unprecedented Web-based viewership on such sites as Google Video. and Information Clearing House. Additionally, thousands of MySpace.com, YouTube.com, and individual websites and weblogs around the world are streaming the movie.

Through Google's video server, Loose Change 2 recently surpassed 856,000 hits. **"By the time we arrive in Phoenix, we may very well be saying 'over 1 million served' on this site alone," said Rowe.** (April 10)

Similarly, when one searches "Loose Change 911" through the Internet's two most popular search engines, Yahoo and Google, the number of references, links, and postings each are approaching the one million mark.

The latest figures on the filmmakers' own www.loosechange911.com website is peaking at 20,000 daily, with three-fourths of them unique users each day. (8)

.....

Avery: **It's because of the internet, where I am today. ...It's overwhelming, like, over 2 million people have seen it on Google Video now. It's crazy. I love it. ...Two million people out there now know the truth about 9/11. ...That's the best part about of this information: it takes on a life of its own. And there's no stopping it.** (April 30) (5)

.....

Rowe: On Google Video alone it's been downloaded **over 5 million times.** (May 24) (21)

.....

Host: Would you say that you've reached a lot of people who are not that informed otherwise?

Avery: **Absolutely, and it's because of the internet that we've been able to do so. We know from Google Video alone, that six or seven million people have watched on Google Video. That's a staggering number right there. The fact that seven million people have watched out movie for free online, that's outstanding. ...It's out there and it's spreading and there's no way to stop it. Right now there's probably a couple thousand people watching as we speak.** (May 14) (3)

.....

The MP/TV panel discussion will also include the Fair Use Doctrine of copyright law allowing the use of copyrighted work for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research. **One of the most intriguing aspects of Loose Change is that the film pieces together revealing news footage and stories presented to the public within the first**

24 hours of the devastating event of September 11, 2001, but which was never seen, heard, or printed again within American mainstream media after that day. (8)

.....

Host 1: **Watching it today, I could not believe the resources. So much video footage of the actual news broadcasts at the time! ...Amazing footage, talk about explosions happening, inside the buildings, you've heard about them talking about it, but you've not actually seen the footage. (3)**

.....

Avery: **People accuse us of stealing other people's research. We're not stealing it. (12)**

.....

Host: **There's no copyright on this, ladies and gentlemen, so you're able to make copies of this. Now, for the price of \$19.95, and that includes shipping, but it's the information.**

Host: **This is the first time I've ever seen pictures of the lobby of the towers where the marble is cracked off the walls due to the explosions. (*Filmed by Jules Naudet*)**

Jayhan: **When I got it, i said, "How come I've never seen any of this stuff?**

Host: **Half of the stuff I've seen in that DVD I'd never seen before.**

Avery: **Mission accomplished. (13)**

.....

Rowe?: **If someone is going to come after and attack us for what we're doing, then come on, bring it on. (22) *April 15, 2006***

.....

May 24, ,2006

Re: 9/11 Film Footage – Copyright and Trademark Infringement (13115-200)

Dear Mr. Avery:

We represent French filmmakers, Gedeon and Jules Naudet (the "Naudet brothers"), and filmmaker James Hanlon, the directors of the extraordinary documentary film entitled "9/11 – The Filmmakers' Commemorative Edition" (the "9/11 Film") about the terrorist attacks which took place in New York City on September 11, 2001. The Naudet brothers and Mr. Hanlon are the owners of all copyrights in the 9/11 Film as well as all other footage shot by them on September 11, 2001. Paramount Home Video ("Paramount"), which distributes the 9/11 Film, is the exclusive licensee of the Naudet brothers and Mr. Hanlon.

.....

Jason Bermas MySpace.com post May 30, 2006

So here come the lawsuits...

I would like to point out the significance of this footage. It is the ONLY PUBLICLY available footage of its kind. The footage contains the ONLY known video that captured the first plane strike on the World Trade Center, the ONLY footage within the lobby of the World Trade Center, and the ONLY available video interviews of the firefighters that had a first hand account of what happened that day.

Yes. That's what makes it so valuable to the Naudet brothers.

... As far as this being a commercial venture that is simply incorrect. Although **the video is commercially available it is mainly copyright free**, we fully encourage the reproduction, free distribution, and screening of the film. We also offer it freely on the internet where it has been seen and distributed millions of times. We also offer the film in bulk for UNDER cost, you get 10 Barebones DVDs for 30 dollars, after the cost of the DVD, its packaging, CCNOWs cut, and the postage we lose money!

The film has been shown in high schools and colleges across the world, and is constantly being aired on public access across the country with our permission. We also donate literally thousands of DVD's to people. *Good of you to offer other people's copyrighted work as copyright-free!*

We are not the naive "kids" that so many out there would like to peg us as, we simply believe in standing up for the truth despite the costs. Everybody out there should understand that no matter what happens in the long run Loose Change is out there, it has a life of its own, its bigger than any of us at this point, and will outlive the three of us. *A legacy to be proud of.*

I would personally like to thank all those out there who have made this movement possible, **and call out for you to make more copies than ever before as well as distribute the free movie link as much as you possibly can while we work this out.** See you at Ground Zero on 9/11.

While telling the Naudet's lawyers that you're complying with their demand to remove the Naudet footage, you're telling your fans to continue copying the pirated material. Nice.

re: Naudet Brothers & Paramount Pictures copyright infringement action vs. Dylan Avery

Excerpts from Wing TV, May 30, 2006. Victor Thorn & Lisa Giuliani, presenters.

V: Here is where Dylan Avery made his first mistake. In various interviews that we've heard, he's bragging about how many copies of "Loose Change" they've sold. And a number that's bandied about is approximately 50,000 copies. Now, he's selling them on his site for \$17, there's other sites like Dave von Kleist that are selling them for \$20. So if we say 17 bucks a pop, and he's sold 50,000 copies, that's up above \$800,000 in revenue. Now, if they put the same footage out and they sold 25 copies, the Naudet Brothers and Paramount Studios wouldn't be suing them. But Dylan had to brag about how many he was selling, and all of a sudden this was on the cover of USA Today, the front page, maybe a month ago, and the Naudet Brothers are saying, 'Wait a minute, they're generating close to a million bucks'...

About the Loose Change internet forum members, some of whom wrote threatening emails to the Naudet's lawyers:

V: These kids are so naive, that Lisa was calling them the "diaper babies," and I think that's a perfect word, because here they are [the Naudets and Paramount], already pissed off that their footage is be-

ing used without being reimbursed at all, so we're gonna get a bunch of diaper babies to incite 'em more and start swearing at 'em, being all hot-headed. It's unbelievable.

L: **And then Phil Jayhan, "Commander Pod," had to relate an idea from his so-called friend that the Naudet brothers don't even really exist.** (Sarcastically) I think they exist.

V: Yeah, so here we go, this is kinda like the 'no-planers' who say that no planes hit the towers, it's just a hologram...

L: You know why they say that? Because no one's seen anything of them [the Naudets] since the footage came out."

V: Yeah, so it's like bluescreen technology or whatever, so the Naudet brothers don't even exist, they're just a hologram.

L: There was one person on Dylan's forum who was making valid points. A person who has worked in television and was trying to explain to everyone in the forum that you need proper releases from every person you're going to use on the footage. TV stations have gotten into all kinds of legal issues, even over people who signed the release, taking them to court. **And he was trying to explain how that whole system works, and nobody would listen to him, and Dylan was actually present on that thread exchange, and I was sitting there watching it, and they banned the guy. They banned the guy for making valid points.**

V: **Yeah, now this is the Truth Movement. This is a movement that advocates, supposedly, freedom of speech.** You know how many of these little chat rooms ban people when they say something that they don't agree with? Here was a guy who was saying, 'Look, I'm in TV. I'm not a little diaper baby like you 20-year-olds.'

L: We urge Dylan to stop listening to these people around you—

V: —These diaper babies that are 20-year-olds that don't know a damn thing about anything in the world.



The Creators of "Loose Change" on their Critics

Avery: People who attack my movie, they're not even attacking my movie, they're attacking me. There's this one, like, 50-page PDF file [\[it's 146 pages\]](#) floating around out there, supposedly [\[sic\]](#) debunking my entire movie, and the first three pages are basically just insulting me....**These people have nothing to come back with. i mean, I'm giving you scientific, and, you know, logic evidence, and these people are coming back with petty insults. I mean, think about that: I'm simply trying to ask honest questions of my government and why they're saying these things which obviously aren't true, and the best thing people can come up with is, "Well, you're a stupid kid."**

Host: That's not evidence.

Avery: **That's not evidence. That doesn't refute anything. It only makes my case stronger!**

Host: Yeah, sure does.

Host: **People might automatically think that any 9/11 video is wild speculation, but you present evidence that is irrefutable.**

Dylan: Well, I tried to, I tried to stick to the things that were as solid as possible, and tried not to speculate. Tried to give as little answers and as many questions as possible. (1)

May 15, 2006 email to Avery, c.c.'d to Bermas and Rowe

Dear Mr. Avery,

Recently I sent you a link to an updated version of my critique of "Loose Change." In case you missed it, you can view the HTML version here <http://tinyurl.com/jnfp8> or download the .doc file (with an index to all the subjects covered) here: <http://tinyurl.com/epp82>

It has been pointed out to me that you have mentioned my critique to the media and have said that it amounts to little more than name-calling, and that it doesn't refute anything.

Since you're confident of that, I'm sure you'll have no hesitation in accepting my challenge to a public, moderated debate about the merits of the claims made in "Loose Change." I've only been aware of these 9/11 conspiracy issues for a few weeks. You have a four-year head start on me, so won't it be satisfying to take your most public detractor "out behind the woodshed?" I'd like to do this as soon as possible. I am available on short notice.

I suggest New York City as the debate location for these reasons:

- 1) I live there.*
- 2) It is featured prominently in your video.*
- 3) Many members of the "9/11 Truth Movement" live here and would be sure to attend.*
- 4) It is the media capital of the world.*

The event would be recorded on video and made available to the public via Google Video and other distribution services. I'm sure you'll agree that a video of you trouncing your most outspoken opponent would be a great selling point for "Loose Change Final Cut."

Please let me know what dates would be good for you..

*Sincerely,
Mark Roberts*

I received no reply.

Sometimes they ask their friends for help. From an emergency post by Dylan Avery on the "LC" forum:

**Guys I need some callers now, being ambushed here...
I'm getting ambushed on this radio show. This guy's asking me to prove where
Flight 77 is and track it down myself to prove my movie is true.**

<http://www.710kcmo.com/contact.asp>

913-514-3000 http://s15.invisionfree.com/Loose_Change_Forum/index.php?showtopic=542

.....

In Oakland, California, Avery & co. tried to shout down other 9/11 Truthers who were handing out flyers near the entrance to a "Loose Change" screening. Their flyers pointed out errors in "Loose Change."

.....

Avery: A lot of the people who watch it trying to debunk it...then they watch it and they're like, 'Damn it, I was wrong' it totally throws their whole world around."

Host: It's pretty hard to prove wrong, though, when so much of what you present is actual footage of news releases that were happening at the time, of these events, documenting what was actually coming out of the mouths of these people.

Avery: **All we ask it that people investigate these things before taking everything they've heard at face value.** (3)

.....

Bermas: **"We respond to our critics with respect," says Bermas. Viewer comments are encouraged on their website's forum at: www.loosechange911.com. "See the film and form your own opinion," they ask. "Do your own research. If there's real evidence supporting it, please tell us."** (11)

When I started posting on your internet forum in April, giving you "real evidence" that contradicted your claims, you banned me, although I had broken no rules. You banned me because the thread I started was the most popular one on your forum. The administrators of your forum continue to ban almost everyone who disputes your claims.

That banning prompted my interest in what the "911 Truth Movement" was all about. I watched "Loose Change," wrote my critique, and presented you with a draft copy of it when you were in New York City to protest the opening of the movie "United 93." Without having read it, here's what you said to me:

Bermas: **Why don't you go collect your government paycheck? How can you sleep at night?**

.....

After they banned me from their online forum, some of the forum's administrators took to insulting me and my critique of "LC." These people didn't attempt to debate me when I was allowed to post on their forum. They waited until I couldn't reply there. When I found out this was happening, I challenged the worst of those offenders to meet me on the forum where he knew I posted daily. He did make an appearance there – and lasted exactly two minutes. Avery, Rowe, Bermas, and the rest of the LC forum members haven't been able to point to single example where "LC" was right and my critique was wrong.

