

Reply to “The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly” by Judy Wood (declines peer-review)

Dear Dr. Jones,

Thank you, once again, for alerting me of the pendency of a second publication that will appear in your journal. You have indicated that "A Brief Analysis of Dr. Judy Wood's RFC to NIST: the good, the bad and the ugly" by Dr Greg Jenkins and Arabesque will appear and that I should provide you with my reply by May 15th.

I do so as follows:

I decline a peer-reviewed approach, but would ask that you publish this letter as you've indicated you would.

The article, which I will henceforth refer to by the second part of its title "the good, the bad & the ugly" helps to advance interest in the subject of directed energy weaponry as a causal factor in the destruction of the World Trade Center complex, and, in particular, WTC 1 and 2 (WTC1,2). It does so by way of criticism, but criticism is fair. That said, criticism is not self-validating and much of the content of the forthcoming good,bad,ugly article have been articulated elsewhere. One would hope that the technique of repetition of wrongly oriented criticisms will not become the operating norm of these authors. That said, please know that I respect the right of Dr. Jenkins and of Arabesque to disagree with me.

I here assert that any further commentary from me would be inappropriate at this time and should, instead, be reserved until such time as NIST provides its officially mandated reply to my RFC, together with other procedures applicable to the official RFC process.

I do not want to prejudice NIST's review. I will reiterate, however, that I stand by the validity of the assertions contained in the RFC that is the topic of "the good, the bad & the ugly" in full.

Thank you in advance for publishing this letter in its entirety.

Very truly yours,
Dr. Judy Wood

A response to Judy Wood’s letter in a reply to “The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly”

By Dr. Greg Jenkins and Arabesque

The tone and demeanor of Dr. Wood’s response to the submission of this letter seems cordial and professional at first glance. However, the necessity to reiterate previously published scientific scrutiny of her hypothesis is apparent:

criticism is not self-validating and much of the content of the forthcoming good, bad, ugly article have been articulated elsewhere. One would hope that the technique of repetition of wrongly oriented criticisms will not become the operating norm of these authors.

Of course, we agree that criticism is usually not self-validating. However, simply because criticisms have been articulated elsewhere is not the relevant point here: none—not one, of the issues raised by the authors and others (James Gourley & Tony Szamboti) have been acknowledged, addressed, or redressed. These criticisms remain unanswered since no scientific dialog between the scientific community and Dr. Wood exists.

Furthermore, it is difficult to respond to the vague claim of “*wrongly oriented criticisms*” when these are not enumerated or demonstrated to be so. Instead, Wood has confirmed that it is her “*operating norm*” to ignore all critiques of her work:

I will reiterate, however, that I stand by the validity of the assertions contained in the RFC that is the topic of "the good, the bad & the ugly" in full.

By claiming that all of the assertions in her RFC are valid, Wood assumes that all criticisms raised against her hypothesis are either invalid or not worth considering. This assertion is clearly not supported by the authors of the following articles and letters published in the Journal of 9/11 Studies:

[The Overwhelming Implausibility of Using Directed Energy Beams to Demolish the World Trade Center](#) Gregory S. Jenkins

[“Scientific Critique of Judy Wood’s Paper “The Star Wars Beam Weapon”](#)
(January 9, 2007) James Gourley

[Why the damage to WTC Bldgs. 3 and 6 does not support the beam weapon hypothesis and some correspondence with Dr. James Fetzer about it](#) (Updated March 20, 2007) Tony Szamboti

["Introduction to and Interview with Dr. Judy Wood conducted at the National Press Club in Washington D.C. regarding the use of Directed Energy Beams in the Demolition of the World Trade Center Towers"](#) (February 9, 2007) Greg Jenkins

[A Brief Analysis of Dr. Judy Wood’s Request for Correction to NIST: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly](#) Greg Jenkins and Arabesque

[Greg Jenkins and Judy Wood: An Interview and Analysis](#) Greg Jenkins and Arabesque

Since the scientific dialog remains closed, reiteration of our criticisms is the only defense against the relentless promulgation of discredited notions by Dr. Wood. Our specific

questions and criticisms (expressed in detail in publications listed above) have remained unacknowledged for many months.