

9/11: TRUTH, LIES AND CONSPIRACY

INTERVIEW: DYLAN AVERY

August 22, 2006

CBC News: Sunday's **Evan Solomon** interviews **Dylan Avery**, writer and director of the documentary "Loose Change", which purports to show a direct connection between the 9/11 attacks and the U.S. government.



Evan Solomon: Pretty surprised about the impact Loose Change has had?

Dylan Avery: Absolutely surprised, continually surprised, on a constant basis.

Solomon: What was the motivation to make this film?

Avery: Uh, well, the original project started out what was supposed to be basically just me getting into film-making, and I wanted to start screenwriting and I wanted to get into film. 9/11 was obviously the defining event of my generation, and I felt, **I think subconsciously, I felt that there were a lot of things that I didn't know about it, that there were a lot of half-truths and a lot of things about 9/11 that weren't being brought to the public. I don't remember exactly why I thought this, I just felt that there was something that wasn't being addressed.**

So I started writing up the idea that.. a fictional story about myself and my friends, basically, doing what we've done now, is.. doing our research and discovering that 9/11 was done by our own government, and then, you know, taking the steps to release this information, you know, get chased by the FBI, you know... just a fun film, I guess, is really the best way to describe it.

Solomon: A fiction.

Avery: Yeah, just a fictional film, you know, and then I started to do my research and I started looking into 9/11, and the first thing that puzzled me was the collapse of the World Trade Center. Uh, I had never been to the World Trade Center, I had been to New York City, but I had never really been there and been inside, which, you know, I'm quite ashamed of, to be honest with you, just because, I mean, if I had any clue as to what was going to happen, I would spent a lot more time there, but you know, hindsight is 20-20.

You know, I saw a lot of problems and it seemed to me that the American public wasn't being given the answers, so... I didn't feel that *I* was the one that was going to break the story, I didn't feel that *I* was the one that was going to .. like that I was the only person out there that felt this, because I was obviously picking up on information that other people had already published, websites like Serendipity and Killtown - you know, the first people to crop up and post videos and compare and contrast. And I felt vindicated, you know, the fact that those theories were even out there, and all I had to do was think about it, and I went out there, and someone else agreed with me. I felt there might have been some truth to what I was doing.

And that's how it's progressed since then, is that every day I get another e-mail or another phone call, or I talk to a rescue worker, or a person who worked at the Pentagon, you know, you just talk to so many people who were involved, who, in one way or another, want a new investigation. And you know, some people have a problem with the evidence in our film; some people agree with the premise but disagree with the evidence; disagree with the premise *and* the evidence. We're not saying that we have all the answers, we're not saying that everything we are saying in our film is gospel or 100% true. We constantly encourage people to go out and do their own research and to come to their own conclusions.

I mean, if we were really going out there, deliberately trying to mislead people, and trying to cherry pick our evidence to fit some kind of convoluted theory that we made up because we wanted to be popular, I mean, it just defies all logic, I mean, we wouldn't be encouraging people to go out and to research 9/11 if we expected it to come back and bite us in the ass. It's like when people accuse us of using fabricated footage, and then at the end of our film, we tell them where to go get the footage, so, it's like, why would we do that?

Solomon: Let's go back to the beginning: so you have these suspicions that you're not getting the truth about 9/11, right? And then tell me about you and your buddies.. what do you guys decide to do?

Avery: Well, let's see, it was mainly Korey and me, and our other friend R.J., who was a big part of the original Loose Change project.

Solomon: And Korey, by the way, he's a war vet

Avery: Korey's a war vet, yeah, so he was following the development of Loose Change, more or less throughout its entire process, while he was overseas. Again, I started writing it in the middle of 2002, which is when he was still overseas in Afghanistan, and on his first break home, is when I started clueing him into what I was doing; I let him read parts of the script, I started dropping subtle hints, I didn't... I knew it was a touchy subject for him, because I knew he was, you know, obviously, deeply entrenched in what was going on, and I didn't want to upset him or deter him from his course, so I actually kind of took an active role in hiding this information from Korey, because I didn't want to be "that guy", I didn't want to be the guy that ruined what he was doing.

I also didn't want him to.. I guess I didn't want him to lose any respect for me, because of conflict of interest between what I thought. So I really tried to keep that away from him. And you know, he kept pushing me, it's like, "hey man, Loose Change, what's it about, you know, what's going on, let me read it, let me see it", and I just kept sending him update after update, you know pieces of the script, film sequences I started putting together - real, real, REAL early versions of Loose Change, stuff that is (laughs) so much more guerrilla and independent than what you see now. You know, things just started clicking in both of our heads...

Solomon: He's in Afghanistan, and then he goes to Iraq..

Avery: He's in Afghanistan, he comes home for leave, and then he goes to Iraq, and that's when things really started to click in his head, where he was like, "Wait a minute, I just invaded one country, and now they're telling me I have to go and invade another country, and neither of these countries have the person that we were originally supposed to be going after." And I think that's when things really started to click with Korey's head, was when he realized he was not an army of one getting the terrorists, but he was a pawn on one of the biggest chessboards that we've ever seen, you know.

Solomon: And so when he comes back, you guys really start to get at Loose Change. Just give me an idea, first of all, where this title "Loose Change" comes from.

Avery: Loose Change is really one of those things, one of those titles that just kind of came, just kind of happened (snaps fingers) out of there. It was basically RJ and I just hangin out, we went to see Austin Powers Goldmember in the theatres, and we were walking back home, and you know, it's two kids, wasted, having a good time, a little high, a little of this, you know, just talkin', messin' around, we were just starting to work on.. - well I was just starting to write the script, it was still untitled, and basically we just started talking about the world, and just talking about what the film could do.

And I don't remember, it was so long ago, but basically the phrase 'loose change' just kind of came out, and I thought about it for a second.. and I was, like, 'huh!.. Loose Change', because everyone hears that, and they think, you know, they think money. I didn't think about money, I thought 'well, that's cool, cuz people think loose change is money, but it actually means the change is loose, you can't stop it - you know, again, it's just one of those titles that, to me, it just seemed perfect. I didn't think that there could have been a better title for the project. And again this was still back when it was a fictional film, about my friends and I, basically, you know, changing the world, so even back then, the title was very a propos.

Solomon: But now you start recognizing that you are about to make a movie, a documentary, not a fictional film. But let's get to some of it, because obviously now, how many people have seen your latest, or how many people have downloaded Loose Change off the internet?

Avery: Millions, millions, is the best way to put it, uh, I would even go so far as to say 100 million people have seen our film.

Solomon: 100 million people? Why do you say that number?

Avery: Because it has a very exponential effect on people, like someone will buy a DVD from us, make a hundred copies, give them out to their friends, and those people will all make a hundred copies, and give them out to their friends. We've confirmed that at least ten million people have watched it on Google Video for free, and you know, even if half of those people had 5 people in the room at the same time.. you see what I'm saying? how there really is no way of knowing how many people have seen it, and that is a testament to how large it's gotten. I mean, we have people translating it into Korean, Dutch, German, Norwegian, Icelandic, languages, you know we would never even have imagined people have translated our film into, you know, on their own accord.

Solomon: Power of the internet?

Avery: Yeah, pretty much, it's a true testament to the power of the internet, is that somebody like myself can make a film in their spare time, just to make a movie about 9/11, and over the course of a year and a half, I mean, just look, I mean, just look at how far our film has come. It just constantly amazes me, and I don't think it's possible for me to really convey that to anybody, because I didn't.. You know, people can throw whatever accusations at me they want, and they can whatever they want about me as a person, but the fact is, I didn't get into this to be popular, I didn't get into this because I wanted to do something cool and edgy, you know? I did this because I saw a problem. And I, as an individual, wanted to do my part to get answers. I wasn't expecting to release it, you know, I wasn't even expecting to put it out to the public, I really just wanted to make a movie, and then people started watching it, they said 'this is good, you might want to release this to people.'

Solomon: And you just released it by putting up on the internet?

Avery: Just put it up on the internet, just put up a site "DVDs for sale", I let people copy it and hand it out. and let people put it on torrent sites, I didn't care, I just wanted people to get it out there and watch it and tell me if they liked it, and it got viral. The first Loose Change

was a very underground hit, it definitely had a following, but when the Second Edition dropped, that's when things really blew up, because the Second Edition was a lot more watchable, it opened a lot softer on people, whereas the first edition opened up on the whole pad/missile/flash thing, the whole Phil Jayhan/letsroll911 evidence..

With the Second Edition, you know, I decided to take a much more open-ended approach, you know, it's like 'alright, someone is going to be approaching this information for the first time, do I really want to open up by saying 'look at this video, you know, zoom in on this and zoom in on that', you know, I felt it would have alienated people right away - and it did, because I found that, in giving copies out to people, they were like, 'oh, well, you need to take out that opening part, because the rest of the film is awesome'... you know, just learning from my experiences, and that's what we're doing now, with the Final Cut.

Solomon: And when you say things just blew up, give us an idea of what you guys are doing now, I mean, touring campuses, what's going on?

Avery: We're touring, we're going all over the world, we have numerous offers from Hollywood distribution houses who want to get the Final Cut in theatres, uh, we have people who want to get it in..

Solomon: Give me some details, who's giving the offers?

Avery: I can't give you any specific details because right now nothing's on paper, and also, you know, nothing's in solid gold, so we don't really want to talk about it. But there are numerous houses, and we have gotten offers from people. We have also turned down contracts, you know, contracts we could have signed and had a million dollars in our bank account the next day, but the people weren't really interested in the information, or taking care of the information, they just wanted to get the movie and make money off it and get their piece. So, you know, again, I can't be specific, but definitely big houses..

Solomon: You guys have been offered big money..

Avery: We've been offered big money by big distributors, and we've turned that down. We've also been offered distribution deals by a big distributors, and we're pretty sure we're going to run with it, but again I don't want to talk about anything, because it's basically counting my eggs before they hatch.

Solomon: You think you'll get rich off this?