It's not a "Truth Movement" that you preside over, Mr. Avery. It's the opposite: a club for intellectual cowards.

Miscellaneous Claims & Theories

Avery: There's a lot of garbage in this movement, but we're having this conversation to tell you we're not part of it. (2)

Avery: You really gotta dig deep. There's a lot of similarities between the World Trade Center bombing [\[Bombing? Does he mean 1993?\]](#) and the Oklahoma City bombing, where there's a lot of news reports saying 'We've got extra bombs found inside the building. You know, a lot of that stuff you're not going to be able to see any more. (6)

He's completely wrong about that.

.....
Avery: I think Atta might have been Mossad himself. (2)

There's no doubt that the Israeli Mossad had at least some level of knowledge [\[prior knowledge of 9/11\]](#). (2)

.....
A member of the "911 Truth Movement" was killed in a shooting in New York. The alleged perpetrators were arrested. They apparently didn't know the victim. Below, other 911 Truthers speculate that it may have been a "hit" put out by the group "9-11 Scholars for Truth," thus mocking yet another fatal tragedy.

Host: What about that thing that really got WingTV mad: Michael's murder? They got mad at Dylan, too.

Bermas: We were kind of shocked about that, too. I mean, **do you really think that the Scholars shot him?**

Host: But don't you think that was a suspiciousable [sic] murder, or ought be investigated?

Bermas: Well, yeah, I think it's a suspicious murder, but the idea that the scholars are behind it is kind of ridiculous. ...Let me ask you, who do you think would have been most likely responsible for shooting this kid in the head twice?

Host: Well, I don't know. **It just seems odd that no one seems to care in this so-called 9-11 Movement,** and the kid has got these close connections to this Professor Wood....

Bermas: **I'm not saying that there's zero possibility that someone within the 9/11 Truth Movement had the guy whacked. You know, who knows? It could be an infiltrator. (2)**

.....
Avery: People spend too much time attacking the messenger and not the message. **If there turns out to be a Zionist insider member of the criminal network** [\[influencing the "LC" creators' work\]](#), then fine, obviously we won't work with them any more. (2)

Host: There are whistle blowers ALL OVER THE PLACE in 9/11, but they're being shut down, and sometimes even eliminated.

Avery: Yeah, that's right. I mean, all the firefighters aren't even allowed to speak about it. Trust me, I tried. (16)

.....
Avery: Now you've got that article in Popular Mechanics, I believe the author of which is tied to the new head of the Department of Homeland Security. (16)

He's talking about Ben Chertoff, an editor at Popular Mechanics, which published an article that debunked many CT claims. Ben is not related to Michael Chertoff of Homeland Security. This is yet another allegation without the slightest bit of investigation.

.....
[On the theory that several of the 9/11 hijackers didn't exist, but that the U.S. government falsely accused foreign nationals of being those hijackers.]

Host: Why don't these people come out and defend themselves in public?

Avery: **Well, essentially they did once, and that was the end of it. So draw your own conclusions there. I think if they wanted to, like if they wanted to be on Jack Blood or Wing TV, you know all those other great alternative news sources out there, they would have done it already, in my opinion. Or at least they would have made themselves available, you know what I'm saying?**

Remember, he's talking about people who mostly live in the Mideast and largely don't speak English. Avery thinks they should know about Jack Blood's radio show and a conspiracy theorist's webcast.

Host: Let me be the devil's advocate. Why should my listeners believe that nine of these hijackers are still alive?

Avery: The Saudi Arabian Embassy. They're the ones who made the initial report, I think in December, 2001.

The Saudi government has acknowledged that 15 of the hijackers were Saudis. The families of these hijackers were notified. There is no evidence that any of the 19 hijackers was alive after 9/11.

Host: Wouldn't you say, Dylan Avery, that this is the hottest news story of our day? I mean, where are CBS, NBC, CNN? Wouldn't this be a Pulitzer Prize-winning story? If you can take one of these hijackers, put them in front of a press conference for the world to see, I think that there are a lot of people that oppose the Bush administration that would really benefit from it! Well, there you go, folks, it's called controlled opposition. *Yes, that would be quite a story. Too bad it's impossible.*

Avery: Oh, yeah. Just like Michael Moore.

Host: *[Loose Change]* **asks serious, serious questions, many of them unrefutable [sic] in my opinion.** (16) *The "LC" creators rely in part on the fact that you can't refute a question.*

About the supposedly living hijackers.

Avery: Then again, who's to say that they are alive any more? I mean, they were, in fact, alive after 9/11. That's all we know. We don't know if they're alive anymore, and if I had to guess I'd say they probably aren't. They gotta be dead.

.....
Avery: ...**The PNAC report they released in September 2000, that says, "In order for us to pull off what we need to pull off, we need a new Pearl Harbor."**

No, the PNAC report says nothing of the sort. I cover this thoroughly in my "LC" critique.

.....
Host: **You also allege that Osama bin Laden is not responsible for September 11th, that the government did it and Osama bin Laden didn't, why do you think we haven't been able to locate this guy.**

Avery: Um, because, A) He has either been wiped out, or B) **because he's on our payroll and always has been. He was on our payroll in the eighties, I mean, who knows? But if I had to guess I would say that bin Laden is probably dead.** (17)

.....
Avery: Oklahoma City, obviously an inside job. The 1993 World Trade Center bombing, obviously an inside job.

"You basically have to ask yourself, "Am I going to trust my own eyes, or am I going to trust the government?" (1)

.....
What Avery has on his side:

Avery: **Galileo's Law of Falling Bodies, Building 7, the Pentagon, basically, the obvious physical and scientific evidence that nobody can refute.** (3)

Avery, Rowe, and Bermas on Air America Phoenix April 15, 2006

The Fred McChesney Show

[Introductions of Avery & Rowe]

Host: And Jason, you're the encyclopedic?

Bermas: Well, you know, I've got a lot of information pertaining not only to 9/11, but also to similar issues.

Caller: I have a grandson who was an eyewitness to the attack on the Pentagon. And his answer explains why there were no plane parts found. He's a big student, and has been, of airplanes. And he was there on September 11th, and he said, "**Teacher, teacher, look out the window!**" They were listening to the radio, and she said, "Oh, an airplane just hit the Pentagon." And he said, "No, not an airplane. Bullet." **So I take that as unassailable evidence of eyewitness that it was probably a rocket.**

Host: **Interesting. Where was he located?**

Caller: About a mile away from the Pentagon **at a Montessori preschool.**

Avery?: **Wow.**

Host: This is exactly the kind of stuff that these guys care about. Because it's one thing that's bothered almost anyone who's studied this, is that we have nothing, no footage of the Pentagon.

Caller: And no plane parts. No engine, even. And even the inside pictures don't show any airplane parts. And what happened to the people?

Avery?: **Don't show any plane whatsoever.**

*Rather than refer you to my "Loose Change" critique again, here's a page covering the Pentagon aircraft wreckage, with photos and eyewitness accounts, from the excellent site 91myths.com
http://www.911myths.com/html/757_wreckage.html*

Host: I want to put a challenge out to anyone who believes the official story. If anyone can explain the Pentagon, can explain why someone would talk to an operator, say on flight 93, I'd like to hear it, **because these guys will rip you a new one.** *Way to think critically, Fred McChesney.*

Caller: I'd like you to talk about the whole issue of a stand-down order, the military exercises. It is so difficult for me to believe that our air force was...this shouldn't have happened.

Rowe? Well, the first and original NORAD report had our jets going at about 27% of their top speed. That should have raised red flags right there.

Completely wrong. The NORAD report said nothing about jets going slowly. Here's the real story:

"Also an airline pilot, Duffy had a bad feeling about the suspected hijacking; something didn't feel right. Consequently, he jammed the F-15's throttles into afterburner and the two-ship formation devoured the 153 mi. to New York City at supersonic speeds. "It just seemed wrong. I just wanted to get there. I was in full-blower all the way," he said."

http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/planes/defense/aviationnow_jumpstart.htm

They Otis fighters didn't get all the way to New York City, because they were ordered into a holding pattern in military airspace off Long Island. Flight 11 had already hit the north tower. They did not receive information about flight 175 until after it hit the south tower.

Through other researchers and great work we now have 15 confirmed war games going on at the exact time of 9/11. And the ones that really interest me are the fact that the CIA and NRO building was running a drill at 8:45 in the morning of ramming a plane into a building. Meanwhile, NORAD is running a drill of 20+ hijacked jets on their screen at the same exact time, and they also talk about interjected blips, so these things were going in and out of radar. When the actual hijacked jets were actually reported and you listen to the tapes, they immediately ask whether it's "real world" or an exercise. Because they're pretty much exercising the same exact thing. And through this kind of confusion and compartmentalization, this is how the military-industrial complex pulled this off.

Caller: Oh, my lord! That's sad. That sounds very contrived.

It is contrived, by the Loose Changers. The National Reconnaissance Office was running a simulated accident drill. Nothing unusual there. There is NO evidence that NORAD was running ANY hijacked aircraft exercises on 9/11. That entire story is based on a mistaken statement by counterterrorism expert Richard Clarke. He referred to a NORAD exercise on 9/11 as "Vigilant Warrior," when it was actually "Vigilant Guardian," which did not involve any simulated hijackings. The Loose Changers somehow turned this into "20+ hijacked jets."

Caller (reading question): What is the objective to be accomplished by placing bombs in the towers, other than a complete collapse, if plane impacts are sufficient to be considered an attack on America, the justification for war?

Rowe: Well, supposedly those bombs weren't there. According to the official version, there was never any charges placed inside the World Trade Center. And it's a question of why they would they be in there, and why you would want to bring down the World Trade Center themselves. **I mean, the World Trade Center was built in 1973 with asbestos and other dangerous materials that aren't allowed in today's building world. I mean, they received numerous citations to clean up the buildings. And to clean up those materials would have cost over a billion dollars. So, I mean, yes, running planes into the buildings would have been sufficient enough as an attack, but it wasn't the overall goal of Larry A. Silverstein, who owned WTC Building 7 and leased the rest of the buildings. It wasn't enough for him. I mean, now he's got prime real estate in downtown Manhattan, and after a 220 million investment turned into a two billion dollar profit.**

Caller (reading question): After 60+ intercepts in the previous year, what do you believe to be the contributing factor for failure by NORAD to intercept four hijacked airplanes on 9/11?

Bermas: After 50 years of standard operating procedure, Dick Cheney signs a memo that says that only him and Rumsfeld have the ability to shoot down planes, when regular colonels and lieutenants in the military, if they assessed a threat, they would shoot these things down. So they made it not impossible to intercept them, but to shoot them down without their permission.

Nonsense. That change in policy applied to airborne objects that DID NOT present an immediate threat. And notice that Bermas doesn't address the question.

And with the Mineta testimony to the 9/11 Commission, **one of the few important things to make it through there**, he was in a bunker with Cheney and as the supposed PLANE that was hitting the Pentagon was 200 miles out, an MP was coming in and saying it was 200 miles out, it's a hundred, it's fifty. And Mineta said, "Do the orders still stand?" and Mineta said Dick Cheney snapped at him and said "Of course the orders still stand, and moments later the Pentagon is struck. So I think it was very key to put it into the hands of both Rumsfeld and Cheney as the sole guys that could shoot down a plane, months before 9/11.

Cheney believed he was CONFIRMING the shoot-down order. And notice the repeated false claim that only Cheney and Rumsfeld had authority to shoot down a threatening aircraft.

Caller (reading question): NORAD averaged 2 or 3 war exercises a year in the decade prior to 9/11. Do you believe that, contrary to official reports, prior knowledge of top officials had anything to do with the 15 war exercises being practiced by NORAD on the single day of 9/11?

Bermas: Absolutely. Absolutely. You know, it's too much of a coincidence that supposedly 19 guys with box cutters were able to piggyback onto war games that were almost the same exact thing.

15 war games? NORAD was running three long-scheduled exercises: Northern Guardian, Vigilant Guardian, and Northern Vigilance. Neither affected the readiness of the normal alert fighter bases. On 9/11, 14 fighters were on alert status as usual.

Let's just get off the subject of 9/11 for a moment. The 7/7 bombings in London. Peter Powers got on Sky television, BBC radio and he was asked, "What can we do, are we practicing this enough, are we preparing?" And he said, "**Actually, we were running a drill of blowing up the same three train stations at the same exact time!**" And, I mean, that is just beyond the pale!

