

Greg Palast apologizes to Dr. Steven Jones: "An apology and hope for reasoned discourse"

Steven Jones (including emails from Greg Palast)

Greg Palast responded to me on 9 Aug 2007: "An apology and hope for reasoned discourse " For the record, here is the exchange (in brief – several people had input to Greg and I including Peter Phillips, David Ray Griffin, Jack Blood, “Galen”, and Ron Rattner).

1. Dr. Jones email to Greg Palast (12 June 2007):

Dear Mr. Palast,

On May 10, 2007, in an INN TV interview, you made statements which were blatantly defamatory when you called me, by name, a "complete and utter fraud" and a "fruitcake." I demand either a retraction or substantiation of your accusations -- publicly.

A lawyer friend affirms that your statements, available here:

<http://youtube.com/watch?v=r2oFTiEpIBQ> , constitute "malicious defamation."

You taunted: "Mr. Jones, come at me!"

Here I am.

I am ready to respond to your specific objections to my papers, or issues you wish to raise which support the "official story" of the Bush/Cheney administration, after you have first verified that you have actually read what I have written on the subject of controlled demolition at the World Trade Center:

<http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JonesWTC911SciMethod.pdf>

http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Buil...

I will respond then to your statements which support the Bush/Cheney or "official story" for 9/11 events, and I will assure that the exchange will be made public. I propose publication of our exchange in the letters section of the Journalof911Studies.com, but you may choose another venue which is open to the public. Be sure to include your explanation of the iron-aluminum-rich microspheres which I discovered in the WTC dust if your explanation differs from mine, as well as the rapid straight-down collapse of WTC 7.

Again, my lawyer friend describes your public remarks on INN on May 10, 2007, as "malicious defamation" and I think he is correct. Do you? You called me a "complete and utter fraud" and a "fruitcake." I maintain that I am of sound mind and not a fraud. However, I invite you to present your substantiation of these claims -- or retract your egregious defamations.

Sincerely,
Steven E. Jones, Ph.D.

PS -- If you do not respond by July 25, 2007, I will consider other options. Thank you. Note that there are over one hundred engineers and architects listed in the Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth web site, ae911.org, along with many at the stj911.org site, so you may wish to correct your mis-statement of last month that there are "no engineers" who challenge the official story.

2. Since Greg did not respond by July 25th (as requested), I wrote another email to him on July 27th, as follows:

Dear Mr. Palast,

I found and looked at the video clip from your interview on INN -- where you refer to me by name, publicly, as a "complete and utter fraud" and a "fruitcake". You also say, to the camera and the public: "Mr. Jones, come at me!"

I wrote to you over a month ago (via INN), asking for a retraction -- or at the very least, some substantiation for your hubris and slander. I received word back that you have backed off your assertion that I, a PhD physicist, am a "fruitcake." It's a start...

I'm ready to accept your offensive and public challenge -- your unsubstantiated accusation that I am a "complete and utter fraud" -- and hopefully this discussion can bring the 9/11 truth debate before a wider public audience.

I'm raring to go! Let's discuss options, shall we?

1. A lawsuit against you for slandering me publicly. All proceeds (in excess of court and lawyer costs) would go to Iraqi war refugees = victims of the 9/11 treachery, if I win.

2. A public debate on INN (where you spoke).

3. A written exchange -- Letters to the Journal of 9/11 Studies, for example. That would be the most consistent with scientific tradition -- you write up your substantiated reasons for making your statements and I will publish my response. I don't think you can do it! But give it a go: you should refute the 13 points I raised in my first paper on 9/11, as well as the supportive data I provide in my latest paper, in order to demonstrate that I'm a complete fraud as you assert. The papers are published for your convenience in the Journal of 9/11 Studies:

A. http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200609/Why_Indeed_Did_the_WTC_Build...

B. <http://journalof911studies.com/volume/200704/JonesWTC911SciMethod.pdf>

You can pull in scientists and engineers as you wish -- and then I will do the same.

I prefer choice #3.

You should also back up your claims of "no engineers" supporting my claims regarding demolition using cutter charges) of the Towers and WTC7. Note the papers by engineers in the Journal of 9/11 Studies. You should read, as background, the seventy-plus peer-reviewed papers in this Journal. Also, count over 140 members in the ae911.org (architects and engineers for 9/11 truth.) group. I can prove that this claim of yours is complete and utter nonsense by my finding just one engineer against your 'No engineers' claim -- Here you go: Gordon Ross and Tony Szamboti both support the mentioned claims from my papers and are both mechanical engineers. I could name others, of course.

I'm ready to move on this -- in a public venue. I've come at you, accepting your challenge. Now its your move -- which choice above do you prefer? Or do you suggest an alternative?

Silence on your part in view of your affront would be most cowardly and would tend to choice # 1. This might be of most benefit to the Iraqi war refugees but would also be least scientific.

Your move.

Dr. Steven E. Jones

3. 29 July, Greg Palast to Steven Jones (based on a third-party email to us both, which Greg quotes to me and asks about):

Dr. Jones,

Do you agree with the content or sentiments of this letter copied to you, particularly paragraphs 8 and 9 which I've placed in bold below?