Avery: I guess, I mean, it's not why I'm doing this, I mean, if we do, it helps the cause, I mean, it helps us give out more DVDs, and it helps us make better products and give more back to the community, I mean, like, we have a research team staying at the Sheraton right now, you know, because we paid for it, I mean, we didn't ask for anything we just asked them to fly out and help us with the film, Again, the message in the film is what is important to us, not the money. Granted.. I mean, let's be totally honest, if this film hits the theatres, it's going to be big. I mean, the popularity of it on the internet is only a testament to how popular it will be if it actually hits theatres. You know, if the controversy begins to swell..

Solomon: Have you guys talked to people like Michael Moore about this?

Avery: Michael Moore doesn't care. You know, he had a genuine opportunity with Fahrenheit 9/11 to educate the American public at least about a fraction of.. You know, he could have... there are so many issues that Michael Moore could have dealt with, where he would have been treading safe water, you know, he wouldn't have had to worry about getting in trouble, and it seemed in his film, you know, that he took the safe road, you know, instead of walking into the theatre and walking out thinking 'wow, our government might have actually been

criminally complicit in the attacks' - whether or not they were involved or apathetic and allowed the attacks to happen for their only political gain I felt that Michael Moore genuinely had an opportunity to educate people to what really happened on September 11, just like I said, the core issues, the fact that four buildings even got hit - or three buildings and one abandoned strip mine - you know, the fact that those four planes even went down is a strong testament to how much is really wrong with 9/11, because of standard operating procedure.

I think a retired colonel, Robert Bowman - he worked on the Star Wars program - he put it best: if our government had merely done nothing, then the Twin Towers would still be standing, and 3000 Americans would still be alive.

Solomon: Let's talk about the evidence, because obviously this is where the controversy starts to get interesting, because there are lots of people that think that Loose Change has got almost everything wrong, as you well know.

Avery: Yeah..

Solomon: Let's talk about the first allegation, that the U.S. air defence, NORAD, essentially stood down and let the planes happen, that's one of your allegations - what do you mean by that?

Avery: I don't want to necessarily say that the military took an active part in standing down, because that would mean that someone consciously said 'I'm not going to shoot this plane down, and I'm going to let this happen.'

I think that the war games that were going on that morning are a very key part of understanding why 9/11 happened the way it did, and how 9/11 happened. You know, we have the tapes that just got released where we have commanders on tape saying 'oh, we have no idea what's going on', and one person's like, 'oh, this is a real hijack? cool', and people are just treating it as 'oh, ok'.. so..

Solomon: You're probably talking about the North American Air Defence transcripts that have been released..

Avery: Transcripts have been released..

Solomon: ...And there are operators on there saying 'is this real world, or is this exercise?' standard operating procedure within NEADS. If it's a hijacking, I mean, these are gallows humour, obviously, in their... but they took action, it struck a lot of people when those tapes were released that they did everything that they could to try to stop those planes, but they just didn't have a lot of, as they say, 'bullets in the gun'..

Avery: Ahh.. you know, it's great, because the government puts up this incompetence theory, like 'oh, we tried as hard as could, and there's a lot of conflicting timelines in regards to the fighter jets response, and also NORAD's response. You know, you have General Larry Arnold, I believe, of NEADS, going and saying 'oh, they flew like a scalded ape at 500 miles per hour and couldn't catch up with the airliners.' OK, uh a 767 cruising speed goes about 500 mph, and they're telling me that an F-16 which tops out at 1875 miles per hour, full blower, full speed, and they're telling me that these F-16s were going 25% of their total, well almost 25%.

Solomon: Just remember, in the NEADS transcripts, the commander who sent those jets out of that particular part of New England, the Northeast, he said - and it's on the transcript - 'go at full blow even if you have to break windows', in other words, break the sound barrier.

Avery: Oh, I know, I know...

Solomon: They went the wrong way at first, and then they had to recall them..

Avery: Well, first they sent them all the way out east and then they had to double back. But I mean, then you have Duff and Nasty, instead of being sent to Flight 11 and 175, instead of being sent to Manhattan, they're sent to some airspace off of New Jersey, and they're put in a holding pattern, I mean, it's things like that.

Solomon: The question is, is that incompetence? I mean, they showed that they had, once the beacons were turned off on the planes, they lost them, not necessarily... I mean, they lost the planes, they sent their air defences to the wrong place. Obviously, we know that there were war games going on, but the question is: does that show total incompetence, as the 9/11 Commission shows, or does it show something else?

Avery: That's very tough. See and again, I don't want to try and implicate anybody, and I don't want to try and say that the entire government was involved in the operation, because as we all know, a lot of government employees are just regular people, just trying to make a paycheck, and I don't want to say that "the government is evil" and I don't want to say that every single person in NORAD and in the Pentagon was complicit in 9/11. A lot of those people were just trying to do their jobs, and that might be - again, speculation - that *might* be what happened to Flight 93, is that someone within the government realized what was going on, and decided 'you know what? Screw the stand-down order, I'm going to go shoot this plane down'. Again, I am just thinking out loud, as an example.

I don't want to implicate anybody without hard evidence, but it seems that NORAD and the FAA and a lot of key institutions of our government simply dropped the ball.

Solomon: OK.

Avery: And whether or not that was incompetence or criminal complicity is for the courts to decide. But I think it goes far beyond incompetence.

Solomon: OK, now, what's interesting is what you say jives well with what we've talked about to Lee Hamilton, co-chair of the 9/11 Commission, he says 'for sure, it's incompetence.' If there's anything more - criminal negligence - he's ready to believe it, but as he - and you - both believe, you need hard evidence, so do you have any hard evidence on that?

Avery: Well, we have things like the Norman Mineta testimony, I don't know if you're aware, Norman Mineta was ..

Solomon: The [former U.S.] Secretary of Transportation.

Avery: The Secretary of Transportation, and that morning, he was in the emergency bunker with Cheney. And this is interesting, because this was his testimony to the 9/11 Commission, and Norman Mineta's testimony happened to be the only three and a half minutes that was accidentally scrubbed from the archives. Like, you can view the entire 9/11 Commission hearings online, but for some reason the three and a half minutes containing Norman Mineta's testimony was scrubbed out of the archives due to a snafu. I mean, someone called CSPAN and asked them, they're like "oh, phhht, we can't figure it out, that three and a half minutes is gone".

So basically the Norman Mineta testimony: he testified to the 9/11 Commission - directly to Lee Hamilton - that he was in an emergency command bunker with Cheney that morning. There was a young man, more or less the exact quote is 'during the time that the plane was headed into the Pentagon, a young man would come in and ask Cheney, you know, the plane is 50 miles out, the plane is 30 miles out, the plane is ten miles out, do the orders still stand? And Cheney whips his head around angrily and says 'of course the orders still stand, have you heard anything to the contrary?'

Now, you know, 50 miles out, if the orders had been to intercept and shoot down that plane, they would have been able to do it, I mean, there's just no question. So I think that that testimony - and the fact that it was subsequently censored - is very telling. And again that is not hard, 100% conclusive evidence, but you have a number of certain things along that vein, where once again, at a certain point, you really have to draw the line and say 'is this incompetence and co-incidence, or is it something much more sinister?'

Solomon: We asked Lee Hamilton about the Mineta testimony.

Avery: What did he have to say?

Solomon: He said that he couldn't remember that moment, during the Commission.

Avery: Really? I'll play him the video (laughs) I mean, we've got it on DVD, I'm just saying, you know..

Solomon: Let's talk about the collapse of the buildings. In Loose Change, the official theory is that the Twin Towers, and then subsequently World Trade Center 7, but let's just talk about just the twin towers. The official theory on the twin towers is that they fell because of jet fuel fire, and then they pancaked straight down. Loose Change says otherwise - what gives you an idea that the official theory is wrong?

Avery: It's very interesting that you said 'official theory', because that's exactly what it is. Even to date, they do not have an actual official explanation, you know, you've got this combination of different theories coming together that account for these two buildings falling. You know, even the NIST report - if you really want to read the NIST report and break it down - even the NIST report says the fire didn't weaken the steel. Thomas Eager of MIT said it - the fire did not weaken the steel.

Solomon: Let me respond.

Avery: OK.

Solomon: **One theory in your film is that a hydrocarbon fire - a fire caused by jet fuel - would not get hot enough to weaken the steel beams that supported the World Trade Center. Many scientists trying to debunk that theory say that all... a fire that reaches 1200 degrees centigrade - which is the.. everyone agrees that the fires reached at least that temperature - would be enough to..**

Avery: **Not everyone agrees, because actually if you read the NIST report, they said that it didn't reach any more than 500 degrees in those buildings,**

Solomon: **Alright. But they say it was high enough to weaken the steel by 50% - enough to cause the buildings' collapse. Many engineers back that - how do you guys respond to that?**

Avery: **I respond: it's simply not scientifically possible. I'm sorry, you can have steel weaken all you want, but they're basically telling us that a 4-storey chunk of the Twin Towers managed to collapse onto itself, and that top 30 floors managed to pancake down and completely demolish a 70-storey intact skyscraper, 'cuz that's what we had below those impact zones, we still had 70 and 90 storey intact skyscrapers, respectively, South and North tower.**

It's not scientifically possible, I'm sorry. Conservation of momentum and energy tells you that the top 30 floors of a building cannot completely, and in free-fall,

demolish the bottom 70 floors. I mean, you have the pulverization of concrete, I mean, it was turned into baby powder in some cases, I mean.. (rubs fingers) A gravity-driven pancake collapse just cannot account for what we saw on the morning on September 11th, it simply defies all logic.

Solomon: One of our scientists that we've talked to, Frank Greening, he says it is scientifically possible, he's a structural engineer [sic] and he did the numbers and he's not connected to anybody.

Avery: Well, so have scientists, and scientists have done the same numbers and come back with different results. I mean, you're going to have engineers agreeing with the official story, and you're also going to have engineers who say the official story is bogus. So I mean, granted, the government has these experts on their side, and we have our experts on our side.. You know, people are going to battle back and forth and they're going to use different things to their own advantage.

I just tell people watch the video, you know, and not even the Twin Towers - watch the video of Building Seven collapsing. It wasn't hit by a plane. If anything, it had a number of fires between, I believe the 7th and 13th floors, maybe more, and of course, as you mentioned earlier, the diesel tanks in the building, but that still cannot account for the total pulverization and free fall collapse of Building 7. Again, we're just dealing with common sense and rationality here.