It might be, if that's what Power meant. Here's his clarification:

"It is confirmed that a short number of 'walk through' scenarios planned [sic] well in advance had commenced that morning for a private company in London (as part of a wider project that remains confidential) and that two scenarios related directly to terrorist bombs at the same time as the ones that actually detonated with such tragic results. One scenario in particular, was very similar to real time events". <http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/july2005/130705powerresponds.htm>

That's a bit different, eh?

Caller (reading question): What in your opinion is the motive for...the attack, assuming 9/11 was an inside job?

Avery: Well, look at everything they've accomplished since September 11th. Look at the Department of Homeland Security. You have the Patriot Act, which was obviously written well before 9/11. It was over a 300-page document. It was rushed through Congress in less than a week. Actually, they voted on it overnight, right?

Host: Yeah, and a lot of them didn't get to read it. It's there to squelch dissenters, to false wars and profiteering, basically.

Avery: It's basically a blank check to tap anyone and watch anything they choose, I mean, it's ridiculous. And not only that, you've got the invasion of Afghanistan, which as Korey can tell you, if you look

at the maps of the military bases in Afghanistan, they coincide directly with a **\$12 trillion a YEAR natural gas oil pipeline**. It's RIDICULOUS. I mean, these things are right in our face.

*"Natural gas oil?" **United States Gross Domestic Product 2005: \$12.6 trillion. World GDP 2005: \$60.36 trillion.** <http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/rankorder/2001rank.html>*

Caller: I wanted to ask the guys if they've talked to Karen Kwiatkowski

Rowe?: She was the one who was at the Pentagon and on the scene and had walked around not seen any debris or plane or anything, right? It's in the works.

Caller: ..There's a lot of evidence of molten metal that's dripping out of the south tower...

Rowe: There's one available video where we see molten steel pouring out of the small corner of the World Trade Center, and it's preceded by the collapse [sic] about two seconds later.

Sorry, you have no evidence that it's molten steel. Aluminum melts at about half the temperature of steel. If it were steel, the aluminum all around it would have melted long before.

...For those willing, I do know that there are a few exhibits that have some steel beams from the original World Trade Center out there. I believe there's actually one in Albany I've had my eye on. So anybody working in one of these museums, if you want to be a hero, get us a sample!

So, you'd like to steal a museum exhibit of 9/11 material, and do what with it?

Right now it's just the **molten steel** in the basements of 1, 2 and 7. **It's not only highly suspect, it's criminal.**

Again, you have no evidence of molten steel. And no matter what metal it is, what in the world is either suspect or criminal about the tremendous heat within the rubble pile? It took 99 days to put the fires out completely. Are you suggesting that criminals were stoking the fires somehow?

Caller: What, if any, relationship have you been able to deduce between Israel, Mossad, the art students, and 9/11?

Rowe: Pretty much just what you said. We know that Israel warned us of a plan to hijack planes and ram them into buildings prior to 9/11. We know that there were the "dancing Israelis" that were reported on FOX News and were actually held for a little while.

Avery: We also know that a bunch of Mossad agents in Hollywood, Florida were actually staying a block away from two or three of the alleged hijackers.

100% wrong. The "Mossad" agents were a group of young Israelis who were working for an organization that ran a fake art sales scam in different U.S. cities. They were arrested when one of them unknowingly tried to sell artwork to a DEA agent at the DEA office. Absolutely no connection to the Mossad was found through them or their boss or through those who were questioned in other cities. None of them lived a block away from any hijackers. The story is utter foolishness. For details, go here: http://www.911myths.com/Israeli_Art_Students.pdf

Rowe: And we also know that an Israeli business stopped a 2-year lease two weeks before 9/11 and bailed. I think it cost them something like \$20,000.

Avery: 50.

Rowe: \$50,000 to do that.

The company, ZIM, is one of the world's largest container shipping companies. They moved their WTC office to Norfolk, Virginia four months before its lease expired. To them, \$20,000 or \$50,000 is just...loose change.
<http://www.zim.co.il/>

Avery: So there's nothing we can prove. I mean, we don't want to point fingers at Israel for a number of different reasons.

There's nothing you can prove, but you just stated that you know Israel warned us? Please elaborate.

Rowe: I mean, there were numerous intelligence agencies that warned us, and seemed to have some kind of prior knowledge. Israel just seems to be another one of those.

Wouldn't it be great if these "truth seekers" would share their evidence that any intelligence agency in the world had specific prior knowledge of 9/11? That would be front-page news everywhere in the world. Well, I'm not holding my breath, because Avery, Rowe, and Bermas do not have any such information. By the way, guys: Israel is a country, not an intelligence agency.

Host: One thing that's interested me: all that gold. I'd never heard figures anything like. So, no one knows where all that gold went.

Bermas?: No. Nobody has a clue.

Rowe: **Actually, we heard recently that the amount of gold was so much higher, somewhere near over trillion dollars.**

That would be about three times more than all the gold reserves in the world, and it would take tens of thousands of trucks to haul it.

Avery: They found about \$200 million.

The correct amount was 379,036 ounces of gold (approx. \$67 million) and 29,942,619 ounces of silver, for a total of about \$230 million. <http://www.hudsoncity.net/tubes/vaultshudsonterminal.html>

Bermas? **Yeah, and the thing with that is, you're not going to leave \$200 million in gold unless you're going to die.**

Actually, you leave it because it's safely locked in its vault.

Caller: We've heard a lot about false blips on radar screens. Is it your sense that those blips are appearing on NORAD screens or on FAA screens by people that are actually doing air traffic control?

Rowe?: I think both, actually. I think it's a good possibility of both. I mean, that would have caused the confusion.

There is absolutely no evidence of that. According to NORAD, any "false blips" on their screens were immediately cleared when they were notified of the first hijacking.
http://www.911readingroom.org/bib/whole_document.php?article_id=92

A mention follows of Cynthia McKinney asking Gen. Richard Myers and Donald Rumsfeld for details on the war games. Myers apparently told her that they didn't interfere with 9/11 defenses..

Caller: Oh, yeah, in fact they make the claim that it enhanced their preparedness.

Group: Ridiculous. Absolutely ridiculous! If that's their ability enhanced, then there's a serious, serious problem.

They don't say why that would be ridiculous. According to this article, NORAD battle rooms were fully-staffed on 9/11 because of the exercises, with top commanders in place:

http://911research.wtc7.net/cache/planes/defense/aviationnow_jumpstart.htm

Here is the exchange between McKinney and Myers referred to above.

CMK: The question was, we had four war games going on, on September 11th, and the question that I tried to pose before the Secretary had to go to lunch was whether or not the activities of the four war games going on, on September 11th actually impaired our ability to respond to the attacks.

RM: The answer to the question is no, it did not impair our response, in fact General Eberhart who was in the command of the North American Aerospace Defense Command as he testified in front of the 9/11 Commission I believe - I believe he told them that it enhanced our ability to respond, given that NORAD didn't have the overall responsibility for responding to the attacks that day. That was an FAA responsibility. But they were two CPXs; there was one Department of Justice exercise that didn't have anything to do with the other three; and there was an actual operation ongoing because there was some Russian bomber activity up near Alaska. So we -

CMK: Let me ask you this, then: who was in charge of managing those war games?

DH: General, why don't you give the best answer that you can here in a short a period of time and we'll - the gentlelady wants to get a written answer anyway, and then we can move on to other folks.

RM: The important thing to realize is that North American Aerospace Defense Command was responsible. These are command post exercises; what that means is that all the battle positions that are normally not filled are indeed filled; so it was an easy transition from an exercise into a real world situation. It actually enhanced the response; otherwise, it would take somewhere between 30 minutes and a couple of hours to fill those positions, those battle stations, with the right staff officers.

Whether or not the exercises enhanced 9/11 response is debatable, but no CT has presented any evidence that they did any harm.

Caller: So many people in New York have photographs of a plane hitting. ...Where are the photographs of a plane hitting the Pentagon, other than the security tapes? *[She seems to be thinking that people should have known where flight 77 was going to hit and had cameras ready and pointing at the Pentagon]*

Rowe:[Responding to a FOIA request] The FBI said that there was actually 84 video cameras that would have captured flight 77 flying into the Pentagon. Not one of those videos has been released or

shown to the public to prove that a plane hit the building when obviously it didn't.

No, the FBI said there was one additional relevant video, which was the one released on May 16, after the Moussaoui trial was over. The Pentagon relied on "live" security, and security cameras at nearby buildings would have been pointed at their property.

Avery et al: I don't think they can [come up with a video] because what they describe in the 9/11 Commission Report is physically impossible. I mean, I would just love to see them fake a video. It would require some serious, serious work, where the wings fold in...

False. The wings did a great deal of damage to the building, and were destroyed in the process.

Caller: When you talk about it to people, one of the biggest problems they have is what happened to the passengers. And the ones that hit the World Trade Center you can kind of excuse away, they were crumbled by the concrete and so on, but flight 93, which was supposedly seen landing in Cleveland, and 77 that hit the Pentagon, no bodies. And 93 was supposed to have crashed in Pennsylvania, and no bodies there either. But the plane that hit the Pentagon, Barbara Olson was supposed to be on that plane. Ted Olson, if I'm not mistaken was the Solicitor General, and before that plane hit, Barbara Olsen supposedly called Ted Olsen and explained what are we gonna do, there's hijackers and so on and so forth on the plane. No bodies. ...I've never been able to make a connection with my cell phone in an airplane.

Bermas: **Well, honestly, the thing is with the bodies and the people is, WE didn't say those people are on the planes, so we shouldn't be the ones to have to prove it. The government is the people saying these bodies and these people are on these planes, come and show us the pictures. Show us the body parts.** Show us some identification that these people you know, were actually there. I'm not saying that a lot of these people weren't alive or weren't real, but it just comes to the fact that there are no bodies there. So explain to us why not, because there's seriously a problem.

We have major discrepancies in the flight lists. Some people were on both flights. *Who was listed on both flights?*

There's just so much information out there. **I mean, the Barbara Olson phone call is suspicious in itself.** It was said that she couldn't find her purse so she couldn't use her cell phone, so she used an Airfone. But everyone who's used an Airfone knows that you need a credit card to swipe first, so they can charge you, and **she would have needed her purse to do that. So, again, these phone calls are VERY sketchy.**

Barbara Olson called collect. Her husband accepted the charges. <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/3067613/>

...I'm not the Attorney General, you know, let's get somebody who can actually investigate that has the resources. **I mean, not only that, but let's say not an investigator, let's say a rich white man. Somebody else with more resources than three young people would be nice.**

Brief discussion follows about Bush claiming that he saw the first plane hit on TV. Of course he couldn't have, since that video wasn't released until 5 p.m. That video is one of the pieces of Naudet brothers footage that has gotten Dylan Avery involved with the Naudet's lawyers. He has been forced to pull the video off the market and edit the Naudet footage out.

Host: **Jason is the one who answers the questions.**

Bermas: **I got a big mouth, I guess.**

Caller: The presumption is that a missile hit the Pentagon. It would have to come from either a ship or a plane.

Rowe?: Or ground. Actually, it could have been a Javelin round, which is a two-man team. It costs up to around \$750,000 to for the equipment for one round to actually have the piece that locks onto to whatever you're shooting from.

Caller: And it could cause the damage that was shown...

Rowe?: Yes, it could do that, but it would have to be significantly modified. But I would lean closer to a missile being shot by an airplane.

This is insanity. Rowe, who served in the U.S. Army in Afghanistan and Iraq, should know better. See my post here for a very brief reply to the missile theory.

<http://forums.randi.org/showpost.php?p=1708326&postcount=196>

Bermas: The interesting thing is that we have Amalgam Virgo going on, that same day, which is an East coast attack on the Pentagon from a missile.

Avery: **Yeah, apparently it was a cruise missile launched off a barge off the east coast by a ROGUE ELEMENT.**

Wrong. Amalgam Virgo took place on June 1-4, 2001.

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/amalgam-virgo.htm>

Caller: ...The size of the conspiracy, I know things were compartmentalized, but that's one of the things that keeps nagging at me.

Rowe: Inside the military you can do things and not really realize what you're doing. The military is so large, and there's so many pieces moving at once, that on certain levels, people don't have any idea.