Greg Palast

[PARAGRAPHS 8 AND 9 from an email Greg and I both received:]

In addition to being "gatekeepers of the left", these eight people have something else in common: they all hail from a particular tribe whose name can not be spoken without inviting charges of being anti-Middle-Eastern, or, more commonly and ad nauseam, anti-Semitic. This expression, anti-Semitic, is a clever term used by people who have a zealous dedication to Israel to describe anyone who doesn't share their steadfast devotion to this particular apartheid state. The implication is that one can not be critical of Israel without being critical of Jews and if you're critical of Jews you must be ethnocentric and disparaging of all Semitic people. Ironically enough, Arabs make up the majority of the Semitic people . Because of this shrewd framing, criticism of Zionism, the fanatical fidelity to an apartheid Jewish state in the "holy land" gifted to Jews by Yahweh, is impossible.

It's pretty clear at this stage of our collective investigation into the crimes of 9-11 that the perpetrators include not only elements within the USG but also individuals aligned with Israel, be they "dual citizens" or straight up Mossad agents. Anyone wanting to protect these criminal miscreants within the USG and the "special" (master/slave) relationship

between Israel and the USG is going to do everything in their power to discredit the people such as yourself and Doctor Jones who have put together so many of the pieces of the 9-11 puzzle. [name withheld -- email sent to Jones, Palast and others]

4. Dr. Jones responds to Greg Palast.

In direct answer to your question: No, I do not. Let me make this clear.¹

I have brought forth evidence, compelling in my opinion and that of many others, that aluminothermic cutter-charges ("thermite" charges) were used in the destruction of the WTC buildings. I have also brought out arguments regarding the time-of-fall of WTC 7 relative to the time-of-fall of building destroyed by explosive demolition -- and other arguments -- which point again to the use of cutter charges in the destruction of these buildings.

With regard to "whodunnit", this is beyond physics, and I do not claim to know. Yes, I have paraphrased/cited Webster Tarpley with regard to who MIGHT be involved, for this is his area of expertise and study.

As for myself, I am willing to say based on the evidence I have seen -- besides the hard physical evidence which is the subject of my research in this area -- that Vice President Richard Cheney should be impeached and given a fair trial. Impeachment is a peaceful and Constitutional remedy and I am exercising my rights as an American citizen in calling for this remedy. Questions regarding the beginnings of the Iraq war and 9/11 should certainly be included in those impeachment proceedings. Beyond that, I do not personally point a finger...

Now, Greg, will you address the questions I posed to you?

Best wishes,

Steven Jones

5. Greg Palast's reply (9 August 2007), subject line: "An apology and hope for reasoned discourse "

Dr. Jones,

It seems, unfortunately, that you did not receive my message sent through Peter Phillips

¹ An article in the **Guardian**, Sept. 5, 2006, claims that I asserted that the 9/11/2001 attacks were "an 'inside job', puppeteered by the neoconservatives in the White House to justify the occupation of oil-rich Arab countries, inflate military spending, and expand Israel." The article also alleges: "says Jones "We challenge this official conspiracy theory and, by God, we're going to get to the bottom of this." I never spoke of this alleged notion to "expand Israel" at all, nor did I use the phrase ascribed to me, "by God," which I consider to be profane. The entire quotation ascribed to me is NOT MINE, nor did the author (Christina Asquith) of the article interview me at all. Where her quotation came from, I do not know -- but the words are not mine. I wrote to the Guardian strongly objecting to their attributing statements to me that I did not make -- but received no reply nor retraction.

<http://education.guardian.co.uk/egweekly/story/0,,1864524,00.html>

and Jack Blood some weeks back. Peter and Jack, both of whom I know and respect, assure me that your research, even if I remain unconvinced by it, was thoughtful and your conclusions sincerely drawn.

My unfortunate characterization of you as a "fruitcake" was based on your assertion that Jesus met with Mayans after His resurrection - which, Peter explained to me, was not a scientific finding but a deeply held religious belief rooted in your Mormon faith...

Some of your admirers have accused me of more serious misdeeds: that I knowingly conspired in mass murder (though I understand you do not endorse this view). I am quite disturbed that commentary on the September 11, 2001 attack has become so poisoned; and as a result, reasoned discourse is just impossible.

Therefore, except for those reports on the attack in my published books and as I have reported on BBC or other established outlets, I withdraw my comments on the topic. I have decided to remove myself from the debate entirely - and leave the field to those more expert than me.

I wish you well.

Greg Palast

6. Steve's reply to Greg, 11 August:

Greg,

Thank you, apology accepted.

The subject line of your email carries some hope for future "reasoned discourse," which is what I seek. ("An apology and hope for reasoned discourse ")

The hard evidence supporting the use of planted cutter-charges in the destruction of WTC 7 and the Twin Towers is very strong and I hope you will retain at least an open mind about these matters. The corporatocracy described by John Perkins has tentacles that are being exposed as we research what really happened on 9/11. I am certainly not accusing you of complicity in any way. There are questions I would like to see posed to Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld and a few others...

Sincerely,
Steven E. Jones

7. "Final" email sent 13 August to Greg Palast:

Dear Greg,

I would urge you to consider my published, peer-reviewed papers which I have attached for you, regarding my research on what really happened on 9/11/2001 (particularly, the evidence for intentional demolition of the Towers and WTC 7). I believe these will be mostly understandable, and I further invite you to send them to "experts" as you wish for comment on the arguments I raise.

Indeed, I invite such criticisms of CONTENT as most seem to prefer to dismiss me as a "fruitcake" without even reading my papers -- can you imagine that?

Can you imagine a scholar or serious investigator taking such an *ad hominem* approach -- especially considering what is at stake if society as a whole continues to swallow the "official" 9/11 myth?

Steven Jones