You know, back to the Twin Towers, man, I mean, just what you saw on TV, you know, you have steel beams shattering and exploding upwards and outwards (motioning with arms), I mean, a gravity-driven collapse cannot account for steel beams shattering and flying up and out.

Solomon: Can I ask you - some people would say that we don't really know what would happen because of the unprecedented nature of the event, so you got engineers on both sides and some say, you got a plane that's hitting at 500 miles an hour, it is full of jet fuel, it rocks the building, there's a fire that there's great debate about how hot it went and what the steel could withstand, there's a huge 40-storey above trying to collapse on 70 stories below, in other words, the unprecedented nature of the accident would suggest that... is it.. it might just be possible that what happened, happened.

Avery: I just don't see it happening. I've seen too much evidence, I've talked to too many rescue workers, I've talked to too many people who were there, I've talked to cops who were there when Building 7 fell, I've talked to people who were there when the Twin Towers fell - it's just not true. You know, I hate to say it with such totality, without 100% evidence or facts or science to back up my claims. Again, I'm not claiming not to be the smartest person in the world, I'm obviously not a structural engineer, I'm obviously not a scientist.

Solomon: Let's talk about, OK, if it didn't pancake because of the jet hitting it.. in the film, you talk about this being a controlled demolition - what do you mean by that?

Avery: I mean that there had to have been a coordinated explosive event inside the World Trade Center to account for what we saw, and this is not only backed up by visual evidence, but by eyewitness testimony from Willy Rodriguez, and at least ten of his other co-workers, whose stories were told independently of Willy Rodriguez: Willy only met these people after the fact, and saw their broadcast reports on Spanish CNN and things like that, people like Jose Sanchez..

Solomon: These are workers..

Avery: These are workers who were in the basement of the World Trade Center, who felt, experienced - and were burned by - an explosion in the basement prior to the plane hitting.

Again: prior to the first plane even striking the North Tower, there was a violent explosive event in the basement of the North Tower. I mean, one guy comes running out, the skin is falling off of his arms, he says 'the elevators! the elevators!'

You know, again, someone could brush that off and say 'oh, Willy got confused, you know, he confused the two impacts'.. So, for that to be true, you also have to say that the other ten eyewitnesses got themselves confused, and that the person who came out screaming with his arms burned was confused too. Again, at a certain point, you really have to draw the line and ask yourself: 'are all these people crazy, and misreporting what they experienced? Or is there something more sinister at hand here?'

Solomon: And that would be, the controlled demolition idea..

Avery: Again, that's just one part of it

Solomon: One part of it suggests that explosives were put throughout the tower to bring it down, with the plane hitting.. how... controlled demolitions, as I understand it, you know, they can take days, sometimes weeks to bring down the building, and they have to put explosives all through the building to bring it down like that.

Avery: Not necessarily all throughout the building, but at key structural members of the building, you know, key points, they basically have to take the blueprints of the building, map it all out, break it down, find the weak points, find it out exactly where they have to place it, it is a very detailed and complicated thing - that's why only a few companies in the world can do it. You were going to ask about the effort to wire the twin towers?

Solomon: Well, I just want to know: how would you do that? I mean, how would people get inside the Twin Towers and be able to wire it? I mean, it seems like an incredibly complicated operation..

Avery: Oh, absolutely, and I'm not saying it happened the weekend before, you know, someone just came in with a bomb and said 'hey, let's ring these buildings down" I mean, obviously, it was a long coordinated effort, and if you look through the timelines and if you look at, you know, key players of 9/11 and key members of what happened, it seems that a lot of these events were being planned before the Bush administration even took office. So I don't want to try and pin this on, you know, 'Bush did it', or you know, 'the Bush administration did it', because it seems like the plans at very least, began taking shape far before Bush took office

Solomon: In 1993, the World Trade Centers were also attacked with a bomb, in the basement of the parking lot, in the parking basement - it didn't bring down the towers down, but security was heightened intensely. How then, post '93, when we already know that the World Trade Centers are going to be attacked, we already know that they withstood a pretty serious bomb in the basement. How then would this other bomb play out? In other words, how does that make logical sense then?

Avery: You can't put anything past our government, you can't say 'well, there was a high security level, so there's no way they could have gotten bombs in there'... I mean, let's just be real here: if our government wants to do something, they're going to do it. And if.. not even if our government - whatever faction was involved in September 11th, there is always a way to get done what you had to do. One way would be to slowly replace workers in the maintenance crew, one by one, you know, I'm not saying over a course of a few weeks, I'm just saying one by one, slowly get rid of people and replace them.

Solomon: Do you have any evidence of that?

Avery: No, I don't, but you're asking me to theorize, so I'm theorizing.

Solomon: We asked Lee Hamilton about the controlled demolition, and he said 'our commission looked at the debris, found no evidence that there was any explosive powder or debris left', and he said 'we dismissed that.'

Avery: Of course, he dismissed it. But I refuse to stop doing what I'm doing because the 9/11 Commission said so, OK? I mean, there really has to come a certain point where you stop taking the government's word for everything, and you have to look at things yourself, OK?

Solomon: He said 'show me hard evidence' and he'll believe it - is there any hard evidence that explosives took place?

Avery: I mean, there's definitely scientific analysis that has been done, you know, a lot of the steel was carted away and wasn't released to private investigators, you know, it was only released to certain government-funded investigations, it wasn't released to a private independent investigation team.

Steven Jones had to get someone to go to a memorial to scrape some dirt off a steel beam to get any samples at all, and when he tested those samples, he found trace elements of not just thermite, but thermate, which is an advanced version of thermite - you basically add sulfur and it increases its' cutting capacity.

Now again, I'm not a scientist, but scientists and structural engineers before me have analyzed the evidence and I would like to point people towards his thesis, which is called "[Why Indeed Did the World Trade Center Towers Collapse?](#)" He not only goes through the official story, but the 9/11 Commission, the NIST Report, the ASCE Report, and he goes through, and he points out all those instances in the NIST report where they say 'the fire didn't weaken the steel', 'the fire temperatures were not extraordinary', 'the fire temperatures did not exceed 500 degrees Celsius' - again, 500 degrees Celsius is not nearly enough to account for what we saw. I mean, high-rise skyscrapers have..

It's actually funny, I went to a 9/11 memorial a while back in Albany, and they had this little placard up next to one of the steel beams that said, the fires that eventually brought down the World Trade Center were fuelled by office furnishing and fire, er, office furnishings and paper. So they're basically telling us that an office fire brought down 2 skyscrapers in total free-fall, no resistance, into their own footprint, you know. The government told us it was a gravity-driven pancake collapse and that the floors slowly collapsed down on one to another. You know, if that's true, then where are the floors? You know, why, when you look at Ground Zero, it's just a pile of steel? Like, a couple of stories high, just mangled steel everywhere.

If it was a progressive gravity-driven collapse, and it was floor after floor after floor after floor (gestures with hands), first of all, you would have that collapse slow down. The building wouldn't have just exploded in mid-air, 'cuz let's be honest - that's what it does. You've watched the videos - the building just disintegrates from the top down, and you would not have seen what you saw on TV if the government's official story is true. You wouldn't have the building exploding out.

Solomon: That's an interesting... let me give the critique of that, the thesis being that it fell virtually in free fall, almost 10.9 seconds, whatever it did..

Avery: Approximately ten seconds, it's tough for account for the actual collapse time of the towers, because obviously the whole thing was obscured by the clouds.

Solomon: Right..

Avery: But - but - by the time the tower has gotten down at least three quarters of the way, at least 10 seconds has past.

Solomon: Right, the question is.. so the thesis is that a free falling tower wouldn't be naturally gravity-driven, it has to be, the theory is that the bottom has to be blown out.

Avery: Yeah, which corroborates with Willy Rodriguez's testimony, and the fact that there was molten steel in the basements three months after the fact, uh...

Solomon: So is the thesis is that there was some kind of bomb in the basement, that those fires got really hot, those fires got molten, and they essentially, after 55 minutes, they melted the bottom, and then the things collapsed?

Avery: Well. even if you just took out the core of the World Trade Center, the whole building itself wouldn't come down, I mean, it probably would have fallen over, actually, because that's what allegedly the terrorists wanted to do in the 93 bombing, is that they wanted to take out the basement of one tower and knock it over onto the other.

But, you know again, if you do your research, you can do your research on a man named Emad Salem, who was an Egyptian army officer, who infiltrated that team, and to make a very long story short, ended up working for the FBI and replacing.., he offered to build the bomb with a fake powder, and he was like, you know, 'well, you know, we can build a fake bomb, or we can get them on tape talking about this, and then we can get them to Boston for that' and his FBI handler - you can listen to their conversation, I mean, the phone call is on the internet - and you know the FBI handler's like, 'oh, no, we need a real bomb, we need this whole attack to go through', uh, you know, that's a whole other can of worms. [Jason] Bermas, if you want to talk to Bermas about that, he'll talk your ear off.. uh..

Solomon: But the point is, on this one..

Avery: But the point is, on this one, yeah, even if there was a violent explosion in the basement, that alone doesn't account for what we saw, but the fact that there was one in the basement, the fact that there was one before the plane even hit.. and the fact..

Solomon: So, you've got a bomb in the basement, a plane hitting at the top, and then controlled bombs throughout the body of the tower.. is that right?

Avery: I'd say that's a fair assumption, and again I don't want to say that they used a particular method - granted, there's numerous methods of controlled demolition, there's RDX, thermite, Dexpan, the list goes on, and I can't even imagine what they used in those buildings, 'cuz I mean, those were two of the strongest buildings in the world, I mean, they really were. If you look at them being built, at the core, you had 47 steel columns intersecting, and then you look at the NIST report, they draw it as a tube, like, they draw it as just two lines going up and down, and the floors are just... they made it look like something a sixth-grader would build, you know, out of popsicle sticks, when in reality, I mean, you had a very strong interconnected, high-rise steel skyscraper - two of them..