Rowe then relates a story that when he was in the army in Afghanistan, his unit had one more mission before returning home, and they went with a CNN crew by helicopter to a remote outpost where there was supposedly a terrorist training camp, but no one was there. They were ordered to shoot the place up anyway, and blow up some caves for the cameras. When he got home and saw the footage a few months later, CNN had made it look like it was a legitimate mission that disposed of a terrorist training camp. He uses that as an example of how you can be a part of something and not understand what the big picture is. It seems like a bad example to me. Rowe knew exactly what was going on at the time. It was the media coverage that distorted the reality. He needs to stop and think about how this would relate to 9/11. It doesn't take much thought to realize that 9/11 could not be an "inside job" without hundreds of key of people involved who would have to know the purpose of what they were doing, and hundreds more would realize it afterwards.

Host: **In the movie JFK, Kevin Costner was asked, you know, how can you keep a conspiracy of this magnitude alive? And he said, "Orders."**

Rowe: Absolutely. In the military you sign away your rights. I mean, if you break your arm, you get arrested for destruction of government property, and you get fined.

I'd like to see Rowe give an example of that happening.

They honestly have you in whatever way they want you. They will twist the things, they will compile evidence, to support their story, no matter what. They own you the moment you sign that line.

Caller: **Airfones are specifically designed to be used from airplanes and they do work from high up in the air.**

Avery: **We're not saying the Airfone calls were impossible by any means whatsoever. We're not saying the Betty Ong call was physically impossible.**

That's a lie. "Loose Change" uses reported quotes from at least six phone calls that were made with Airfones, and then says that they couldn't have happened. From "Loose Change":

Narrator (Avery): "Flight Attendant Betty Ong **allegedly** placed a call from Flight 11. According to the 9-11 Commission, although the conversation lasted 23 minutes, only 4 and a half minutes was recorded.

Does Ms. Ong sound like a woman on a hijacked plane who just saw three people murdered? Why is nobody in the background screaming?

To date, none of the calls, except for Betty Ong's call to American Airlines, has been released to the public.

But to be honest, none of that matters. Why? Because none of these calls could have taken place."

Avery: But cell phone calls at cruising altitude are impossible. **That's all we're trying to get at, and we realize the difference between air and cell phones.**

Another lie. Madeline Sweeney was on the phone for 25 minutes, until flight 11 hit the north tower. You said that call didn't happen.

And we actually say "cell phone," we say the cell phone calls were fake.

So, would you like to explain why there were four real hijackings going on, with real people calling and describing them as they happened, AND you believe there were also fake phone calls that were also LIVE CONVERSATIONS describing the same events? Please explain that for me. Please. We're all eager to hear this extraordinary story of yours.

This is intellectual cowardice at its worst.

Bermas: Paul Wellstone was the first Senator to really question the official version and say, "Hey, we need a real investigation into these events. And all of a sudden his plane blows up in mid-air with his family in it. This was a small jet, I'm not sure how big it was. But he was basically squelched. And this was very early on. And we really haven't seen anybody big in the Congress or Senate, besides maybe Cynthia McKinney, possibly Ron Paul, I guess you could give Curt Weldon the benefit of the doubt, being part of the Able Danger hearings and whatnot. **But we haven't seen anybody say, "Yeah, we need an independent investigation not only into 9/11, but the mysterious death of Paul Wellstone," where, his debris was over something like 8 miles.**

Host: **The very suspicious death of prominent liberals is a big problem. Gee, John Lennon is the oonly rock star ever shot to death, you know.**

Bermas: Yeah, the guy sat down and read a book right after, in the middle of the day....

Host: The guy just happened to have been to Beirut by the age of 25. We've all been there, haven't we?
(laughter)

Caller: Regarding our Air Force. Now the east coast has got a multitude of naval air bases and Air Force bases. Yet if memory serves me right, the two scrambled jets were dispatched out of Bangor, *[memory serves him wrong. The first jets to be scrambled were from Otis ANG in Massachusetts]* which is a heckuva long way away. Now, Andrews Air Force Base I know is a NASA center, but every time Air Force One flies, it always flies with a military escort. There's gotta be more than two F-14s or F-16s. The other part that gets me, is flight 93 that went down in Pennsylvania. Ohio Air National Guard, supposedly unarmed, on a training mission, was diverted from over Lake Erie to do an intercept. Now, not only was there no debris from that plane, but as the plane goes down and crashes, things go up in the air. There were trees in the area, yet there was nothing showing any debris. I remember hearing two reports, and then it just dried up completely over the major networks, that our Air Force had found one of the hijacked jets. Can you gentlemen comment on that or fill me in better.

Avery: I do know that there was a report that was confirmed by Richard Clarke in his book "Against All Enemies," that allegedly a plane crashed on the Ohio/Kentucky border.

Clarke wrote that there was a report that allegedly a flight crashed. It was flight 77, and it was simply out of radar contact, not down.

And this is interesting, because if you look at the original flight paths of flight 77, it actually flies all the way out to the Ohio/Kentucky border and then disappears from radar completely. They draw a dotted line because they have absolutely no idea where the plane went. As for an intercept over Lake Erie, I haven't heard anything about that.

Bermas: Just the point that it's the most militarized airspace in the world over the Pentagon...

What a bizarre claim. The Pentagon is an office building in Arlington, Virginia, across the Potomac from Washington, D.C. It is just over 4,000 feet (1.2 km), and almost directly in line with, a runway of Reagan International Airport. There is no "militarized airspace" there, and no air base or missile defense there. It is in an area of heavy commercial air travel.

Bermas: ...and it's also restricted airspace over Manhattan where these things took place, it's unbelievable!

"Restricted" means that only scheduled flights can fly there. On September 11, 2001, there was no air defense in place anywhere near Manhattan.

Bermas: **It's UNBELIEVABLE that there were no jets scrambled. It's beyond the pale.**

No jets were scrambled? Someone hasn't done their homework at all in the past four years!

Caller: I was just wondering about, there was a man on flight 93 in Pennsylvania, and he was talking to his wife –

Rowe: That's not true, ma'am. You're referring to Todd Beamer. Todd Beamer never talked to his wife. In fact, he only talked to a Verizon operator for what, 19 minutes, Dylan?

Avery: Yeah. *[Wrong. It was 13 minutes.]*

Rowe: And she actually offered to patch him through to his wife, and **he didn't really want to talk to his wife, 'cause, I guess it wasn't all that important.** And then his wife is the one who makes the multimillion-dollar book deal where Todd Beamer is having dreams that a plane is hitting the White House.

Perhaps he would like to fill us in on the details of this "multimillion-dollar" deal.

Caller: Oh.

Rowe: Yeah.

Caller: **So, what about the "Let's roll" part?**

(Avery, Rowe, or Bermas): **It's a total joke.**

(Avery, Rowe, or Bermas): **It's fiction.**

Host: **It's an American slogan to get us motivated to do something about terrorism.**

Avery: **It was a war cry.**

A total joke and fiction, huh? The Verizon operator made it up? Well, guys, I can only say that I hope your last words are treated with the respect they deserve. Here is the account from Verizon operator Lisa Jefferson:

Then, when the plane seemed to take a dive, Beamer said, "Oh God, Lisa." Jefferson had not told him her first or last name at that point. When she did Beamer offered that Lisa was his wife's name too. He also mentioned their two sons.

"I asked if he wanted to be connected to his wife and he said no, that he did not want to upset her as they were expecting their third child in January," she recalled. Instead, he asked her to call his family and let them know he loved them "if I don't make it out of this."

Jefferson promised that she would.

Beamer continued to talk with her about his family and his background before telling her that some passengers had decided to "jump" the hijacker with the bomb so they could try and take control of the plane. She asked if he was sure that was what he wanted to do. There was not much choice, he said. By this time, other passengers calling from Beamer's plane apparently had learned of the other terrorists and the plane crashes in New York City and Washington, D.C.

Jefferson told Beamer she would stand by him and stay on the line as long as he wanted her. Shortly after that, she heard an "awful commotion" of men shouting and women screaming.

The last words she heard were Beamer speaking to someone else. "You ready?" he said. "Okay. Let's roll." <http://www.s-t.com/daily/09-02/09-10-02/a02wn022.htm>

The passengers' attempt to retake the cockpit of flight 93 is well-documented.

In Greensboro, N.C., as he talked to his wife, Sandy, Phil Bradshaw could hear a group of men reciting the 23d Psalm: Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil...

Sandy told him it was time to go. "We're running to first class now," she said. CeeCee Lyles called her husband, Lorne. "Babe," she said, "my plane's been hijacked." They talked about their love and their four boys. Suddenly Lorne heard screaming, and Cee-Cee yelled, "They're doing it! They're doing it!" Elizabeth Wainio ended her phone call with her stepmother, saying, "I've got to go, they're breaking into the cockpit. I love you. Goodbye."

The distance on a Boeing 757 from the rear galley to the cockpit door is 110 feet. It's not known who led the charge, or how many followed. When NEWSWEEK interviewed the families and friends of the passengers of Flight 93, they all imagined their loved one in the hero's role—whether it was a grandmother whaling away at a hijacker with her purse or a disabled sister tripping a hijacker with her cane. In a sense they were all right; resistance—fierce, unyielding resistance—was the spirit of Flight 93.

Beginning at 9:57, the cockpit voice recorder began to pick up the sounds of a death struggle. There is the crash of galley dishes and trays being hurled, a man's voice screaming loudly. The hijackers can be heard calling on each other to hold the door. One of the passengers cries out, "Let's get them!" More crashing and screaming. In a desperate measure to control the rebellion, a hijacker suggests cutting off the oxygen. Another one tells his confederates to "take it easy." The end is near. The hijackers can be heard talking about finishing off the plane, which has begun to dive. The hijackers cry out, "God is great!" The cockpit voice recorder picks up shouting by one of the male passengers. It is unclear whether the passengers have breached the cockpit or are just outside the door. The hijackers apparently begin to fight among themselves for the controls, demanding, "Give it to me."

http://www.j-bradford-delong.net/TotW/flight_93.html
<http://www.snopes.com/rumors/beamer.htm>

For more information, see the 9/11 Commission Report, pages 12-13.

Caller: So, he (Beamer) was... I just don't get it.

Rowe? What we have is a 19 minute phone call to a Verizon operator. And what we have is a transcript for that. And we have a wife that's profiteering from that.

Avery?: We don't even have an official transcript. What we have is bits and pieces of conversation with Alice Bingham, which is Mark's mother. *[How did Mark Bingham enter into this?]*

Caller: So they never found the bodies, and there's no clue where those people went?

Bermas: **I mean, all's you have to do is take a look at the video. There's no bodies, tail section, fuselage, luggage. There's nothing there.**

Of course there's nothing there in your video. You don't present the evidence. Nor do you interview

anyone who was there. How about answering the caller's question?

Avery: **No evidence of a commercial plane crash.**

Avery should really talk to United Airlines, which had representatives on the scene at Shanksville, and which, after the FBI was done with its investigation, took delivery of the 95 percent of the plane that was recovered.

Bermas: **There's not even a dark streak, like in other plane crashes.**

Rowe?: Except for a red handkerchief that supposedly these hijackers were wearing on their heads. Not burned, not scratched, not singed. Still tied in a knot. And a license plate from...

Avery: Not a license plate, they had a Ziploc bag full of personal effects of CeeCee Lyle's,

I mean, they have her driver's license, they have a Marriott Hotel card, I mean, they basically have her entire WALLET in a Ziploc bag, and it was PRISTINE. No evidence that it crashed at 600 miles per hour.

This disgraceful comment ignores the fact that these personal effects were placed in the plastic bag after they were recovered. The documents themselves were torn and singed.

Rowe? And again, this was just RECENTLY released.

Because it was used as evidence in the Moussaoui trial. The government doesn't ordinarily release photos of personal effects of crime victims to the public, guys. Get it?

Host: Didn't something similar happen with one of the hijacker's passports in New York?

Oh, man, that's ridiculous!

It's unbelievable. They're telling us that they can't recover the black boxes, YET A PASSPORT SURVIVED this unbelievable tragedy!

Yes, so did many body parts that are far more fragile than a passport, as did personal effects, mail, seat cushions, etc. Plane crashes and explosions are chaotic events. They do not effect all things equally.



