

JOHN REMINGTON GRAHAM

COUNSELOR AT LAW

180 Haut de la Paroisse
St-Agapit (LOTB)
Quebec G0S 1Z0 Canada
TEL-FAX 418-888-5049
jrgraham@novicomfusion.com
May 9, 2014

Hon. Cyrus Vance Jr.
New York County District Attorney
One Hogan Place
New York, New York 10013 U. S. A.

Attention: Tom Wornom, Esq., Assistant District Attorney

In re: Collapse of the Twin Towers and Building #7 at the World Trade Center in New York City on September 11, 2001

Dear Sir, --

In order to bring you quickly up to date, I submit herewith file copies of the letter of William H. Schaap of the New York Bar dated the 13th of February 2013, and of my letter to you dated the 4th of February, 2013 as transmitted by Mr. Schaap by certified delivery. Your office reacted by telephone call from your assistant Mr. Wornom to our counsel Mr Schaap, and then I followed through, with the approval of Mr. Schaap, in my letter of the 9th of August, 2013, of which I also enclose a file copy. Mr. Schaap represents Architects and Engineers for 9/11 Truth (also known as AE911Truth) in the State of New York, and he is also transmitting this further letter to you as our counsel. I am a member of the Minnesota Bar (#3664X), working without compensation and for patriotic reasons as a volunteer lawyer and private citizen to support the activities of AE911Truth undertaken with the approval of their board. My purpose is limited to assisting AE911Truth, formed around a nucleus of professional men and women, through our counsel, in offering a petition to your office, as public authority for the State of New York, for redress of grievances and promotion of the public good. Our petition impacts all our fellow Americans.

In short, we asked you and/or one or more trusted lieutenants in your office to meet with a committee including Richard Gage, chief executive officer of AE911Truth, our counsel in the State of New York, and myself or one or two other citizens in or associated with AE911Truth. We proposed a meeting on a confidential basis in order to discuss our request for your cooperation in securing the appointment of an independent special prosecutor and the calling of a grand jury in New York County with a specific purpose of examining the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building #7 at the World Trade Center in downtown Manhattan on the 11th of September, 2001 (commonly called 9/11).

Through our counsel in the State of New York, we are approaching you again, because **we now have compelling new information regarding our earlier correspondence, and we**

believe such information surely necessitates investigation of the facts surrounding the execution of contracts concerning public safety at the World Trade Center, made before 9/11 between the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey and two private companies. Hereinafter, I shall discuss this new information in factual context.

To recapitulate our objective, the mission of the special prosecutor and grand jury we seek would be to determine

-- Whether the cause of the collapse of the Twin Towers and Building #7 was aircraft collision and office fires, or controlled demolition which would have had to be implemented probably over some months before 9/11, and, if controlled demolition,

-- Whether there are individuals who or institutions which might be indicted and thereby brought to justice for treason, murder, or other such crimes against the State of New York.

We suggested appointment of a special prosecutor in order to relieve your office of political pressure. We understand the obvious political and legal parallels between the assassination of President John F. Kennedy and the events of 9/11, between the Warren Commission and the 9/11 Commission, and between the painful story of Jim Garrison in connection with Kennedy's murder and the circumstances faced by your office in consequence of the events of 9/11.

We are not indifferent to, but are not here concerned about other attacks against the United States on the same day, which certainly are outside the responsibility of your office. And for purposes of this discussion, we do not challenge the premise of the 9/11 Commission that the attacks in question were generated abroad by Al Qaeda, a foreign enemy of the United States designated by the President as such, under a resolution of Congress authorizing warlike acts and approved on September 14, 2001.

Our position is that the Twin Towers and Building #7 came down from controlled demolition which necessarily had to have been prepared inside the structures of the World Trade Center and within the State of New York. This position is not a conspiracy theory, but concerns a question to be determined by forensic evidence that does not depend on whom or what anybody may want to believe, including the opinions of witnesses who qualify under the law of evidence as experts from academic training, professional licensure, and/or post-academic study, learning, and experience. When we first contacted you in February 2013, we supplemented our offer of proof with a link to a 58-minute, internet-accessible video, prepared by AE911Truth to educate the general public. The link was www.YouTube.com/AE911Truth, and it can still be viewed by anybody who wants to weigh the facts. Our purpose was to illustrate the kind of testimony available and the caliber of the expert witnesses available to prove up controlled demolition of the Twin Towers and Building #7. We provide here as an appendix to this letter a list of the technical witnesses who spoke on that video, with a short background statement for each witness, so as to eliminate any question of the legitimacy of our evidence.