Solomon: One of the things that you show in your video is pictures - video evidence as you guys call it - these of squibs, which are, as the buildings collapse you see sort of puffs of smoke popping out in a few places..

Avery: Absolutely, and you're going to say that that would be pressure from the collapsing floors above, correct?

Solomon: Some critics say that there was such a pressure that things are going to burst out like that all the time.

Avery: Absolutely, but actually, if you get close enough to those explosions, you can actually see steel beams are being blown out, it's not just dust, it's not just, you know, debris and stuff like that, You can actually see steel, and bits of the building being blown out. Now granted, if it was, you know, 5, 10 floors below the demolition wave, I can excuse it. But you have that one case where the South Tower is just beginning to collapse - it's the second video I believe I played, in the Second Edition - and you know, the South Tower is collapsing right up here, and there's a bomb, like on the 30th floor - you know isolated, way down the building, right down here, just a squib going out like that. And then later up in the building another one pops out.

Solomon: But what would that signify? I mean, if it's a squib, first of all, I think in the video you have 6 or 7 of them, but they're are not that many, in other words, from a controlled demolition idea, usually there's, they're popping all over the place.

Avery: Oh, absolutely..

Solomon: Why would that one tiny little puff of smoke that comes out, in other words..

Avery: Who knows, man? And again, I don't want to say that it's proof of one thing or another, I'm saying, it's interesting to say the least. The fact that these squibs are coming off, in some cases, 60 floors below the demolition wave, when you know, pressure can only account for so much. You know, again, you see these kinds of squibs in demolitions, and the fact that you only saw a few of them - who knows? Maybe they tried to conceal them and they screwed up in certain points, you know, again, I don't like speculating, because it's exactly that - speculation.

It just, from the video evidence, from the physical evidence, from the science that I've read, it just doesn't add up. It's really all it comes down to, is that things just do not add up. And I realize that the 9/11 Commission, you know, if you search for the word 'explosion', it's not in there once, you know, Willy Rodriguez gave them an entire testimony about the explosions in the basement, they didn't mention it once, they don't mention Building 7 in their Commission Report, it's.. you know, the list of things goes on, that they did not address legitimate questions.

Solomon: Building 7, some have called it the 'smoking gun of 9/11', the collapse of a building that wasn't hit by a plane.. I asked Lee Hamilton why they didn't mention it. At first he wasn't sure whether they did or they didn't, but in the end, they decided not to mention it. What's your view?

Avery: And see, I think that is very telling, because as I said earlier, Building 7, in and of itself, is an architectural anomaly. The fact that you had a couple of floors, a couple of fires and falling debris from, you know, a collapsed building, and then supposedly a diesel tank in the basement, you know, just the fact that that building even fell the way it did should merit investigation, and the fact that there's not even a paragraph saying "at 5:20 pm on September 11th, World Trade Center 7, a 47-storey building 300 feet away from the North Tower fell down into its own footprint" - you don't even get that, they don't even mention it.

Solomon: Tells you what?

Avery: It doesn't tell anything concrete, but you know, it's one of those crimes of omission, where it seems like the 9/11 Commission could have at least said something about it, could have at least thrown in a sentence, saying 'hey, Building 7 fell'.

And it seems like that, and numerous other things, are a deliberate part to keep certain information from the public, like, you know, they could have included Willy Rodriguez's testimony, they could have included Sibel Edmonds' testimony, the list of things goes on. You know, you could add to the fact that they ignored Curt Weldon's Able Danger testimony, the

fact that the government was well aware of Mohammed Atta's presence in the United States at least in 2000; and the fact that the government destroyed 2.3 terabytes of data on him because of a time restriction or something.. so, you know..

Solomon: I asked Lee Hamilton if he knew about an alleged payment that the Pakistani intelligence service gave to Mohammed Atta for \$100,000..

Avery: And they said they they've had no evidence, right? Yeah, and then you have, I believe, the head of the ISI confirming that transfer went place, I mean, that transfer actually took place. I am not 100% scholarly on that subject, but I do know that there is a certain amount of debate surrounding that topic, but it seems like that evidence points towards that transfer actually happening.

Solomon: Let's talk about the plane that hit the Pentagon, not far from where we're sitting. In the film, you guys talk about the evidence points to the fact that it just could not have been a plane, it must have been, as you say, a missile.

Avery: Well, it's not that it could not have been a plane, it's that the.. everything that we see at the Pentagon, the physical damage to the lawn - granted the light poles sync up, the light poles are the one thing about the Pentagon attack that they got right, it's the perfect trajectory, it's the perfect wingspan. But we're saying that, just looking at the scene at the Pentagon, it is not consistent with a commercial airliner being kamikazied into a reinforced building. I mean, that was the initial impression of the people that showed up, you know, like 'it was weird, it was out of Twilight Zone, I couldn't find the plane', I mean, we've talked to people who were there, we talked to Bob Pugh, who was the guy that shot the first 12 minutes of video at the Pentagon, and even he was like, 'I didn't see the plane, you know I thought it was really weird, because I've shot video of plane crashes before, and I didn't see any plane parts'.

So that was what was really telling to me, is that a lot of people were like 'where's the plane?', and this wasn't me, this was people who were actually there, and were actually on the scene, and saw the building, and were like 'I don't see a tail, I don't see wings, I don't see any indication that a jumbo jet just came through and swooped into the building.'

Now as for what it was, again, that's speculation. Granted, in the Second Edition, we kind of come out and say it could have been a cruise missile, but, you know, in cases like that, we're really just trying to give people answers, because that's the first thing that's gonna come to their head, because, like 'if it wasn't a plane, then what was it?'

Solomon: But let, let.. the NTSB, the National Transportation Safety Board, they say they have released tapes from the plane, flight data that shows the actual flight of the plane.

Avery: Oh, yeah, I know, I've got it.

Solomon: Their testimony contradicts the initial testimony in the 9/11 Commission's report. However, when presented to you - when you get flight data from the plane that hit the Pentagon - doesn't that kind of say to you 'well, it looks like a plane did go into the Pentagon'?

Avery: Again, I am not doubting that a plane was there, I am not doubting that a plane was involved, I am not doubting the existence of any of these planes, I am doubting their involvement in the alleged attacks.

Now, again, we not only have the flight data recorder, we have the NTSB's actual video recreation of the flight - I've watched the entire thing - and it doesn't jive with the official story. The official story has it coming from the right, through Columbia Pike, down there (using hands) and then sweeping through the light poles and coming into the left. It basically

has it flying to the right of the Sheraton Hotel and the Navy Annex - the Sheraton Hotel where we're staying - has it coming down through the right sweeping in and doing its 45-degree angle. If you watch the video of the cockpit flight data recorder, it comes in at a steep shallow left angle, and then the plane stops 400 feet above Columbia Pike - that's where the flight data ends, 400 feet above Columbia Pike - making the impact with the light poles impossible, making the impact of the Pentagon impossible.

So you're asking me if the flight data recorder proves me wrong? Hell, no! It only vindicates what I've been doing because the flight data recorder that was released completely contradicts the official story.

Solomon: And it doesn't have it going into the Pentagon?

Avery: It doesn't have it going into the Pentagon - it ends above Columbia Pike, it ends at approximately 180 feet.

Solomon: This is the recently..

Avery: This is the recently released flight data recorder that members of our forum filed the FOIA from, this is not the government releasing something on a whim.

Solomon: Freedom Of Information Act..

Avery: Yes, somebody in our forum filed an FOIA - Freedom of Information Act - years ago, and just got this information from them. Again, a member of the Loose Change forum filed this and got an official response. They not only got the actual FDR and CSV files from the NTSB, with a cover letter, OK? This wasn't something that someone posted, they had the actual FOIA response, and you can look at it, it would be pretty hard to fake.

Solomon: So the flight data that was released did not take it right into the Pentagon?

Avery: No, it didn't, it ends a couple of hundred feet back, and two hundred feet up into the air. (pauses, shrugs and smiles) And again, what does that mean?

Solomon: Let's talk about United Flight 93 -

Avery: There's a can of worms.

Solomon: - a plane that people assume crashed in Shanksville. There was a film made about it. In Loose Change, that plane never crashed.

Avery: Well, we're not saying, again, that a plane did or did not crash anywhere. We're saying that the scene in Shanksville, again, is not consistent with a jumbo jet crashing into the ground. Whether or not it was shot down, or crashed by Ziad Jarrah, because he knew that, you know, the passengers were coming in and they were going to storm the cockpit, regardless of what happened to that plane in the air..

You know again, the crash scene, you've got a 15-foot crater, you've got small whiffs of white smoke coming up, you've got no substantial debris. I mean, if you look at any plane crash, there is a huge gouge in the earth, usually from some kind of a trail where the plane skidded to a stop, you've got, at the very least, the nose and the tail. Granted, sometimes the fuselage will melt away, but you still have a large tail section, wings, engines, and the cockpit.

And again, at Flight 93, you've got a crater about as big as this hotel room, you've got small whiffs of white smoke, you know, you've got 10,000 gallons of jet fuel that just ignited, and you're telling me it all basically just vaporized, and you've got white smoke trailing off.

Solomon: In the film, you say that that flight actually lands in Cleveland, and the passengers got off.

Avery: We're saying that there are a number of different reports that a plane that was initially confirmed as Flight 93 landed there. And we actually went to Cleveland Hopkins and talked to some flight attendants - this was after the release of the Second Edition. We talked to ticket agents, flight attendants, and they said 'yeah, there were two planes here, there was one plane here, and there was one off by NASA, we don't really know much about that plane'. Apparently there was a lot of things going on at Hopkins that morning, a lot of planes coming down, a lot of planes going up, but, it's...

Solomon: Every airport was the same. I guess that people ask about this one is..

Avery: It's the fact that we've heard from passengers from Delta 1989, we've heard from people who were grounded at Cleveland Hopkins that morning, and people, you know, who thought they were on a hijacked plane, and we've never heard from any of those 200 people that went to the NASA Research Center. And, again, it's not the fact that..

Solomon: *What about the people who died on the plane?*

Avery: *I don't know, man, and the burden of proof is not on me, to prove where these people went.*

Solomon: But I mean, you know, the families are out there, and many of them talked to their relatives on that plane.