**Figure 6d. Debris at the roof level of 130 Liberty Plaza—
seat from American Airlines plane.**



**Figure 6c. Debris at the roof level of 130 Liberty Plaza—
American Airlines life vest.**

Avery: **It's absolutely ridiculous**, the kinds of things they expect us to believe. To believe 9/11 the way this government has represented it to us, you would have to believe a couple of hundred different complete coincidences happened on a single day.

Host: Not just coincidences, scientific impossibilities. *I'd like to hear about these.*

Host: Just as an example of this, **I've seen Pentagon pictures where the plane itself vaporized into thin air. The passengers, everything, vaporized into thin air.** Yet there's a little podium there with an open book on it. Right next to where it was hot enough to vaporize a plane into thin air. Yet there's paper sitting right there unhurt, even unsigned!

(Unknown): Yeah.

Oh, brother. You certainly haven't looked very hard for evidence of the 757, have you? Photos of the debris are incredibly easy to find. And you certainly haven't made any effort to contact, or even read the reports of, the thousands of people who investigated the crime scene. And you certainly haven't read the reports of eyewitnesses who saw the plane hit, have you? You are an intellectual coward. By the way, the book on the podium was visible after the Pentagon wall collapsed, exposing several office interiors. There's nothing hard to understand about that. All you have to do is think.

Host: **So, that's what they're asking you to believe, and I think Korey nailed it the best: just don't believe it. Makes it a whole lot simpler, doesn't it?**

Rowe?: **Sure does.**

Caller (*He says he's an employee of the Transportation Safety Administration*): I want to know what your opinion is of what security is today, opposed to 9/11. Is it nonexistent, existent...?

Rowe?: ...I honestly don't see airport security as being too much better than it was prior to September 11th.

He doesn't tell us that he knows anything about airport security, beyond going through metal detectors and wondering if they search suitcases. He doesn't ask the TSA employee for his opinion.

Bermas?: And not only airport security, let's look at security in general. **If there was a real terrorist threat, the first thing we should have done is militarize our borders with Canada and Mexico**, so that terrorists couldn't get into our country easily. Because the border system is probably the biggest joke in America. I mean, you can literally RUN across it.

***Militarize the borders?** I thought you were AGAINST the military-industrial complex! How much do you think it would cost to seal off, surveil, and patrol 4,000 miles of land borders, plus tens of thousands of miles of coastline, so that NO ONE could enter the U.S. illegally? Should the military search every car, truck, boat and aircraft that comes from those countries? Don't you realize that there are many ways for terrorists to legally enter the U.S.?*

Caller: I wonder if you guys have approached anyone like Frontline, because this really needs to be seen nationally. Because the scientific evidence is just so overwhelming. And I feel that if people see this on a national scale, we can tip this lie that has created this five-year nightmare that we've been in.

Rowe: I totally agree, and you're going to be getting a call from me when we get to New York. **That's exactly the type of thing we need, is national media exposure.**

Bermas: Have you seen "JFK II The Bush Connection" yet? You really need to see it, man! It is the *creme de la creme* of JFK documentaries, let me tell you!

It's a video that posits that George H.W. Bush supervised the assassination of JFK.
<http://prisonplanet.tv/articles/september2004/260904jfk.htm>

Host: When you get enough bad news, do you eventually just explode?

Nothing surprises us anymore!

We're going to be really cynical in 20 years!

Caller: Thank you for the "Second Edition," but I want to know if you have any new evidence.

Oh, we have tons! We have so much more. We actually got our hands on, and just interviewed the man who shot the first 12 minutes of footage at the Pentagon. A crisp, close-up picture of the hole, confirming that it was a 16-foot hole, and that was it. And we actually have this on tape. He was like, "I could have jumped into that hole." And that's just one of the many things that have just come to light.

Host: Is there a "Loose Change" theme park in the future? (they all laugh)

Rowe?: No, there is not a "Loose Change" theme park. I mean, we feel guilty about doing T-shirts and hats.

Caller: I am warning you guys, the IRS will probably come after you.

We've got a really good accountant.

Avery: I'm sure that's already happening.

Rowe?: And bring it on. We're legitimate, honest, good-hearted, 22, 23, and 26-year-old **men who are doing the right thing**. If someone is going to come after and attack us for what we're doing, then come on, bring it on.

Oops. The Naudet brothers "brought it on" with legal action because you used their footage without permission.

Host: How do you ever succeed with a plan like that? Haven't you been paying attention?

Avery: **We're going to try to make this America again, if you guys don't have a problem with that.**

We're so naive! Ha ha!

Caller: **You're truly patriots.**

Caller: What's the connection with this Moussaoui? Is he just a fall-guy or stooge?

All: Ooh, good question.

It's such a PR twist, man. Just look at everything that's coming out right now: the Moussaoui trial, the

Tribeca flight 93 premiere ("United 93"), I mean, the World Trade Center movie, the new release of evidence of flight 93, just absolute RIDICULOUS evidence. And we don't know what's going on inside that courtroom. **We're supposed to rely on faith-based transcripts.** We don't have pictures, we have drawings of what's going on. And supposedly NBC reported that he's wearing a "stun belt." And the U.S. Marshals have control, if he gets too rowdy they'll just push a button and shut him up.

Host: And he's saying ALL the right things.

Avery: And the interesting thing is, he's never said this before. In the past couple of years, when he was on trial,

Bermas?: **Yeah, yeah, the other trials where they actually said he had nothing to do with 9/11.** And they moved those along. I have an NBC report from a couple of years ago where he's cleared of it, you know, they talk about his al Qaeda connections and his other terrorist plots, but say that he wasn't gonna be in the loop. They also, at the same time, had a separate 20th hijacker in their midst. They actually NAMED another guy. It's unreal. It just falls off the radar.

Host: I wouldn't be surprised if he gets the 72 virgins in this life, for what he's doing right now, and if somebody else gets the death penalty, as it were.

Caller: I'd like you to describe the detonations again, for people who haven't heard that part of it. And secondly, the people who were allegedly on the on the planes, the hijackers.

Bermas?: Our video does a great job of showing the squibs, or explosive blasts, coming off the World Trade Center, 20, 30, 60 floors below this initial "collapse."

No, the video footage you "borrowed" does a great job of showing what happens when air is compressed by millions of pounds of building falling down. The "squibs" are quite clearly not the result of explosive charges, nor have you attempted to explain what these random, sparsely-appearing "squibs" could possibly have to do with a "controlled demolition."

And the other things she's referring to is the BBC, and the London Guardian and the Telegram actually confirmed that at least 8 of the hijackers were still alive.

No, the people featured in those reports had either had their identities stolen by hijackers, or simply had the same names as hijackers. By November, 2001, it was conclusively proven who the hijackers were, and Saudi Arabia has agreed that 15 of its citizens were hijackers.

It would be good if you "truth seekers" would occasionally read the results of the investigations that thousands of people, and would make the effort to consult news sources more recent than October, 2001.

(Frantic self-promotion over rising music precedes end of show.)

Dylan Avery on "Beyond the Ordinary" 5/17/06

"Beyond the Ordinary" is a webcast run by the J.Z. Knight organization. The webcast featured members of "Louder Than Words" on three consecutive Wednesdays. Knight makes her living by "channeling" the spirit of a 35,000 year-old "Warrior from Atlantis" named Ramtha. She also produced the 2004 new-age movie "What the (Bleep) Do We Know." Knight did not participate in these interviews.

Host: **You're not being dramatic about it. You're just stating facts. You're not being politically biased, and you're not adding anything to it. It's not artificially sensational in anything that you did, and that's quite a lot.**

Well, again, I'm not doing anything extraordinary, I'm just doing my job as an American.

Host: **That's what all the great geniuses say!** (19)

Host: About the lack of whistle-blowers about this evil terror attack conspiracy. Is that not in our nature?

Avery: No, it's not. Look at how many people were involved in the Manhattan Project. The Manhattan project is responsible for spawning the A-Bomb. **It's responsible for killing millions and millions of people.** I mean, a hundred thousand different individuals worked on the Manhattan Project. They all worked on the same dates, they all worked on the same projects, and yet none of them knew what the other one was doing.

The Manhattan Project took place during wartime. It involved creating an industry the size of the U.S. auto industry in just a few years. Thousands of people knew what they were working on and what others were working on. They were working in concert to help defeat Japan and Germany. The A-bombs dropped on Japan killed a lot of people, but not "millions and millions."

If someone had enough lack of conscience to participate in the murder of 3,000 people, what makes you think they would have enough conscience to come out and admit it. And you also have to realize that because of all the war games that were going on that morning, and because of the way the government works in general, then if this is true, **don't you think the government would have found a way to use people without them knowing what they were actually doing.**

Astonishing.

Host: Absolutely. That's the way they've been doing it all along.

Yep.

Host: And it's also part of human nature that a person may get into something that is totally against their present belief, but because of being challenged in some way, or to keep their job, or because they have to follow orders, they do a little bit. And they do a little bit more. And pretty soon they've justified in their minds for so long that it no longer becomes an issue.

Yep. Basically.

Host: Who in America can actually find the truth?

Anybody. **The truth is out there, and it's so easy to find.** Again, I didn't do anything extraordinary. I mean, our government is lying to us. Like I said, I'm just trying to get people to ask questions, and to not assume that everything our government says is 100% true.

There's so many people out there supporting what I'm doing, it's not even a question anymore. The sooner people realize it (that our government was responsible for 9/11), the sooner we can take our country back. (19)

Ground Zero this year is gonna be nuts. It's gonna be so insane. I mean, I can't wait. I mean, we're gonna have thousands of people there. (19)

Your film is also going to be screened then, isn't it?

Hopefully. With any luck.

It's not a firm thing, then?

It's not 100% firm, but we're almost positive that we're gonna do it. We're telling people that we're gonna do it, so we're gonna do it.

Michael Meacher. He's responsible for holding a screening of our movie for British Parliament, coming up.

Host: What's ahead for you, Dylan?

Um, I don't know.

Host: How did you chose the name "Loose Change?"

I don't know. I was fishing different ideas back and forth with some friends for the fictional movie, and "Loose Change" just came out and it sounded right. And it was obviously the right choice. (19)

Host: We're so oblivious, you know?

Yes, absolutely. But that's the sad part about America, and we're trying to change that. ...That's the idea, to get people up in arms, and to get the truth out there by any means necessary.

Host: **Doesn't it seem to you that we're like that story, where if you put a frog in lukewarm water, and very slowly raise the temperature, it won't jump out, and it will be boiled?**

Yes, that's actually a very fitting analogy.

Host: Unless people like you start building a fire underneath us, it's not a very good destiny that we're facing.

No, not at all.

My peers are the ones that are going to be making the future...so I should be educating them more than anyone.

Host: **Well, there's really no educating a large segment of the population. It's beyond that. So you have to work with more malleable possibilities.**

Yeah.

I know there's high school classes that are refusing to watch 9/11 videos, supposed "official" documentaries, because their teachers try to play them, and they say, 'No, we've already seen "Loose Change" and we don't want to watch this. I mean, someone heard that from a friend who was still in high school, and, I mean, that's unreal. I mean, groups of high school students that are banding around my movie, it's kinda cool.

Host: **OOH, that is SO BEAUTIFUL! It gives us hope!**

Host: Any repercussions?

No, I'm just doing what I gotta do, and, sure I get afraid sometimes, but we've been pretty lucky. We haven't been approached by any means, and we've gotta keep doin' what we're doin'.

Host: Well with this much visibility, that in itself becomes a bit of a safety net.

Yeah, you're right.

Host: Nobody's reacting to the stuff that goes on for the last couple of DECADES, even since the Kennedy assassination. We're getting sensitized [sic]. And nobody reacts to obvious stuff like some of these things we're talking about here anyway. so, if someone comes right out and tells the truth, they're not really unsafe yet, until people start listening and doing something about it. And then it'll be too late to have any repercussions, because there won't be any point. Is that kind of how it seems to you, Dylan?

Yeah, pretty much. A lot of people are afraid of what happens in general, but you can't be afraid, that's what it comes down to.

Host: Unless we get up and do something, there is no future. At least not a pleasant one.

Not a future I want to live in.

Host: **It does take time to research, and people are busy. You've made it easy. It's all there, and if one part seems unbelievable to anybody, they can just follow it up.**

Host: Jason had been pursuing this on his own before he met you, wasn't he?

Yup. He's been doing this full-time. He was actually a big fan of the first edition before he met us.

Host: And did you find that there were things he found out, that you did differently, in your research?