As my letter of February last year reflects, our offer of proof rests of enumerated elements, which I restate as follows, to wit:

(1) the durability and design of the high-rise buildings of the World Trade Center, which were sufficient to withstand the impact of aircraft and internal fires as observed;

(2) the extremely high temperatures (2800-4000 degrees Fahrenheit) which could not have been generated by aircraft collision and/or office fires observed, yet were required to melt, and actually melted steel structures and concrete material in the three buildings;

(3) the near free-fall acceleration and

(4) symmetry of the collapse of the three edifices at the World Trade Center,

(5) including such collapse even of Building #7 which was not struck by aircraft, yet, like the Twin Towers, came down in a manner visibly indistinguishable from a professionally engineered demolition;

(6) the lateral ejection of hundreds of steel members at a calculated speed of 60 miles per hour from, as must have resulted from powerful explosions, and

(7) mid-air pulverization of many tons of concrete, as again must have resulted from powerful explosions, during implosion of the Twin Towers;

(8) the discovery by public officials, in the dust at Ground Zero and across downtown Manhattan, of large quantities of previously molten, iron-rich microspheres; and

(9) discovery in the same dust by an international team of scientists of fragments of unignited nano-thermite used in the preparation and planting of incendiary and explosive agents required to accomplish the destruction observed. Nano-thermite is a high-tech incendiary which is manufactured only by the most advanced laboratories of defense industry contractors.

Since our original approach to your office in February last year, we have accumulated more forensic evidence indicative of controlled demolition, and we add here and now a further element of proof, namely,

(10) hundreds of oral histories ordered recorded by a fire commissioner for New York City, since released by judicial order, and providing accounts by fire fighters and emergency medical workers, these including reference to explosions actually heard as buildings collapsed, thus cinching the case for, and removing practical doubt concerning the controlled demolition, which, therefore, had to be the fundamental reason why the buildings came down.

Your office answered our petition letter of February 2013 by contending that the events of 9/11 are exclusively a matter of federal responsibility. We trust that our reply by letter of the 9th of August last year (attached to this letter) makes the jurisdiction of your office sufficiently clear. Your office is responsible for prosecuting treason and murder within the New York County, regarding which there is no statute of limitations in your State, and the 10th Amendment reserves authority which cannot and has not been pre-empted by Congress. The late Osama bin Laden and his associates were the business of the United States under a resolution of Congress pursuant to the eleventh clause of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, but **those who engineered the controlled demolitions are doubtlessly the concern of the State of New York.** Our purpose in writing you on this occasion is to address

critical discoveries we have made since our earlier communications with your office, -- discoveries, based on undeniable facts which may well help identify culprits.

Investigations by public authority in the wake of the events of 9/11 were all founded on the assumption that the Twin Towers and Building #7 came down from aircraft collision and office fires. Given that premise, it is perhaps arguable that there was no reason to investigate those responsible for public safety at the World Trade Center during the year or so prior to the 11th of September, 2001. **But given meanwhile-understood and now-overwhelming evidence which establishes controlled demolition to a high degree of scientific certainty, public authority now has a solemn duty to reinstitute inquiry concerning those responsible for public safety at the World Trade Center during the year or so prior and up to and including 9/11.** Even if public authority earlier had a colorable excuse not to investigate particulars related to this concern, such excuse has since evaporated.

The World Trade Center is subject to the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which has been established under a compact or agreement between neighboring States of the Union and approved by Congress in keeping with the third clause of Article I, Section 10 of the United States Constitution, and has had at all times material, including the present, responsibility for public safety at the World Trade Center. Insofar as they touch upon the activities of the Port Authority, the events of 9/11 certainly are the business of the State of New York, including your office as district attorney for New York County.

On the basis of enhanced and renewed effort, we are now aware, or at least better understand the importance of critical facts which are public knowledge and not subject to serious question:

-- While it is true that there were a few individuals from a fairly early date who suspected controlled demolition on 9/11, **it was not until after the 29th of March, 2006**, when the attention of Richard Gage, AIA, was riveted by circumstances on this problem, **that many hundreds of qualified architects and engineers were organized for professional consultation among themselves, and thus able to reach a professional consensus based an ample foundation of factual material, that the Twin Towers and Building #7 must have come down from controlled demolition**, and that, therefore, a new investigation by public authority with full subpoena power should be undertaken.

-- **During many months prior and up to 9/11, the Port Authority had a contract for security work at the World Trade Center with a private company which was then working to fulfill its obligations, and, therefore, had privileged access to the Twin Towers and Building #7.** And from the internet-accessible reports of Margie Burns, a reputable investigative journalist working out of the District of Columbia who had interviewed the chief executive officer of the company as recited in her internet-accessible articles of February 4 and March 2, 2003, we know that this contract was being implemented substantially before 9/11. On the basis of the same source, we can say that the Federal Bureau of Investigation made no attempt to inquire or gather information about this contract or the activities of the Port Authority and the security company in carrying out the agreement. It might be said that the FBI was irresponsible for not making inquiry. But as long as controlled demolition on 9/11 was not widely suspected, it can be argued -- perhaps lamely, but at least an argument can be made -- that the FBI had an excuse for not making inquiry into the activities of the Port Authority and the security company. Whatever might be said of the situation then prevailing, controlled demolition is no longer the

quiet suspicion of only a few, but it is now a matter highly respectable forensic evidence that cannot be responsibly dismissed. Hence there can no longer be any moral excuse offered for failure by public authority to inquire.