Avery: Oh, I know, but a lot of the family members contact us, and they're asking the same questions we are, it's like..

Solomon: Do you have family members who lost people on United Flight 93 who are telling... who believe that their family members may still be alive, or not.. didn't die in that accident?

Avery: We've got e-mails from ten friends of Mark Bingham, I got an e-mail from Mark Bingham's aunt Ellen, we've talked to Todd Beamer's friend, I actually talked to the son of a guy who worked with Todd Beamer at Oracle. The kid was pissed off, 'cause he heard about the premise of my film, and then he tracked me down on MySpace, sent me a flame mail, and like, 'look man, I'm really just asking questions' and I sent him one of the pictures that got released in the Moussaoui trial, of the crater, a close-up of the crater, like the guy's, like, right here, with the camera, and I'm like 'dude, please just explain to me where Todd's body is, like, just look at this picture, this is what the government is telling you, they're telling you Flight 93 crashed here - please explain to me where Todd's body is.'

And the guy sent me back an e-mail, he's like 'dude, I'm totally with you.' I'm not making this up, the guy was like 'I'm totally with you, I don't know what happened, but where's Todd's body? Where's the plane? I'm furious' And then he went and told his dad, and now his dad has seen the movie, and his dad's like, 'yeah, where's Todd?'

And again, you have no way of believing me on this, but I'm giving you this as an example that we're doing the same things that the family members are doing, we're asking questions, we want to know what happened. So where are the people?

Solomon: Yeah, people want to know, you know.

Avery: I want to know too, man, but the burden of proof is not on me.

Solomon: So what about the phone calls? Some have suggested that cell phone calls couldn't have worked above 10,000 feet, and so the calls that were allegedly made from the plane weren't true. I posed that to Lee Hamilton. He said that the Commission said, in fact, cell phone calls do work sometimes up there, and some of them obviously went through. And some of the phone calls were from airphones anyway.

Avery: Yeah, we're not disputing the airphone calls. What we're disputing is the fact that a lot of the phone calls from Flight 93 were made at cruising altitude, and a lot of these conversations were sustained over a minute's time. This was back in 2001, OK? Granted, I understand if now you can get a cell phone connection, but technology grows a lot in five years, so for a number of these passengers on Flight 93 to holding sustained conversations with their loved ones on cellphones, it just doesn't seem likely - at all.

Solomon: But again, let's try to use the thesis that some people made them on airphones, and they work. In other words, the notion that some could get through on airphones and some not, if it was..

Avery: Well airphones and cellphones are two entirely different technologies.

Solomon: They are, they are, but what I'm saying is, if there were some kind of idea to take these people away, why let anyone make them from airphones?

Avery: I don't know, man, and again, I don't, I can't, I can only explain so much, I'm trying to ask questions, not give answers, OK? The burden of proof is not on me to provide.

Solomon: But you guys do give answers in the film.

Avery: We're not trying to give answers so much as we're trying to give people an alternative explanation, because, you know, when I was writing the script, I could tell what people were going to ask, right away, I'm like, 'well, let me give them a possible answer',

Solomon: So, you're saying.. part of the problem, I think, with the critics of your film is that you give answers - 'the Pentagon was not hit by a plane', you guys essentially say, a 'cruise missile'; 'Flight 93 lands in Cleveland, the people disappear', essentially, that's what the film says.

Avery: Yeah. And that's the thing, is that everyone takes everything that we're saying in our film as gospel, and we constantly stress to people, we're not saying this is exactly what happened, we're not saying 'take every single thing that we're saying'. We're saying 'this is the evidence that we've come across, these are the things that we've learned, come to your own conclusions.'

Solomon: What about the allegation that nine of the alleged hijackers are still alive?

Avery: It's not even the fact that the alleged hijackers are still alive, it's the fact that a number of these people who were blamed for the most atrocious event in human history, the FBI isn't even sure who they were. I've got a press release, from CNN, Robert Mueller on TV saying, two weeks after the attack 'we've got no idea who these guys really were, some of their identities may have been stolen, we don't really know'. And then the 9/11 Commission

Report comes out and they've got detailed back stories for these 19 hijackers who may or may not have been involved.

Solomon: So do you think they're still alive? Do you think people under those names are..

Avery: I think Waleed Alsheri might have been a good example. One of the members of our research team who's coming here, he actually tracked down Waleed and it turns out that his father is a Saudi diplomat, so that's kind of interesting.

You know, a lot of things about the hijackers really just don't add up - like a lot of the things about 9/11, there's just a lot of things about them that just don't add up.

Solomon: '166 billion dollars in gold is stolen from beneath the World Trade Center' - that's an allegation in Loose Change.

Avery: And again, you know, we're not saying exactly 167 billion dollars, that's why I specifically said in the film 'rumour has it that 167 billion dollars...' I mean, I wasn't saying it was fact, I'm saying that here's substantial rumours that a large amount of gold was stored in the basement of the World Trade Center, and apparently they only recovered 200.

And again, I'm not saying that one thing happened or another, I'm just trying to bring up evidence, I'm trying to paint an alternative picture that people might not be aware of.

Solomon: I guess that guys like me look at what you did, and then I pose questions to Lee Hamilton, and I'll say 'what about this?', and he says, you know, 'there's a thousand rumours and ideas surrounding every single tragedy, we had a year - 14 million dollars and one year - to investigate a huge amount, millions of documents, and some things are rumours, you know, the 166 billion dollars, we can't track down everything' - is that a fault of the Commission in your mind?

Avery: I think it's very telling that the 9/11 Commission initially wasn't even going to be formed, and then Bush was going to appoint Henry Kissinger for the Chairman, and then only after a public outcry and the fact that he had to reveal his business dealings that he resigned; I think the fact that Max Cleland resigned from the Commission and called it 'one of the biggest cover-ups in history' - hello? One of the commissioners resigns and denounces it for being a cover-up - I think that that's very telling, the fact that one of the people involved quit because he felt that there were conflicts of interest. It defies all logic.

So you just have to watch the actions of the Bush administration after 9/11, watch how Bush constantly blocked an independent investigation, said 'we need to leave this to Congress, this is a Congressional matter', you know, we can't have people investigating the government.

And then, you know, after the Families Steering Committee, Mindy Kleinberg and Kristen Breitweiser and the rest of them got together and said 'we need an investigation', and they were like 'well..'

Solomon: These are the Jersey Girls.

Avery: These are the Jersey Girls, yeah. And the government's like, 'alright, you can have your commission.' The Commission originally got 3 million dollars, which is a fraction of the cost of Bill Clinton's impeachment, you know, his impeachment procedures. So the government was willing to spend 30 million dollars on a blow job, but you had to fight to get an investigation into the biggest.. what could have been the biggest atrocity. and biggest screw-up - or worse - in America history.

It could have been the biggest lie ever, and I think the fact that we donated more money to investigation of a blow job than we did to 9/11 is very telling, yet again, it's like, you really, again, you have to draw the line at some point - are these people truly concerned, and where we really caught off guard by a surprise attack, and you know, does Lee Hamilton really have no clue what's going on, you know, did they really investigate and honestly try to find financiers, or is there something much deeper at hand? And that's really what it comes down to.

Solomon: If you were sitting down with Lee Hamilton, what would you say to him?

Avery: That is a very tough call, I guess I would basically pose to him the same questions that I pose in my film, and I would like to see what answers he has. Um, I'm sure Jason and Corey have their own set of questions for him, but myself personally, I want to know what he does, you know, I mean, was this guy who was really swept up to investigate something and didn't find any evidence or the alternative theories? Or, you know, again, was he commissioned to cover up these alternative theories and to deliberately not address them?

And I don't want to implicate Lee Hamilton or anyone else, but you look at people like Thomas Kean, who, you know, go on TV and are now saying that they willingly accepted false testimony from the Pentagon, and that they knew the Pentagon was lying, and they thought about bringing them into criminal court, but they didn't.

Now that the Commission's closed, the people aren't going to do anything about it, they're going to buy their book and read their book about how everyone dropped the ball, and that's going to be it, And the American public is going to totally forget that the Pentagon gave the 9/11 Commission false testimony.

Solomon: Hamilton would say that they didn't have a mandate to bring legal charges - what they would do, as he likes to call it, is punt, they flip it over to the Justice Department to bring charges as they had done with the FAA, and as they had done with NORAD, in two cases. Let me ask you another thing - I mean, this is the question that everyone wants to know. Let's say you buy all these inconsistencies, what you talk about, World Trade Center 7 that collapsed, the towers, the fact that the planes didn't get down..

Avery: Let me guess.. too many people would have been involved.

Solomon:(spreads hands) Huge!

Avery: Not necessarily. There's two words that come to mind: wargames and compartmentalization, The wargames are now public record, I mean, we just got those tapes that confirmed, at the very least, that they were doing hijacking scenarios that morning, That, and the fact that the government has a way of using you without you knowing it. Lee Harvey Oswald went on TV that day and said "I'm just a patsy".

The government has a way of manipulating people and using them to their own advantage, and then wiping them out when they're no longer needed. I think that perhaps even a number of the people what were involved in the true aspects of 9/11 might actually have been wiped out on the day. I mean, you have five Raytheon executives - Raytheon is a company that specializes in remote aircraft, aviation, you know, they have dealings with the United States government. If there was any company that, let's say, would have been involved in this alternative explanation, Raytheon is one of their top picks. And the fact that five of their executives got killed on Flight 11 and 77, I believe, three on Flight 11 and two on 77 - I'm not entirely 100% on that.

Then you have people like Chip Burlingame, I've looked into Chip and I've studied his story. We were having a long talk about Chip last night. We were looking out the window of the Sheraton, just looking at the Pentagon, just thinkin'. Chip Burlingame, I think, is one of those examples of a person who they felt was a liability. He was a very good person, you know, he was a company man, he was a top gun, he did anti-terrorism strategies, he did leave to work for American Airlines in 1989, but he did stay as liaison in the Pentagon until 1996, doing anti-terror strategies, so he was working at American Airlines, and still doing anti-terrorism strategies.