No, we pretty much see eye to eye.

Host: **To me, the reason I ask that, is that it's pretty obvious what's out there, and it's just irrefutable evidence.** And we've had a lot of mail that's attempted to refute parts of it, you know, this or that part, and it just doesn't hold up. And here you are, two young men, and you both find the same thing, and then you come together. (19)

.....

Beyond the Ordinary interview with Korey Rowe 5/24/06

Rowe: Now we're starting on "Loose Change Final Cut" which is going to be in theatrical release on September 11th, 2006, which we're going to try to get into theaters across the country. Actually, we ARE going to get it into theaters across the country.

We're at a point where we have to go a little bigger, and we have to hire a few people to work for us.

On Google Video alone it's been downloaded over 5 million times.

.....

A Stroll Down Conspiracy Lane with "Researcher" Jason Bermas

Bermas: I mean, I don't like it when people attack you about the moon landings. I've done a bunch of research on that, too, and I really don't think that the videos that they're showing us are real. **I contend that we may have been to the moon, not with rocket technology, but with something else and it's secret. Definitely not the Apollo landings – they're a joke.** But at the same time, but coming out and saying that, Eric, you're leaving yourself wide open, you know that, right? And it's not because you don't make a legitimate point on the moon landings: there's tons of legitimate points, but it just polarizes people, man." (2)

.....

(On politician John Kerry) **This guy practices the occult. He had to in order to get into (Skull & Bones at Yale). What ELSE is he capable of?** (2)

This not just about Cheney and Rumsfeld and those guys. But by piercing them, we're hoping to get to the bottom of this criminal network that you talk about.

That's the "Zionist criminal network" that Holocaust-denier Eric Hufschmid talks about.

We're very aware that the Rothschild's funded the Nazis, and the Bush family's connection to Nazis, and how they came up financially through them, We're well-aware of that. We're planning on putting that Nazi connection in there, man, because that's where the Bush family fortune comes from.

The unification of Europe, the fourth Reich if you will, that was Hitler's dream. And it seems to have happened. (2)

I really do feel like the evidence is there that these guys (U.S. political and religious leaders) are in the occult. Don't come to me as a moral authority, as a Christian conservative, and then be practicing the total opposite. (2)

You gotta give me some documentation, you gotta get it on film, you know what I mean? (2)

I think generally, the Americans are controlled by the old European money. Have you read

"13 Bloodlines?" When you look at all the evidence and him naming off the names of these family lines of families that have been around for hundreds of years, and what organizations they're in, and it's all like, 33rd-degree Masons, and Knights Templar, Knights of the Secret Circle...the kind of connections that seem to really be the power structure in this country. (2)

.....

Host: **And the 9/11 attack itself, is that the European group, or is that more the Americans, like Bush and Cheney?**

These guys in America are able to become billionaires, **but they're not the multi-trillionaires that are in countries, basically with a free license to print money. So their power** *(the Americans' power)* **can only go so far.**

Host: **So you see it as more of a European-type thing?**

Absolutely. I mean when you look at how bizarre some of these rituals are, and where these things come from...Helmut Schmidt, for instance, former German Chancellor, talks about all the things he used to do, all these Germanic death cults, and he talks about, you know, Bohemian Grove being a sex event and loving the rituals there, It's suspicious to me, man! I mean, I can see that with my own eyes. ...You look at things like the Montauk Project, and Boys' Town, and they definitely used, you know, drug addicts, sexual deviants, it's mind control! It's absolute mind control. (2)

.....

Why are Americans so complacent? "Indoctrination-every day we're told how great we are, and we've lived comfortably," he says. In fact, "We're the biggest military power. No one can stop us." And terrorism? **"Terrorism in this country has always had government backing," adds Bermas.** He mentions Thomas Barnett who wrote a book about the Pentagon's "new map." "They want to take over Eurasia and destabilize our economy," Bermas warns. (11)

Is there hope in all this? "So far we haven't had tyrannical governments take over most of the world," explains Bermas. "Bush's grandfather, Prescott Bush, had ties to the Nazis, and there was a plot to overthrow Roosevelt, but it was stopped," Berman [sic] says. (11)

"We have to help ourselves...My hope is that people are generally good and that the majority of people in the intelligence community are really good people," says Bermas. "If we can say to ourselves, 'I want my family and friends to grow up in the same kind of world I grew up in' then we can say 'I need to make the sacrifice' of coming forward and exposing the truth," he adds. (11)

"Beyond the Ordinary" Interview with Jason Bermas 5/17/06

Host: Are there recommended sites, for verification, if listeners want to go off on their own?

Don't take anything we say for gospel. Go to our evidence section, and a lot of the mainstream articles that we source in the movie are linked up

Some of the other websites I recommend are Alex Jones's websites, Infowars.com and prison-planet.com. They have a September 11th prior knowledge and involvement section that is **basically the gospel, I** mean, it goes through almost every single instance.

I didn't really realize how far they [[the U.S. government criminals](#)] were willing to go. And it wasn't until after September 11th, and even after the invasion of Afghanistan, I started getting concerned about the way the country was headed. **And I've always assumed that our country was lying about the JFK assassination,** I've done a lot of research on that, but then again, there's really nothing that you can see that you can bring someone into court, **and I thought, you know, maybe he didn't have the best plan for the country.**

After looking into 9/11, and seeing how they would just disregard thousands of American citizens' lives, in order to go into war, for basically their own reasons: power, greed, money, whatever you want to call it, it's a full spectrum. Then I really started to get concerned, and now I'm just trying to research these type of events. Things like this, the Gulf of Tonkin, the Iran-Contra affair.

I'm trying to motivate people, because they just seem to be so asleep. They want to watch American Idol. They're so concerned with what car they're driving, what house they're living in, and they're really not taking a look at how this country is being eroded.

It's been about three months since we all had a day job, and we're going on tour.

We want to let people know that we're in this for the right reasons. We want to get this information out.

We do four or five of these things (interviews) a day.

The biggest thing that we're really trying to get going, is for people who know about this to show up at Ground Zero on 9/11 this year. It's a Monday. We're going to be there early. And every major media outlet in the world is going to be there. And this is our chance to break through. Instead of being viewed as conspiracy nuts, or wackos, and people need a real cause.

But we don't want to be too loud, and cram this down peoples' throats, but there are legitimate questions out there, and we're hoping that if enough people have the shirt on, that if they want a wide shot of the memorial, which any news agency is going to want, they going to HAVE to cover us.

These guys are openly announcing that they want to invade Iran. They're setting up a test for a new nuclear weapon they want to use against that country, in Nevada, in June. So I would hope that people become aware of that, and speak out against that. I mean, how many people actually read the 18-page letter that the president of Iran sent Bush? It's out there, but did anybody read it?

Host: You spoke about the apathy and the retardation in this country, and the gas will be a lot more expensive in a year. Brazil, the largest country, is going to be free of oil dependency in a year. There's the difference. Look at what a country can do.

I remember being kid in middle school and they were telling us that technology literally doubles every eight years, and I believe it's a quicker acceleration than that at this point.

We're in this because we believe that 9/11 is gonna be the crux issue that wakes Americans up and starts to anger them.

They really put on the full court press again. With "United 93" out in the theaters now, they just released that Pentagon tape yesterday, the World Trade Center movie coming out by Oliver Stone, which I think is going to be five times as big as United 93 because it's got that big Hollywood star Nick Cage in it. And people eat that stuff up. So, I mean, we really have some hills to climb, if not mountains, and I really believe that 9/11 is going to be the way that we're gonna start bringing this down.

Host quotes Bermas: "My goal in this situation are simple: to fight this war through peaceful information until those truly responsible are tried for their crimes and the restoration of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is complete." (19)

"Beyond the Ordinary" Interview with Jason Bermas 5/24/06

Operation Northwoods was a plan that made it all the way through the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and it was headed up by Robert McNamara.

No, Secretary of Defense McNamara is the one who summarily rejected the scheme.

Kennedy got rid of McNamara afterwards, and after Kennedy's death, McNamara is back in the picture.

No, McNamara was the U.S. Secretary of Defense from 1961 to 1968. Kennedy was killed in 1963.

If you look at every major conflict for the past hundred years and beyond that, they all seem to be staged with some sort of a false flag terror attack,

Mr. Bermas may want to review some of these major conflicts.

1848-1849 First Italian Independence War, 1859 Second Italian Independence War, 1866 Third Italian Independence War, 1848-1849 Second Anglo-Sikh War, 1848-1849 Hungarian Revolt of 1848, 1848-1851 First war of Schleswig (aka First Danish-German War, aka Three Years' War), 1850-1865 Taiping Rebellion, 1851-1853 8th Cape Frontier War, 1852 Brazil, Uruguay's Colorado government and Entre Ríos and Corrientes (Argentinean provinces) against Argentinean government under Brigadier General Juan Manuel de Rosas, 1852 Second Burmese War, 1853-1856 Crimean War, 1856 Campaign of 1856-1857, 1856-1860 Second Opium War, 1857-1858 Indian Mutiny (aka the First War Of Indian Independence), 1857-1901 Caste War of Yucatán, 1859-1863 Federal War (Guerra Federal) in Venezuela, 1861-1865 American Civil War, 1862-1867 French invasion of Mexico, 1864 Second war of Schleswig (aka Second Danish-German War), 1864-1868 Snake War, 1864-1870 War of the Triple Alliance (aka Paraguay War), 1865-1866 Chincha Islands War (Spain against Chile and Peru), 1866 Austro-Prussian War (aka Seven Weeks War), 1866-1868 Red Cloud's War, 1868-1869 Boshin War in Japan, 1870-1871 Franco-Prussian War, 1872-1873 Modoc War, 1873-1903 Netherlands colonial war in Aceh (aka Thirty Years War), 1874-1875 Red River War, 1876-1877 Black Hills War, 1877-1878 9th Cape Frontier War, 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish War, 1877-78, 1878-1880 Second Anglo-Afghan War, 1879 Anglo-Zulu War, 1879-1884 War of the Pacific, 1880-1881 Gun War, 1880-1881 First Boer War, 1881-1885 Franco-Chinese War, 1885 North-West Rebellion, 1885-1886 Third Anglo-Burmese War, 1890 Dog Tax War in New Zealand, 1894-1895 First Sino-Japanese War, 1895-1896 First Italo-Abyssinian War, 1896 Anglo-Zanzibar War, 1897 First Greco-Turkish War, (aka the Thirty Days' War), 1897-1900 Boxer Rebellion in China, 1898 Spanish-American War, 1899-1902 Second Boer War, 1899-1902 Thousand Days War, 1899-1913 Philippine-American War 1903: Ottomans vs Macedonian rebels, 1904: Germany vs Namibia, 1904-05: Japan vs Russia, 1910-20: Mexican revolution, 1911: Chinese Revolution, 1911-12: Italian-Ottoman war, 1912-13: Balkan wars, 1915: the Ottoman empire slaughters Armenians, 1914-18: World War I, 1916: Kyrgyz revolt against Russia, 1917-21: Soviet revolution, 1928-37: Chinese civil war, 1931: Japanese Manchurian War, 1932-33: Soviet Union vs Ukraine, 1934: Mao's Long March, 1936: Italy's invasion of Ethiopia, 1936-37: Stalin's purges, 1936-39: Spanish civil war, 1939-45: World War II (55 million) including holocaust and Chinese revolution, 1946-49: Chinese civil war, 1946-49: Greek civil war, 1946-54: France-Vietnam war, 1947: Partition of India and Pakistan, 1947: Taiwan's uprising against the Kuomintang, 1948-1958: Colombian civil war, 1948-1973: Arab-Israeli wars, 1949-: Indian Muslims vs Hindus, 1950-53: Korean war, 1952-59: Kenya's Mau Mau insurrection, 1954-62: French-Algerian war, 1958-61: Mao's "Great Leap Forward", 1960-90: South Africa vs Africa National Congress, 1960-96: Guatemala's civil war, 1961-2003: Kurds vs Iraq, 1962-75: Mozambique Frelimo vs Portugal, 1964-73: USA-Vietnam war, 1965: second India-Pakistan war over Kashmir, 1965-66: Indonesian civil war, 1966-69: Mao's "Cultural Revolution", 1966-: Colombia's civil war, 1967-70: Nigeria-Biafra civil war, 1968-80: Rhodesia's civil war, 1969-79: Idi Amin, Uganda, 1969-02: IRA - Northern Ireland's civil war, 1969-79: Francisco Macias Nguema, Equatorial Guinea, 1971: Pakistan-Bangladesh civil war, 1972-: Philippines vs Muslim separatists, 1972: Burundi's civil war, 1972-79: Rhodesia/Zimbabwe's civil war, 1974-91: Ethiopian civil war, 1975-78: Menghitsu, Ethiopia, 1975-79: Khmer Rouge, Cambodia, 1975-89: Boat people, Vietnam, 1975-90: civil war in Lebanon, 1975-87: Laos' civil war, 1975-2002: Angolan civil war, 1976-83: Argentina's military regime, 1976-93: Mozambique's civil war, 1976-98: Indonesia-East Timor civil war, 1976-2005: Indonesia-Aceh (GAM) civil war, 1979: Vietnam-China war, 1979-88: the Soviet Union invades Afghanistan, 1980-88: Iraq-Iran war, 1980-92: Sendero Luminoso - Peru's civil war, 1980-92: El Salvador's civil war, 1980-99: Kurds vs Turkey, 1981-90: Nicaragua vs Contras, 1982-90: Hissene Habre, Chad, 1983-2002: Sri Lanka's civil war, 1983-2002: Sudanese civil war, 1986-: Indian Kashmir's civil war, 1987-: Palestinian Intifada, 1988-2001: Afghanistan civil war, 1988-2004: Somalia's civil war, 1989-: Liberian civil war, 1989-: Uganda vs Lord's Resistance Army, 1991: Gulf War - large coalition against Iraq to liberate Kuwait, 1991-97: Congo's civil war, 1991-2000: Sierra Leone's civil war, 1991-: Russia-Chechnya civil war, 1991-94: Armenia-Azerbaijan war, 1992-96: Tajikistan's civil war, 1992-96: Yugoslavia's civil war, 1992-99: Algerian civil war, 1993-97: Congo Brazzaville's civil war, 1993-2005: Burundi's civil war, 1994: Rwanda's civil war, 1995-: Pakistani Sunnis vs Shiites, 1995-: Maoist rebellion in Nepal, 1998-: Congo/Zaire's war - Rwanda and Uganda vs Zimbabwe, Angola and Namibia, 1998-2000: Ethiopia-Eritrea war, 1999: Kosovo's liberation war - NATO vs Serbia, 2001: Afghanistan's liberation war - USA & UK vs Taliban, 2002-: Cote d'Ivoire's civil war, 2003: Iraq's liberation war - USA, UK and Australia vs Saddam Hussein, 2003-: Sudan vs JEM/Darfur, 2003-: Iraq's civil war, 2004-: Sudan vs SPLM & Eritrea.