-- Even more significant in our view, **the Port Authority had a contract with another private company for modernization and renovation of the world-class elevator system in the Twin Towers, and this contract was carried out over many months before 9/11.** This modernization and renovation must have included substantial work on elevator shafts, and entailed privileged access to the inner core of the buildings during the months leading up to 9/11. While this information was not widely available at the time, it was reported in the March 2001 and November 2002 issues of a respected professional magazine published as *Elevator World*, and there were some pertinent stories in *USA Today*, as published on December 19, 2001, and September 4, 2002. In any event, there can be no serious question that elevators at the World Trade Center were undergoing extensive modernization and renovation on contract with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. The very limited coverage of this important reality in the mainstream news media of the United States is disturbing to us, but it is important here that this very extensive operation was underway sufficiently in advance of 9/11 to include the time span in which controlled demolition would probably have been undertaken.

With the benefit of new information and of hindsight, it is now clear enough that the ongoing work over many months on the elevators and the interiors of the buildings before 9/11 could well have compromised security and created an opportunity for saboteurs to undertake the planting of incendiary and explosive agents for what could only have been controlled demolition in the opinion of an impressive list of qualified professional men and women who have studied the facts, applied their knowledge, and stepped forward in the public interest to express their conclusions. We are not accusing any particular persons of criminal acts; but, given adequate proof of controlled demolition such as we have offered, we believe that a grand jury, with the guidance of a special prosecutor, should give penetrating consideration of means, motive, and opportunity, and should systematically examine witnesses and documents in order to determine whether there is or is not probable cause for indictments.

We are naturally aware of the 9/11 Commission, which did, on March 31, 2003, call one witness from the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, and the text of the report includes a few scattered remarks about the Port Authority. Even so, the final report shows that the entire focus of attention was upon the dramatic events of 9/11, and **no meaningful attention was given by the 9/11 Commission to the Port Authority, not to mention private companies on contract with the Port Authority, or related activities in the time span before 9/11.** Legitimate reasons exist for suspecting the integrity or effectiveness of the Commission, including the resignation of Senator Max Cleland as a member over loud and clear protest in November 2003, but lay this concern aside, and view this situation most favorably to the Commission. Excuse them for human error in not looking into events at the World Trade Center before 9/11 because at the time controlled demolition of the Twin Towers and Building #7 was not widely understood. Even so, we can say without fear of contradiction that, for one reason or another, be it design or fluke, **there has been no meaningful investigation under any public auspices of circumstances and events within the buildings of the World Trade Center before 9/11 which, as now appears, could open the door to significant leads, and eventually reveal the identities of the culprits who would have financed, managed, and implemented what surely was a professionally engineered collapse of the Twin Towers and Building #7,** resulting in deaths of 2606 individuals in the World Trade Center and on the

ground in New York City, not counting those who perished in the aircraft which collided with the Twin Towers. The great bulk of these 2606 individuals died from the collapse of the buildings which, as we have offered to prove, was induced by controlled demolition.

A grand jury is not only the traditional method of investigating this kind of problem in our system of government, but it is the best adapted to the kind of inquiry here proposed, for a grand jury can exercise its powers of subpoena and questioning, using the combined intelligence of twenty-three respectable citizens under the guidance of learned counsel, behind closed doors, thus sealed from public fanfare, political grandstanding, and press antics. A grand jury does not meet necessarily to accuse, but it must always investigate. We believe that our proposal immunizes you as district attorney from unreasonable political pressure, because you are asked for nothing more than cooperation in your capacity as a public officer for the State of New York to assure that a proper inquiry takes place. In this way, you avoid the perils encountered by Jim Garrison in New Orleans, yet you are assured that the interests of our country are served. Misconduct by prosecutors or grand jurors can spoil this method of public inquiry, but this danger can be eliminated or minimized by due care in selecting a special prosecutor and the grand jury itself.

Again we assure you that we shall abide by whatever conditions for confidentiality in discussion you designate for a sober-minded, businesslike discussion on how this project might proceed. We are not interested in news media fanfare and political grandstanding. We would like to appear at an initial meeting by way of a committee. We shall be happy to meet at such time and place, subject to such precautions as you specify, with you and/or such member or members of your office as you designate.

We ask for the courtesy of an answer to this correspondence at your earliest convenience. You may contact Mr. Schaap for this purpose.

Mr. Gage plans to be in New York City on the 23rd of May, 2014. If you could arrange a meeting on that day, it would be very helpful, although the 23rd may be too soon, and other dates can be arranged to suit mutual convenience.

Thanking you for your attention, I remain

Yours respectfully,

Copy to Richard Gage, AIA.