Solomon: The pilot...

Avery: This is the pilot. Now, seriously, let's just take a step back for a second, and just think about this: this guy worked in the Pentagon, did anti-terrorism strategies, worked in the Naval Command Center, he knew all these people in the Pentagon, he was flying American Airlines, on the morning of 9/11, he is the alleged pilot of American Airlines Flight 77, which, you know, flies over Arlington Cemetery, where his dad is buried - and he will eventually be buried months later - flies over Reagan... or flies over Arlington National Cemetery, flies into the very office where he used to work at the Pentagon, killing every single co-worker he used to have... uhhhh... no, again, it comes off as crazy when you bring up all these things separately, it's just, that the numbers behind that have to be astronomical, the odds of that happening..

Solomon: But, the odds of.. I mean, just think about, let's just put it all together, because this is what a lot of people are trying to figure out, and then look at all the inconsistencies that you raise, and they are interesting, without a doubt. But think about the pilots on the planes, the passengers, who either have to be murdered..

Avery: OK, but again, we're doing circular logic here, we're talking about people that might have been involved, where people might have been, I'm talking about facts.

Solomon: OK, but I'm just saying, one way of trying to understand inconsistencies is to posit 'how could it happen?', there's so many conflicting.. you'd have to have people that put bombs in the buildings, you'd have to have, you know, hijackers...

Avery: So, they could have outsourced the demolition job to the Israeli Mossad, people with entirely different moral values than us. Again, you really, you have to stop asking questions about us, and you have to start asking questions to the government, because we're not the people that are responsible for this.

Solomon: No, no, I understand that, but in terms of getting buy-in, I guess, Dylan, that's the question.

Avery: I know, I know it's very hard, it's very hard to accept that Americans would do this to themselves.

Solomon: But why would they? What's the motive, do you think?

Avery: Look at everything the Bush administration has done, I mean, I think that all you have to do is go read the PNAC document that we talk about, that was released in September 2000, I mean, we have not only key members of this current Bush administration - and the former Bush administration - but also we have people like Scooter Libby, Jeb Bush, you know, the list goes on, of people who were signers of the PNAC document, who said 'we want to invade Iraq, we want to invade Iran, Syria, North Korea, we want to increase military spending, we want to...'

Solomon: 'We want a new Pearl Harbor..'

Avery: ...'but we need a new Pearl Harbor to do it', OK? So, you know, ask yourself: did our administration just get lucky, and the terrorists were like, 'oh, we're going to bomb America', and the Bush administration was, like, 'yes - let's pull our plans off the shelf.'

But, and again, you asked, 'how could things like this be pulled off?', you know, again - 100% speculation - the people that could have been running the drill that hit the Pentagon - could have been running it from the Naval Command Center, which got hit, so someone, you know, someone could have come in that morning and said 'hey, man we're going to a drill this morning, it will be kind of cool, we're going to fly a missile into our building' - you know, again, as a drill, OK? And just saying to someone 'hey, this is what we need to do, do this at this time, etc., etc.' - again, I am not saying this is what happened, I'm not saying this happened one way or another, I'm just saying this is how the government works.

Solomon: Why do you say this is how the government works?

Avery: Because I've seen the way people have changed their stories when they've been used by the government - a pertinent example is Zacharias Moussaoui. For the longest time, he was, like 'I wasn't involved...', you know, 'I was supposed to be the 20th hijacker' and then 'I wasn't', and then he completely denied having anything to do with 9/11, and then when he was in the courtroom wearing a stun belt, yeah, he changed his story, and he was, like, 'oh, yeah, I was supposed to be the 5th hijacker and fly a plane into the White House.' You know, people like Moussaoui, you have to wonder, was this a useful idiot, or something else?

Solomon: One of the things about this that baffles people is, if they did, if someone, whoever it was, if there is some conspiratorial element here, why would - and you talk about the Bush administration's actions - why would the hijackers, if you're going to go to all the trouble, be Saudi Arabians, as opposed to, let's say,

Avery: Iraqis..

Solomon: Iraqis, right? Why then go towards Afghanistan, where there's no real serious oil interest, as opposed to, let's say, Iran or Iraq, which..

Avery: Afghanistan was a means to the pipeline, not necessarily to get the oil that was in Afghanistan, but to use it as a means to transport oil through Afghanistan..

Solomon: I know, but even that, the pipeline is years away, and it's a complicated thing, as opposed to... if the final goal was to go after Saddam Hussein or Iran, as many of the kind of theories suggest, why make them 19 Saudi Arabians, why bother even going after the White House and the Pentagon? Wouldn't it be enough to bring down the Twin Towers and then go right to Iraq? In other words, it seems there's huge amounts of complexity..

Avery: You needed the Pentagon for extra.. the Pentagon made it officially an act of war. I mean, granted, had the Twin Towers fell, that probably would have been good enough, but I guess they just needed an extra something, Now again, I am positing here, I am speculating, and I don't want to talk about things that I have absolutely no proof of. I mean, I have no clue how they would have pulled off what they pulled off. I don't know what plane they would have used. I don't know how they would have gotten the bombs inside the Twin Towers, I don't know what bombs they could have used. Granted, people who are much more qualified than I am, and have much better credentials - people like Steven Jones - have posited that it was thermite, or thermite was at least used to sever several of the main support columns. Now again, speculation..

Solomon: What's the hardest piece of evidence you have? In other words, the thing that the 9/11 Commission missed, that you just lay down in front of Hamilton, and said 'guys, I would speculate there, and there's people.. you know, there's lots of speculation, they have witnesses and scientists', but a piece of evidence that you just give, 'I am going to lay it down for you, bro', and here's the hard evidence...'

Avery: That is really tough, if I have to give it to Lee Hamilton, I probably wouldn't choose Building 7, because like you said, he would just say 'we found no evidence of that' or, you know 'we didn't want to discuss it', or he doesn't even remember if he covered it or not.

You know, in regards to Lee Hamilton, you would have to bring up something like W199i and John O'Neill, the fact that Bush signed an executive order in the months before 9/11 blocking John O'Neill from investigating the bin Ladens, and saying that 'if you investigate these guys, you're going to get arrested'. You know, the FBI agent Robert Wright, who got up on CSPAN and said 'I can't tell you guys what I know, all I can tell you is the Bushes vacation with the bin Ladens'. He had tears running out of his eyes, again, this is an FBI agent who's going on TV and saying, you know, 'there is a serious problem here.'

Solomon: Now the Bin Ladens are a very well-known Middle East family, they do literally billions of dollars worth of business..

Avery: I realize that the family has ostracized themself from bin Laden..

Solomon: ..from bin Laden - in other words, of course, you can just imagine, post-9/11, people who do business with the bin Ladens - of which there are literally thousands and thousands of people, because they are a very well-regarded family in Saudi Arabia and that part of the world - it's probably not great to be in the Washington beltway doing business with the bin Ladens, just because of perception. So people don't want that to come out doesn't necessarily mean that those people are involved in any terrorist activity.

Avery: Of course, but, you know, Robert Wright, as an FBI agent, probably has a lot more information that I am not privy to - that you and I are not privy to - I just think that the fact that he got up in tears and made a big deal about it, you know, should be very telling, that it's not just business as usual, if you know what I am saying..

Solomon: Hard evidence, I just think, I want, I want..

Avery: Hard evidence, you know, that's the thing, is that a lot of the hard evidence that we would have we don't, because it's either been shipped away, locked up, or not released to the public. I want Lee Hamilton to show me the other videos from the Pentagon. I want to see the 84 videos that they've decided not to release, you know, they show us only two videos of the impact at the Pentagon, and I'm sorry, I don't see a jumbo jet, you're going to have to do much better if you're going to convince me that a jumbo jet slammed into the Pentagon.

I'm not saying the videos are fake, because now that we have the five frames, the actual video of the five frames, and a video taken from the guard post in that video, and you take the two videos side by side, and you sync them up, everything's perfect: I mean, the smoke, the inconsistencies in the smoke trail, it's all authentic. I mean, if they faked that, they did a damn good job. I'm not saying it's possible at all, because I watched those videos, and they go for a minute each, there's just no way.

So, you know, again, those videos are completely indistinct. You see a small indistinguishable object, then you see a smoke trail going into the building, and then a huge explosion. I mean, in the first frame, it's interesting, well for the five frames, they're pointing at that white blob on the right, and they were saying that that was the plane, but if you watch it a lot closer, if

you watch the two frames, mainly the first and the second, you actually see a tailfin behind the guard post, and in the second frame, that tailfin disappears. I'm not crazy here, like, go watch the video, if I had my laptop, I'd show you right now.

I also think it's interesting, they did the same thing with the second video. They didn't actually really zoom in on the second video and look for the plane, they saw the white blur, and they're, like, 'there's the plane.' They did the same thing with the second video. You saw that white blur on the right side of the frame, and they're like, 'oh, there's the plane entering the frame', when in reality, if you look to the left of it, and again, advance a frame, there is a plane to the left of that, there is some kind of shape to the left of that plume. All you have to do is go frame forward, frame back, just keep doing it back and forward until you get the picture.

I also think it's very telling when those videos were released, when the five frames were released, and then again, when they re-released that video, and in the new one, they were constantly pointing to that white thing, and saying 'there's the nose cone of Flight 77 - it's solved, a plane hit the Pentagon, move on.' And again, in reality, I think that they were distracting attention from this black plane to the left of it.

Solomon: So, what's happened to you since then? Have you been called unpatriotic, Dylan?

Avery: I've been called unpatriotic, an asshole, a fucker, a cocksucker, you know, I've been called all kinds of mean nasty names, un-American, unpatriotic, 'if you don't like it, go live with bin Laden', you know, I've heard all kinds of ridiculous nonsense..

Solomon: Death threats?

Avery: Death threats here and there, you know, mostly just a pissed-off guy with an internet connection who says "I would want to kill you if I ever met you", you know, he's just some pissed-off guy, he's not actually going to do anything. You know, as for direct contact from the government, I guess, or what could be not really, I think it'd be pretty stupid of them to take us out, or to threaten to take us out, because that would really only vindicate what we were doing. I mean, seriously, if I started getting death threats, I mean, you'd have to think that I was onto something.