I mean, the Reichstag is a great example. The Nazis were already in power, but it was through the burning of the Reichstag and blaming the Communists, they were able to pass the War Powers Act, and go into sovereign nations such as Poland, and take them over. But it wasn't until they instilled fear from within, by, basically the government attacking its own citizens and itself, that they were able to pass these provisions.

The Reichstag is a poor example. The Nazis blamed the Communists for the 1933 burning of the Reichstag and used the event to consolidate their power, but the best evidence indicates that the arson was committed by Dutch Communist Martinus van der Lubbe, who was arrested in the building and who said he was solely responsible. To claim a similarity between that event and 9/11 is illogical.

<http://www.du.edu/qsis/hrhw/volumes/2005/leebaw-2005.pdf> (p. 73-74), and Kershaw, Hitler: Hubris 1889-1936, p 456-459

I mean, they were literally hijacked within moments of each other. I mean, how is that even possible if they weren't somehow coordinated within the planes? It's pretty beyond the realm.

Bermas has apparently not heard of flight schedules and wristwatches. Anyway, the planes were not hijacked "within moments of each other."

Flight 11 Hijacking time 8:15 a.m. approximately

Flight 175 Hijacking time 8:42 a.m.

Flight 77 Hijacking time 8:54 a.m.

Flight 93 Hijacking time 9:28 a.m. Source: 9/11 Commission Report pages 12-13

And then, on top of that, what's even worse is that they were running 15 confirmed war games at this point, and one of them is a hijacking drill in which NORAD and the FAA are seeing 20 hijackings on their screen with interjected blips...now you're telling me that these 4 hijackings were able to happen at the same instant that this drill was happening. So, I mean, these guys could have had almost 30 blips on their screen, and didn't really know whether it was exercise or reality.

False. We've been through that.

Why did the FAA DESTROY THEIR TAPES? I mean, they literally destroyed their tapes. They guy went through, got all the tapes, put it through a shredder and then threw them away in different bins, because they didn't want what happened to come out. I mean, the "Incompetence theory" only goes so far. (Laughs)

They didn't "destroy their tapes." One person destroyed one tape of interviews he had personally made. This was not a real-time recording of any FAA activities.

From the Washington Post, May 7, 2004:

The report found that an FAA manager tape-recorded an hour-long interview with the controllers just hours after the hijacked aircraft crashed into the World Trade Center towers, the Pentagon and a field in Pennsylvania. His intention was to provide the information quickly to the FBI. But months after the recording, the tape was never turned over to the FBI and another FAA manager decided on his own to destroy the tape, crushing it with his hand, cutting it into small pieces and depositing the pieces into several trash cans, the report said.

The controllers in question had been debriefed by the FAA and FBI, so it's unlikely that the tape contained news of great importance, but FAA rules required keeping such evidence for at least five years, so the supervisor was wrong to destroy the tape. All of the recorded

Charles Burlingame, whose plane allegedly hit the Pentagon, six to nine months prior to 9/11 he was still in the Navy and he took part in the drills where they actually drilled hitting a plane into the Pentagon. You can actually see the pictures of the broken up commercial airliner in a model of the Pentagon. And like I said, they did the same thing with the World Trade Center.

Wrong. Burlingame retired from the Navy in 1979, when he became a pilot for American. He retired from the Naval Reserves in 1996. He did not take part in the Pentagon aircraft crash drill.

Host: Yeah, Charles Burlingame is another big mystery here, for sure.

Um, hmm.

Host: It's kind of a spooky thing, isn't it?

Bermas: To me it's not that spooky. To pull this operation off, it had to be very compartmentalized. The people who were actually doing it had to think that they were drilling it. For instance, they had run World Trade Center drills in the past where planes would hit them. So someone obviously had to drill the imaginary plane into the World Trade Center. What if they thought it was imaginary? They wouldn't know they were involved until after the fact. And then they would never want to talk about it. I mean, can you honestly think that you would want to talk about how you were responsible for the deaths of thousands of people unknowingly?

Yes, if I found out that someone had involved me, without my knowledge, in a plot to kill 3,000 Americans, I would want to talk about it. I would scream about it to the world. I can't imagine anyone who wouldn't.

I can't help but mention that one of the drills actually took a large section of fighters out to the border by Russia...they put a good number of our fighters out there on the morning of 9/11.

Host: You've got a good thread of history that makes it pretty obvious that this is not fiction.

In order to take over pretty much the western hemisphere of the United States, we had to have William McKinley – who was not president yet – he was in charge of a ship called the Maine. He had to fake a bombing on his ship, and blame it on the Spaniards.

I'll overlook the first part of that statement. The Maine incident was in 1898. William McKinley was elected President of the United States in 1896 and was reelected in 1900. He was never in the Navy. The cause of the explosion that sank the Maine and killed 266 men remains unknown. Research time: 60 seconds. <http://www.history.navy.mil/faqs/faq71-1.htm>

Pearl Harbor was a definite set-up. Roosevelt actually ordered out all of the new ships and brought in all of the old, and disabled some of the submarine radar so the attack would be a surprise. So there's World War II. *Completely wrong.*

<http://forums.randi.org/showpost.php?p=1688871&postcount=13> (See also posts 21 and 40)
<http://www.bartcop.com/0658.htm> - Op/Ed - Conspiracy Theories Abound

Prescott Bush made his real money through...Nazi money-laundering. He laundered a LOT of money through the Nazi party before and even after Hitler was in power. A lot of people don't know that.

Because it's false. We covered this earlier.

And through Project [paperclip] a lot of our institutions were built from Nazis. Look at our space program. I believe it's van Buren, is his name, he helped, you know, it was all through rocket technology.

He's thinking of Wernher von Braun. <http://history.msfc.nasa.gov/vonbraun/index.html>

"A lot of our institutions were built from Nazis?" Which ones? We did bring many German scientists to the U.S. after the war. Should we have encouraged them to go to Russia? Anyway, look at how poorly von Braun and his colleagues did: as you said, rocket technology did not get us to the moon.

And through Project Paperclip we also started a lot of our intelligence agencies. And, you know, that's where the modern CIA and NSA come from. So, you know, the Nazis were involved. People don't like to hear that. People don't like to hear that, but it's the truth.

I think most people would argue that these agencies had their beginnings with U.S. military intelligence agencies such as the O.S.S.

George (H.W.) Bush became the head of the CIA just as people started investigating the Kennedy assassination.

Bush became the head of the CIA in 1976, around the time the SECOND major JFK assassination inquiry took place. That inquiry's conclusion that acoustics evidence indicated more than one shooter has been comprehensively disproved. You can see many similarities between the 9/11 conspiracy theories and the JFK assassination myths here: <http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/home.htm>

There's also a lot of other things pointing to the fact that George Bush was INVOLVED in the assassination of Kennedy, as a CIA agent. So, like I said, without him being officially part of the CIA, he's just suddenly MADE head of the CIA.

If Mr. Bermas would like to contact me directly, I will disabuse him of that notion.

Bermas follows with a claim that John Hinckley's attempt to kill Ronald Reagan in 1981 was somehow related to Reagan's opposition to the Federal Reserve system! The Federal Reserve is a favorite bogeyman of U.S. conspiracy theorists. A good refutation of those theories is here: <http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/Embassy/1154/flaherty.html>

Wikipedia entry on John Hinckley Jr, who first planned to assassinate Jimmy Carter to impress actress Jodie Foster, but was arrested on firearms charges: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Hinckley,_Jr.

...I think it's less than a year later [after Reagan's election] that the assassination attempt on Reagan happens. Broad daylight. Doesn't look like he gets shot. There's about four different camera views, but, apparently he gets a rib cracked and gets shot.

Yes, he really was shot, by a .22 caliber bullet from Hinckley's revolver that ricocheted off the presidential limo. Reagan didn't know he had been shot until a secret service agent saw blood coming from his mouth as they were driving towards the White House. They immediately went to the hospital.

Another interesting thing about that, Brady gets shot in the head, and he doesn't get rushed into anything. An ambulance takes about 15 minutes to get there, grabs him, and somehow Brady was able to get to the hospital ten to twenty minutes before Reagan, even though he was rushed away immediately. Reagan stops talking about the Federal Reserve after he's shot.

Completely wrong.

"When we got to the hospital, and got out of the ambulance, I saw the presidential limousine. On the way to the hospital I had gotten on my radio, called the radio room at the White House, told them I was in an ambulance with Brady who was badly wounded, to please inform the president's office, the press office, and the advance office, and to send some help to the hospital." <http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0103/30/kl.00.html>

I'll let the bolding in the following paragraph speak for itself.

So, where does Clinton come into this? Well, through a lot of testimony and research you can find out that a lot of the cocaine that was being smuggled in by the CIA was through Arkansas military bases. **And that's kind of where people speculate the relationship began.** ...Clinton was key in ratcheting up the police state, and if we weren't careful, this could have happened in '93 if the first World Trade Center bombing had been successful. ...Ahmed Salem had [on videotape, Bermas claims] the Deputy Director of the FBI in New York **saying, 'Blow up the World Trade Center'** basically. **The New York Times, the Washington Post, a couple major publications, published this one time.** So, had the plan actually worked and they blew up the World Trade Center and one building toppled into the other one, there's no telling where this war on terror would be. **We would have been in the middle east in the early to mid nineties,** without a doubt. I believe less than 20 people were killed there [It was 6], but they ratchet it up and up and up.

And you have the attack on Oklahoma City, which I was totally ignorant of at the time. I thought that this crazy guy had blown up the building with a truck bomb. I came to look at the videotapes of that day, and first of all, the ATF didn't show up to work. They got a tip-off.