Solomon: Are you worried about your safety?

Avery: I'm obviously worried about my safety, but the path I am taking takes priority over my life, and I fully dedicate my life - and my death - to this, I suppose is the best way to put it.

Solomon: Do you think you'd have to die for this, Dylan?

Avery: I don't think I have to, but I'm saying, I ask anybody, if you really think that I'm doing this just to be cool, and I'm doing this just because I caught on to something that I thought was going to be popular so I ran with it, would I really be putting with all this bullshit? Would I really be dealing with death threats? Would I really be getting hate mail on a daily basis and still continuing to do what I do? Would I be here, you know, in D.C., talking to people who allegedly saw the plane hit the Pentagon? I mean, would I be here? Would I be doing all of this? Would I be putting up with every single thing that I've put up with since I released the first Loose Change last year - and everything I put up with when I was making it, when I was homeless, when I was making the video while I was sleeping on a couch.. I mean, would I..

Solomon: What do your folks say about this?

Avery: My mom loves it, I mean, she's been behind it since day one, she's been always been supportive of me, believes in what I'm doing, you know, fully believes in my information, you know. I've never met my father. Apart from that, I have a pretty small family, not that I have a small family, but my immediate family is quite small, it's basically my mother, my grandma, and my uncle.

My uncle, I don't think I've really got his opinion on it, he definitely supports what I'm doing, whether he supports the information, I'm not sure. I'm sure, like anybody, it's very hard to accept. You know, I didn't stumble upon this and go, 'OK, this makes sense'. It wasn't a good thing, you know, it's not that I enjoy thinking this about my government, it doesn't give me comfort to think that there are evil forces controlling things. I mean, I think it's much..

Solomon: So in the end, Dylan, what do you think right now? After all this, what do you think happened?

Avery: I think there is no doubt that the United States government at the very least was criminally negligent, in regards to the events of 9/11, but the more you dig into it, and the more you look into how stories change over time, and how people give different testimonies, how, like I said, you know, not even NORAD and FAA can get their stories straight; how everyone says that the planes were flying at different speeds in different directions. You really... where's your line in the sand, you know? Is our government incompetent, were they caught off guard by a terrorist attack by 19 Muslims with box-cutters managed to penetrate a 400 billion-dollar-a-year defense industry?

Basically, 19 lucky Arabs managed to perform the most atrocious act in history - or - were there plans that were on the shelf for decades before the Bush administration? Not just in regards to invading the Middle East, OK? It's not as short-sighted as that. I mean, there are numerous things on the shelf that probably we don't even know about, in regards to 9/11.

I am not positing that I have all the answers, I don't even have a fraction of the answers. I have hundreds of unanswered questions that, to me, necessitate a new investigation. And I don't mean another 9/11 Commission, I don't mean people, you know, who were tied to Iran/Contra and Watergate investigating the government. I don't want the criminals investigating the criminals.

I want the Jersey Girls, I want the 9/11 family members, I want the rescue workers, I want the people whose lives have been destroyed because of 9/11 - I want *them* investigating, because they are the ones who are going to get the answers, they are the ones who are going to do what needs to be done.

Solomon: But in the end..

Avery: What do I think happened?

Solomon: Yeah..

Avery: Our government was involved. It's the only way I can put it.

Solomon: In what way? I mean, you said criminally negligent.. that means..

Avery: Criminally negligent would mean that they let it happen. There are basically two factions of the 9/11 Truth movement, there is LIHOP and MIHOP: Let It Happen On Purpose, and Made It Happen On Purpose.

Solomon: That's right, let it happen on purpose, and made it happen on purpose.

Avery: Absolutely, and, you know..

Solomon: Are you a "Made It Happen" or a "Let It Happen"?

Avery: I guess I'm a "Made It Happen", you know a lot of people start off as "Let It Happen", and they either stay there, or they move on. Now again, at the outset, I wanted to believe that our government didn't see it coming, you know, they were truly caught off-guard, they missed all these warnings, you know.

Even the Taliban warned us that there was going to be an attack coming, they warned us on September 7, they said 'listen guys, there's an attack coming' - this was after, you know, the MI6, the Mossad even warned us, Russian intelligence, German intelligence, all these red flags were going up all across the world, not just in our domestic intelligence agencies - all across the world, signs were coming in saying 'there's something big coming, something big is going to happen, and you guys better do something about it, the World Trade Center is going to get hit, the Pentagon's probably going to get hit' - all these signs were coming in, I mean, is it incompetence, or is it complicity? It's really the question you have to ask yourself.

Solomon: You think it's complicity..

Avery: I think it's complicity. Me, personally, I believe that the United States government was complicit in the attacks of 9/11 and all you have to do to accept that possibility is read your history books and just look at all the things that have happened, look at Pearl Harbor, look at JFK, look at the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, look at Oklahoma City, look at those all these times that something major has happened to America, and it has always led, almost always led to a war in a sovereign nation.

And you know, again, you really have to ask yourself, has our government been honest to us this entire time, not just in terms of 9/11? Go back to the Gulf of Tonkin incident, where Lyndon B. Johnson basically lied to Congress, and said that, you know, that the Maddox got blown up, and we need to invade Vietnam to get these people back, and they signed the resolution and we were in Vietnam.

Now, historians are agreeing that the Gulf of Tonkin never happened, because they actually heard Lyndon Johnson's phone conversations, so, you know, Vietnam, Iraq is now being described as the new Vietnam, which I think is very poignant, because Vietnam is now proven to have been escalated thanks to a false flag terror attack - Gulf of Tonkin. So if Iraq is the new Vietnam, what is the new Gulf of Tonkin?

So, you know, again, I'm just asking people to read your history books, you know, America is not the only country in the world. I hate to shatter peoples' illusions, but you know, all across the world, people know what's going on.

You know, I've talked to members of international press, people like yourself, we had, like, four different German crews come over to our house, and everytime they're like, 'why is your press not picking up on this?'. You know, we asked them, 'guys, are we crazy, or do people know what's going on?'. 'oh yeah, people know.' The international community knows that there is something sinister behind 9/11. Now, again, whether it is negligence or complicity, we need the answers, and we need them now. You know, we don't need these guys to be publishing books and going on TV and talking about how they got lied to, OK? That doesn't cut it for me.

Solomon: So what's next for you?

Avery: Uh, right now, for example, I mean, we're here in Washington D.C., we're talking to eyewitnesses to the Pentagon attack, we're talking to people who were working in the Pentagon, we're hopefully going to be talking to April Gallop - she was the woman we mentioned in the Second Edition, I've been talking to her on and off - outstanding woman, she's got a lot of great stories to tell. And, you know, she's on our side, too: you know, she crawled out of the hole where the plane was supposed to be, and she didn't see anything. She never would have known it was a plane if the people who came to the hospital didn't tell her that.

So that's what we're doing, we're basically doing everything that we wanted to do in the Second Edition, we are taking out all the times, you know, all the parts where we speculate out loud, we're taking that out. It's intended for American theatres, it's essentially what it comes down to. This is going to be a mainstream documentary, but it's going to ask hard questions, and it's really going to make people upset, but hopefully we're going to do it in a way that doesn't alienate anybody.

Solomon: Are you a film-maker, Dylan, or a crusader?

Avery: I guess both, I've always been a film-maker at heart, I believe Loose Change, I guess, was the first real project that I started working on. Again, I never intended it to be finished, or I didn't even know if it was going to be finished, it was just something, you know, to take up my time, when I wasn't washing dishes, you know, to do something with my life and not be another stupid kid, you know, pay attention to what was going on around me, take an active participation in politics, take an active participation in this world, and it's grown to exponential levels, obviously. I mean, I went from one kid just trying to shout from the rooftops to where I am now.

Solomon: Is there a movement you think?

Avery: There is a movement. There is definitely a movement. There was one before the release of our film, and there is definitely a movement now. It's uncanny the strength that we have now, the strength in numbers, in evidence, in people of good repute, who are now on our side. We have former members of the Bush administration; we have CIA analysts on our side. The list of people goes on.

One of the other questions we get is 'well, you know, if I was involved in something like this, I would have come forward by now.' Well, first thing, is people have come forward - not the people who put the bombs in the buildings, or the people who flew whatever into the Pentagon, we're talking about people who were tracking the bin Ladens and have come forward and say, 'hey, we were shut down before 9/11'. We have the people who were working in the World Trade Center who were doing 12-hour shifts for security, and they were like, 'the weekend before we got pulled out.' I actually talked to one woman, it turns out that a lot of those people didn't just get.. it wasn't just a shift change, a lot of these people actually got laid off. Like, a lot of the security team got laid off prior to 9/11. You know, again, it's just another brick in the wall, is really the best way to put it. I mean, like it's..

Solomon: And students love this stuff..

Avery: Students love it because, you know, a) the film, I suppose, is geared towards them - not intentionally, I guess subconsciously, because I was speaking to my peers by making a film that I thought was cool, and that I thought would be watchable, and not entertaining - because the subject matter is certainly not entertaining- but people would want to watch it, and that they would want to sit through it.

Solomon: Are there any journalistic standards that you abide by, in your group, in your forum?

Avery: Uh, what do you mean?

Solomon: In other words, do you follow any procedure as to what evidence you guys are willing to say and what you just throw out there, in other words, do you guys now have any standards that you abide by?

Avery: I definitely do now. I mean, I have come a long way and I have learned a lot since the release of Loose Change, You can't even imagine what happened to me in the past year and a half, I've come so far, man, and now at this point, it really, it's really coming down to the wire, where we really have to focus, and you know, stick to the hard evidence, and stick to the things that we can prove.

Solomon: But how do you know when you are just going to jettison stuff? Like I'll give you an example, the plane that lands in Cleveland, and the television report that covered that now says that was false, we got it wrong. How do you know when to say 'you know what? let's not include that, that doesn't make sense to us?' - what are the standards that Loose Change uses?

Avery: Well, again, since releasing the Second Edition, and especially the first one, I've come a long way, as both a person and a researcher. I can tell you right now that the Final Cut is going to be substantially different than the Second Edition, Again, when I was making the Second Edition, I was trying to address the people who were uninitiated to the information, but at the same time, I was kind of preaching to the choir, because I knew there was a movement out there, and I did want to sort of speak to the movement at the same time and address... you know, I wanted to pick up on things that no one else had picked up in their films. I really wanted people to at least watch one part of my film and say 'finally, someone brought that up', because we really wanted to paint a very complete picture, and bring to the table all the conflicting evidence, and naturally, you know, it became, sort of a clusterfuck in the Second Edition, because we have now so many things that people tear us apart for, and you know, criticize us for, 'debunked!', you know, it's like, 'well, guys, we never said anything was 100% fact.'

Solomon: But not saying that, doesn't that weaken the case, like, you know there is a whole book out called "Debunking 9/11"..

Avery: Yeah, absolutely, I think it's very funny that Popular mechanics, which is supposed to specialize in tractors, is now publishing books about 9/11.

Solomon: But they've done a lot over their history, not just on tractors and technology. What do you think of the "Debunking 9/11", the folks from Popular Mechanics, now a book?

Avery: I haven't read the book yet, but it seems like a lot of them focus on the same key arguments, and bring up the same quotes over and over again, and leave it at that, and it seems that every time that we bring up another piece of the puzzle, they just jump back to **the same defence, like, 'aw, well, you know, people saw the plane hit, so you're crazy'. It's like OK, well, why didn't the Pentagon release the 84 videos?...'well, the people saw the plane, you're crazy'. They always just jump back to the same key defences, you know, 'eyewitnesses saw the plane, the AFIP identified the passengers, so a plane hit - shut up, go away'. it's very telling, I think, that they never have an answer to our specific claims, it's always that they jump back to one or two talking points.**

Like, you bring up anything about the demolition of the World Trade Center - the molten steel in the basement; the explosions before the plane hit; the molten iron, the molten metal pouring out of the corner of the South Tower, brighter than that light bulb over there, and they're telling us it's aluminum from the planes, or it's office furniture, which is just ridiculous!

So, I mean, you have what seems to be a sustained chemical reaction pouring out of the corner of the South Tower, where the building fails, right before it's collapse. And, you know, again, people can say 'oh, well, that's obviously melting steel from the jet fuel' - it's like, well, if you look at it, it's a reaction, it's not just steel melting, it's actual, you can see sparks flying off and reacting as they go through the air, so it's a sustained chemical reaction, that's going on right there, and it happens, right before the building falls.

And then you have all the smoke from the base of the Twin Tower right before it collapses. You even have a FOX News anchor saying 'holy crap, there's a lot of smoke coming from the base', and then the building falls. Again, you can just rattle off point after point after point, it will be, like, 'guys, something is not right here'. And they'll just keep deflecting back to the same talking point: 'well, they said that the steel only had to weaken so much for the building to collapse' and they just leave it at that. It's like, 'I wasn't even talking about the collapse, man, I was talking about before the collapse.'

Solomon: So you really don't buy the debunkers?

Avery: I don't buy the debunkers at all, because they all, it seems like they all resort to the same thing, and if you really want to get into it, and you really read the NIST report, and you really read the Commission Report, and the ASCE Building Study, they admit - openly admit - that the steel did not melt. Thomas Eager at MIT even said the steel did not reach unusual temperatures, the steel did not melt, it was either Frank Gayle or Thomas Eager.

Solomon: When will this come out in theatres?

Avery: Next year. We're wrapping it up hopefully by the end of this year, and we're going to have it in Sundance in January, and hopefully have deals locked and loaded for next year.

Solomon: How much have you spent on this yourself?

Avery: On the Final Cut?

Solomon: On the whole project..

Avery: The project, you know, all the money we make, man, you know, we put it right back into the movement, You know, right now, this trip is a perfect example: we are flying out two or three different researchers, we're putting them up in a hotel room, and all we're asking for is help - you know, all we're asking for is to pound the streets with us, and to task people, you know, what did you see? Ask their neighbours - what did you see?

Solomon: And you spent how much making the first film?

Avery: The first Loose Change cost \$2,000.

Solomon: And the second edition?

Avery: The Second Edition cost an additional \$4,000 and again, that wasn't really even production costs, it was stuff like footage, and equipment and a hard drive that erased itself, while we were out at lunch one day. I couldn't make this up - like, we went out to lunch, we came back, and the hard drive that had literally everything with the Second Edition on it was, like, (snaps fingers) - gone.

And if you watch the Second Edition at the end, it says "Very Special thanks to Nate, without whom this documentary would not have been possible." Nate is a guy who I knew for a long

time, he worked at, actually, the local bagel shop. It's really funny actually, I took my hard drive to, like, every professional in town, and I was like, 'look, guys, my hard drive just fried itself, and i need to get the data off it.' I took it to places that were like, 'well, you're going to have to spend, you know, \$6,000 on data recovery, you might get it back in a month'. I took it to one guy, he told me to freeze it overnight. I mean, like, I went to all these official places, and then my friend RJ was like, 'hey man, you know, Nate works at the bagel company', and you know, I was like, 'oh yeah, that's right.' So I went and talked to Nate - he had my hard drive with all the data in 72 hours, and he was, like, '500 bucks', because he had to spend like, \$150..

Solomon: Still working at the bagel shop?

Avery: Still working at the bagel shop.. and he had needed \$150 for the software, and a couple of hundred just for labour and everything else, and dude, he did something in 72 hours with \$500 that all these other companies couldn't have done.

Solomon: The point is, with under ten grand, you guys have started something..

Avery: Yeah, the point is that, you know, for under ten grand - for under the cost of catering on the set of "World Trade Center" for a day, we've made a film that's spoken to hundreds of millions of people, and is literally changing the world.

Solomon: What did you think of Oliver Stone's "World Trade Center"?

Avery: Haven't seen it yet.

Solomon: What did you think of UA flight 93?

Avery: Total garbage. I mean, it's.. you know, we have Paul Greengrass coming out and publicly bashing our film and saying that his film is based on fact, and he got the story straight, when he didn't even listen to the flight data recorder from Flight 93. You know, he basically admitted that he improvised the entire film, he basically said there was no script for most of it, it was a lot of just people talking, and just playing along. Granted, you know, the parts from NORAD and stuff like that was all scripted, because it had to follow the transcripts and everything, but..

Solomon: 'Total garbage'...

Avery: Well, not total garbage, I don't mean total garbage like, you know, insulting the passengers of Flight 93, I don't mean that at all., I mean the whole 'let's roll, let's take down the hijackers, this is the first victory in the war on terror' - it really seems like this giant propaganda piece, it doesn't seem like the genuine story of heroes, it seems like, regardless of what happened to Flight 93 - you know, who.. whatever really happened with it, landed in Cleveland, or shot down, or landed - apart from whatever happened to that plane once it took off, the story itself reeks more of advertising than it does of something that actually happened.

Solomon: Let me ask you one last thing before i let you go, and i know i keep going on.

Avery: No, that's fine.

Solomon: Lee Hamilton, I asked him about the black boxes on the planes, which ones were recovered, and he didn't remember.

Avery: (bows head down, smirks) It's just fun to me, I mean, the chairman of the Commission can't even remember if he mentioned Building 7, or if they mentioned the black boxes, it blows my mind.

Solomon: What's the story of the black boxes?

Avery: The story of the black boxes is the 9/11 Commission says that the black boxes from the two planes that hit the World Trade Center were not found, that Flight 77's FDR was recoverable, had nothing useful on it, and that the cockpit voice recorder was unrecoverable. And as for Flight 93, they got the cockpit voice recorder, and they played that for the families, the families couldn't even take notes, you know, the families could listen to it, but they couldn't say anything about it outside the room - which again, I think, is very telling: these people are listening to the last moments of their loved ones' lives, and they can't even write down what happened.

Solomon: Is the last 3 minutes of the flight data recorder on UA93 missing?

Avery: That's what the FBI said, and that's because apparently there was a discrepancy, because the seismic records said that the plane crashed at 10:06, and that the 9/11 Commission and everyone else says that it crashed at 10:03. And then, you know, we had that report, I don't remember the exact outlet but it's in the film, we had the exact article that says '3-minute discrepancy in tape', and the FBI admits that there's 3 minutes scrubbed from the last minutes that didn't get recorded for some reason.

Solomon: Seismic data, I asked Lee Hamilton if he'd ever heard of the seismic data about the buildings getting hit, both in New York, and in Shanksville - he's never heard any information, he said, about seismic data.

Avery: Never heard any? See, that's puzzling to me, because I thought that the 9/11 Commission supposedly debunked that, but I guess Popular Mechanics did itself, but... that boggles my mind, Lee Hamilton didn't hear about the seismic events either - it seems he didn't hear about a lot of things that, at the very least, he should have been aware of.

You know, the fact that a building collapses in lower Manhattan, and it registers as an earthquake, you know, 20, 30 mile to the north, and is picked up on seismographs.. I mean, the '93 World Trade Center bombing wasn't even picked up, and that was a huge explosion, a decent-sized bomb, and that one wasn't even picked up at all. And, you know, the plane crashes registered as .6, .7 - under 1 - and the collapses themselves registered as 2.1 and 2.3, South and North Tower. And if you look at the data, you know, it's funny, it depends on how you look at it. You know, if you look at it from a distance, there's a sharp spike and that it levels off.

Solomon: Yeah, there's a duration..

Avery: Yeah, there's a duration, but then someone says 'well, if you go in and zoom in, there's actually a rising crescendo before that peak', but the fact is, there's still had to have been some kind of violent event - connected to the ground - to push that energy that far away, in all those directions, and I don't think that debris just hitting the ground would have been enough to do that, and also it would have been a rising spike as more and more pieces of the building fell. Instead it was a spike that slowly leveled off, so it seems more indicative of a sudden sharp explosive event as opposed to, you know, the rising impact of more and more building debris hitting the ground, and again..

Solomon: And he hadn't heard of that.

Avery: He hadn't heard of it, so I ask him 'why? Why did no one feel that that was important enough for you to at least address and debunk?'

Solomon: It was great that you talked to us for so long, thanks Dylan.

[^TOP](#)