Wrong. Five of the 10 ATF personnel in Oklahoma City were in the Murrah building when the bomb exploded. Three were seriously injured. A post of mine with details on that subject:
<http://forums.randi.org/showpost.php?p=1573248&postcount=256>

They showed up in full bomb gear right after the bomb went off. You know, it takes about 40 minutes to get dressed up in that. We have two bombs going off, from the seismographs, one from the outside and one from the inside. And we have the ATF on tape, and the FBI, admitting that there are devices inside the building. And you can actually see them taking the devices out. The governor at the time, Frank Keating, actually admits that there were bombs in the building.

A link to a post of mine debunking the "extra bombs" claim, and providing links to the seismic analysis, which shows that there was one explosion.
<http://forums.randi.org/showpost.php?p=1569591&postcount=110> *The CTs believe that there were two massive bombs that went off 10 seconds apart, yet somehow NO ONE in Oklahoma City noticed the second explosion, including the people in the building!*

...How many people were killed there? I believe it was 168. So they ratchet it up again. And it takes six more years for this massive terror attack that just scares America and the world. And they kill over 3,000 people. What's the next one going to be like?

Yet Jason Bermas, who has the whole conspiracy sussed out, is allowed to live and to freely implicate whomever he pleases!

We're all hypnotized by how big our house is, what our lawn looks like.

I have neither a house nor a lawn.

You know, *American Idol* finals are on tonight. People can't wait to jump on that. You know, what kind of sneakers I'm wearing, the dress, down to the brand on the bottle of shampoo they have. That's

what people care about. You know, they'd rather not be bothered 'cause they've lived so comfortable the last 30 years. And they have a nice family, and it hasn't really affected them that much. They pay a little bit more for gas, they get a little more angry, but, you know, they couldn't even imagine a horror like I'm describing right now.

The President's approval rating is below 30% right now, I mean, that's incredible. It's unprecedented.

If everyone is hypnotized by their lawns and by American Idol, why is Bush's rating so low? And if this conspiracy is so far-reaching and powerful, why are the Neocons in serious political trouble?

Anyway, you're wrong on two counts. Bush's rating was just over 30%. Hideously low, but Eisenhower, Nixon, Reagan and Clinton have all had approval ratings that were as low or lower. Presidential approval polls began during the FDR administration.

<http://www.pollingreport.com/BushJob1.htm>

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2005/11/02/opinion/polls/main1005327.shtml>

What have they told us that has panned out, to be true? Name one thing?

This is not taken out of context. It immediately follows the "approval rating" statement above.

And some people say to me, 'Well, they didn't lie about 9/11' and I say, 'Well you have just haven't done your research. Because that is just not the case. **They lied about everything about 9/11.**

So there we have it. Everything we've been told about 9/11 is a lie.

I get emails now saying, 'If they pulled off 9/11, they would have planted WMDs in Iraq,' and I think to myself, well, I don't think they would have gotten away with it, because even at that point people were starting to wake up, and **if they got caught planting WMDs**, that would have made it that much worse. **People actually use that argument against me. And I don't know if I disagree with the possibility of them doing something like that, or staging an event, I mean, they tried to actually pass off aluminum tubes as some sort of bioweapons manufacturing.**

Again, you may think I took that passage out of context, but I didn't. Bermas believes it is BOTH ridiculous AND perfectly logical to think that the U.S. would plant WMDs! He thinks it's ridiculous because someone might get caught, although he believes that the same people planned, committed, and covered up the murder of 3,000 of their fellow citizens and the destruction of billions of dollars in property. On the other hand, Bermas thinks it's perfectly possible that the government would plant WMDs, because they've lied about other things.

And Bermas is wrong about the aluminum tubes. The U.S. wrongly accused Iraq of importing them for use in uranium enrichment, not for "bioweapons."

There was a report out in the past couple of days that the government has been actually recruiting pastors and ministers to go around and say, you know, **if something like the bird flu hits, it'll be good to go with, like, FEMA into camps** and all these other federally-regulated areas, and they're actually being paid to say this stuff. **And taking inoculations, and that is SCARY.** That is really SCARY! I mean, I'm not a religious person, but just to have them target Christians, you know, **to tell them to go along with something as spooky as that, is VERY, VERY telling.**

Bermas is referring to the "report" by the always-reliable conspiracy website PrisonPlanet.com
<http://www.prisonplanet.com/articles/may2006/240506femaplan.htm>

The mainstream media is attacking us more than ever, but at the same time, a lot of people in the mainstream media are no longer attacking us, they're kind of supporting some of our claims, and asking some of the same questions. I mean, we're still going to be attacked, and I think the worst is yet to come, but it least it's starting to speak...they're starting to have to attack us, because it's getting out at the grass-roots level. ...All we're asking is, 'take a look,' and if you realize that something's wrong here, action needs to be taken.

We're going to be down at Ground Zero, Monday, September 11th 2006. ...We have to make it so the establishment has to sit up and take notice and do something. I'm hoping that they'll underestimate us...they were able to squelch the protests at the G8 summit.

...And we're taking it, as Americans, I mean, this Coca-Cola generation just continues to disappoint. I can't believe it at points. I mean, I really just cannot believe it. It is, it is unbelievable to me.

About flight 77, which hit the Pentagon

How did this thing clip five light poles, after doing just this amazing maneuver and dive, not hit the ground and penetrate three rings while leaving a 16-foot hole, no debris, no wings, no tail section, nothing. And Jay MacIntyre has done an entire 180, you know, saying the entire week that he photographed the people and the luggage and the pieces of fuselage, and then the pictures he shows basically show nothing. I mean, they could be setting us up. I think it would be demoralizing to a lot of people and it would give the media a big boost to say, 'Yeah, you guys are all nuts! See, here's the plane.' And show an AWESOME video, even, of the plane hitting, you know, 'There it is. You guys are all morons.'

See the lengthy "Pentagon" section of my "LC" critique for a complete refutation of these claims.

But we're trying to focus right now on World Trade Center 1, 2 and 7 being definite controlled demolitions. I mean, we have the molten steel in the basement over a MONTH later still smoking. That is IMPOSSIBLE without some sort of explosives. I mean, people that don't realize that, I just don't understand them. I don't get how you can't realize that there's something very wrong that there's molten steel at the bottom of two buildings that supposedly just collapsed on themselves, which is totally impossible anyway.

Not a single piece of evidence supports the absurd WTC "controlled demolition" claims. There was molten metal in the basement rubble of the WTC. We don't know what it consisted of. It may very well have been aluminum, which melts at about one-half the temperature of steel. I have held cooled blobs of molten aluminum from the WTC in my hand, so I know it was present there. The controlled demolition theory is not helped in any way by the presence of molten metal in the basements. I would be very interested to hear what Bermas thinks the connection could possibly be.

None of the very obvious signs of explosives damage, or of explosives or blasting caps or wiring, was ever found at the World Trade Center during the nine-month cleanup process. 1.6 billion pounds of debris was meticulously sorted, and tens of thousands of items as small as buttons and teeth were identified, but not a single trace of an explosive device was found.

Demolitions charges leave very obvious marks on steel. Demolition of the WTC buildings would have required hundreds, or thousands, of explosive charges, with every charge leaving obvious cuts and explosive residue on at least two pieces of steel. Not a single trace of such signs was found. Not a single investigator or steel worker on the site has supported the CD theory. Controlled Demolitions, Inc., the world's premier experts in that field, call the WTC CD theory "ludicrous." Not a single conspiracy theorist has come up with a plausible explanation of how CD could have been carried out, because the theory is completely implausible.

And then one of those buildings not even being hit by an airliner! I mean, how does that happen? TELL ME? HOW DOES IT HAPPEN?

HOST: That was simply explained as debris from the towers that did it.

Like the towers, WTC 7 suffered SEVERE structural damage followed by SEVERE fires. The FDNY pulled its men away from the building hours before it collapsed, because the commanders on the scene were certain that the building would fall. CTs choose to completely ignore these facts. For details and extensive quotes about the building's condition, please read the WTC 7 section of my "Loose Change Viewer Guide."

Oh, absolutely, although all the other buildings around the towers stood intact!

No, seven WTC buildings and a church were completely destroyed, the 40-story Deutsche Bank building is in the process of being torn down due to 9/11 damage, and all surrounding buildings were severely damaged. Five months after 9/11, there were still 22 buildings that were uninhabitable due to damage.

A lot of people haven't dwelled on this 9/11 issue, even though our entire domestic and foreign policy have been based on this event.

That statement would take some proving.

HOST: Why don't you briefly explain project Achilles.

Bermas: Which one is Achilles?

It's the one that's prominently named and extensively described in your video.

Host: That's the cell phone...

Oh, yeah, A.K. Dewdney. Basically, cell phones don't work at 32,000 feet. ...And even though some of these calls were Airfone calls, a lot of them were from cell phones, which simply do not work at cruising altitude. ..It's ludicrous.

No, Mr. Bermas, your claim that the calls were faked with "voice morphing technology" is ludicrous, and extremely insulting to the victims of 9/11 and to all thinking people. Bermas believes that family members of the victims did not actually speak to their loved ones and hear their last words. But notice how he mentions that some of the calls were made with the planes' installed GTE Airfones. Actually, at least seven such calls were made. "Loose Change" claims that none of the calls were possible. Notice that Bermas also only mentions calls at cruising altitude, not those that were made at lower altitude. Some of the victims on flights 11 and 175 were talking on the phone at VERY low altitude.

HOST: People are so scared, that they're willing to accept a chip to be identified.

I am SO glad you mentioned the chip. So many people don't want to talk about it. I'm kind of hesitant to talk about at some times, but let's talk about it.

There follows a discussion of tiny RFID chips that Bermas fears could be implanted in people to track their movements. That technology exists. It is used most commonly for inventory tracking and veterinarian pet identification. It has a transmission range of only a few feet, but if detectors were also planted every few feet, everywhere....

Bermas also talks about "brain chip" implants, which he fears may be able to read our thoughts based on brain wave patterns.

Believe it or not, **TIVO was working on a brain chip, so that with your TIVO box there it would record what you want, when you want it, and it will base it on your brain patterns.**

(Sigh.)

And for people who think this is science fiction, the brain chip at some level already exists. ...The science is there, it's public. And people would just rather not take a look at it. But they're gonna have to start looking at it, because the chip's on TV now, and your new job might want you to get chipped to be safe, because we have to be safe and we don't want bad people getting into the buildings, or a thousand other reasons.

Unfortunately, in this country if there is another major event, and if it is incrementalized and larger than the last one, they could declare martial law at any moment, and have forced inoculations, and who's to say what they put in your body?

Unfortunately, I'm the minority in America. I watch the news. I see what's wrong.

.....

So there we have Dylan Avery, Jason Bermas and Korey Rowe. Three men who aggressively claim to be spreading the "truth" about 9/11.

And almost every single thing they say about 9/11 is false.

They plan to have a movie about their "truth" in American theaters on September 11, 2006

They plan to lead thousands of people in a protest at the Ground Zero Memorial on September 11, 2006.

I plan to continue exposing their ignorance, hate-mongering and intellectual cowardice.

Please let them know what you think

Dylan Avery email: dylan@loosechange911.com

Korey Rowe Email: korey@loosechange911.com

Jason Bermas email: jason@loosechange911.com

Louder Than Words phone (New York State) 607-267-4456

Speak out on the Loose Change Forum:
http://s15.invisionfree.com/Loose_Change_Forum/index.php

.....

"The truth is out there, and it's so easy to find." –Dylan Avery (19)

"It's going to be a very good year for the truth." – Dylan Avery (5)

"Prove it." –Mark Roberts

A bit about me:

Although I have been accused by paranoiacs in the "truth movement" of being a government "disinformation" agent, I do not represent, and am not supported by, any organization. My interest in these matters is purely personal and is not motivated by political or financial gain. My politics are well to the left of center. I have always had a deep dislike for the administration of George W. Bush, and I don't believe it is necessary to lie in order to discredit its policies. Since becoming aware of the many bogus 9/11 conspiracy claims, I have also developed a deep dislike for people who, in the name of "truth," spread misinformation and who present questions and allegations as evidence. —Mark Roberts

FAIR USE NOTICE: While this document consists of significant amounts of original content, in order to explore and advance understanding of the events surrounding 9/11, it has been necessary to reference some material that is copyrighted. Such use falls under the 'fair use' provisions set out in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. Equivalent provisions exist in EU law. Thus, in accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information, specifically for research and educational purposes.

For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner