

SEVEN

9/11, Texas A&M University, and Heresy

Morgan Reynolds

“Every violation of truth is not only a sort of suicide in the liar, but is a stab at the health of human society.”
—Ralph Waldo Emerson, 1841

There is an amazing intersection between 9/11, the state of Texas, the Bush family, and Texas A&M University. It reminds me of the JFK assassination plot, another intersection of Texas and national conspiracy.

In June, 2005, my suspicion that 9/11 was a false-flag operation committed by the US government in consort with selected outsiders became widely known after UPI, the *Washington Times*, and the Drudge Report picked up the story. A principal reason that my article—“Why did the Trade Center Sky Scrapers Collapse?”¹—garnered such “near-mainstream” attention was that I served for 16 months as chief economist at the US Department of Labor in 2001–2002. I was, therefore, a Bush appointee during George W. Bush’s first term. And I was the first official from the Bush administration to declare the official 9/11 account bogus.

Among the lessons I learned in coping with the many reactions to my article, some intense, was the response of the academic community when the official conspiracy theory of 9/11 was challenged, primarily a deafening silence, with a few notable exceptions. Only one colleague in my department, for instance, called me on the telephone to ask what was going on. During the course of our conversation I told him that he was a scholar and a gentleman for trying to get my side of the story. My university, Texas A&M University, the oldest public institution of higher

learning in the Lone Star state, where I had been an active faculty member for 28 years, went beyond a cool silence and quickly weighed in with this statement:

The following is a statement from Texas A&M University regarding recent news reports about the collapse of the World Trade Center on 9/11.

Dr. Morgan Reynolds is retired from Texas A&M University, but holds the title of Professor Emeritus—an honorary title bestowed upon select tenured faculty, who have retired with ten or more years of service.... Any statements made by Dr. Reynolds are in his capacity as a private citizen and do not represent the views of Texas A&M University. Below is a statement released yesterday by Dr. Robert M. Gates, President of Texas A&M University:

“The American people know what they saw with their own eyes on September 11, 2001. To suggest any kind of government conspiracy in the events of that day goes beyond the pale.”²

Dealing with Heresy in Texas

Universities are supposedly about the life of the mind, but it would be hard to craft a more anti-intellectual statement than that of Robert Gates. The official A&M statement might have stopped with the first part, predictable enough and not especially oppressive for today’s higher education establishment.³ But Gates went much further. The first part of Gates’s statement says that people “know what they saw with their own eyes.” What does that mean? The clear implication is that we have no need to investigate further: first impressions are final impressions. CNN and the government told us what we saw, what to believe. The media always separate the real from fake on TV. So we should accept what we were told and move on.

Maybe I am too suspicious about government and its deceptions and a step slow to boot, but I am still trying to figure out what happened with four reported airliner crashes, all of which yielded little or no wreckage and none of which were investigated by the NTSB, not to mention many other mysterious aspects of that blood-soaked morning.

But even if people properly understood what they saw that morning, the implication from Gates is that we should not ask such

questions as: Why did this happen? Who did it? How did they pull it off? What happened to the CIA and other intelligence services? Why was the entire northeast undefended by our air force that murderous morning? How could three steel skyscrapers collapse so neatly at nearly free-fall speed? After these spectacular crimes, why did officials destroy evidence?⁴ Why were thorough investigations resisted if officials have nothing to hide? Why has not a single bureaucrat or disgraced warrior been disciplined? And the most important question about the official account of 9/11: Where is the proof? Proof is evidence that can be verified and therefore trusted, in contrast with the inaccessible and uncorroborated pabulum dished out by the 9/11 Commission.⁵ The Bush administration's view is that evidence to back up the official conspiracy doctrine of 9/11—that a rag-tag band of 19 young Arabs plus a few cave dwellers in Afghanistan pulled off these atrocities, unaided—is unnecessary in our post-9/11 world. Government need not meet the standard of proving the case in criminal court. No, the government can just declare that 9/11 “means war.” The US and British governments promised to produce a “white paper” to prove that Osama bin Laden and his suicidal band of Islamic fanatics committed these atrocities. But these promises have been flushed down the memory hole. While the FBI puts bin Laden at the top of its international most wanted list, he is not actually wanted for 9/11 because, as the FBI chief of investigative publicity shockingly admitted in June 2006, “The FBI has no hard evidence connecting Bin Laden to 9/11.”⁶

To doubt government doctrine is heresy or, as Gates puts it, “To suggest any kind of government conspiracy in the events of that day goes beyond the pale.” But the first questions the police ask when investigating a crime are: *Cui bono*—Who benefits? Who had the motive? Who had the means? Who had the opportunity? Certainly the US government benefited immensely from 9/11 and cannot therefore be dropped from any rational list of suspect organizations. Would it be the first time in history that a government provoked or staged an attack on its own people to stimulate the juices of war? Hardly (as the chapters in this volume by Daniele Ganser and Ola Tunander show). By extension, I guess, questions and answers about the initiation of the Mexican-American war, the sinking of the USS *Maine*, the sinking of the *Lusitania*, the Reichstag fire, the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Bay of Pigs conspiracy, Operation Northwoods, JFK's assassination, Gulf of Tonkin disinformation, Nixon's Watergate

conspiracy, Reagan's Iran-Contra conspiracy, the first President Bush's Kuwaiti baby incubator hoax, the present administration's Iraqi WMD fraud, along with countless other cases of skullduggery since Nero burned Rome to blame the Christians, are verboten.⁷ Given this long history, there is no basis for an a priori claim that our government cannot be suspected of lying to us about 9/11.

To raise that possibility, Gates suggests, puts one "beyond the pale," which means "[o]utside the normal limits of good behavior, what is acceptable." The expression comes from the 16th century, when "the pale" was the name for the limited area of English government around Calais or Dublin, and the people who lived beyond it were considered "uncivilized barbarians."⁸ In Gates's formulation, it is as if "the pale" is the university and my questioning the official 9/11 story is beyond its province. But in fact, such questioning is what the university is founded on. Consider these portions of the mission statement of the institution he guides:

Texas A&M University is dedicated to the discovery, development, communication, and application of knowledge in a wide range of academic and professional fields. Its mission of providing the highest quality undergraduate and graduate programs is inseparable from its mission of developing new understandings through research and creativity.... Texas A&M assumes as its historic trust the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and an intellectual environment nurturing the human mind and spirit.... In the twenty-first century, Texas A&M University seeks to assume a place of preeminence among public universities while respecting its history and traditions.⁹

A&M is dedicated to the discovery and development of knowledge? Developing new understandings? Research and creativity? Freedom of inquiry? An intellectual environment? Really? The statement by Gates serves none of these purposes. In fact, Gates's anti-research message reached the A&M faculty loud and clear. It was another signal to steer wide of white-hot topics such as depleted uranium, stolen elections via electronic vote fraud, and, most of all, 9/11.

In a better world, with a university managed more or less in accord with its founding principles, perhaps a meeting of the Board of Regents would have been called to consider the president's remarks. Instead, there is reason to suspect that they agreed with Gates. One A&M board member of interest is Lowry Mays, namesake of the A&M Business School and former CEO and current

chairman of the board of Clear Channel Communications.¹⁰ Clear Channel owns and operates 1,225 radio stations and 39 TV stations. This media giant, aptly termed “radio’s big bully,” also dominates concert venues and touring promotions.¹¹ Concentrated corporate media, of course, have acted as a government megaphone, largely blocking out criticism of the official 9/11 account and the lies that led our troops into the disastrous war in Iraq. Clear Channel, a Texas-based company that is “tight” with George W. Bush, lowers its hammer on political dissent as it pleases. Among its credits, the company has arranged pro-war rallies, targeted the Dixie Chicks after lead singer Natalie Maines criticized President Bush, and terminated “shock jock” Howard Stern, allegedly for “indecent,” but more likely because Stern came out against Bush.¹² Stern even had 9/11 skeptics as guests and “told his 13 million listeners that he did not believe a commercial airliner hit the Pentagon; a cruise missile, he said, was a far more plausible explanation.”¹³ Mays is a Bush insider whose value system probably does not rank freedom of inquiry, open debate, logic, and evidence near the top. Clear Channel is a powerful example of why the internet, satellite radio, and alternative media must be kept as free as possible from central political control.

A&M’s administration claims that it strives mightily for an environment in which “each person’s individuality and contributions are respected.” The school also has its Aggie code of honor: “An Aggie does not lie, cheat, or steal or tolerate those who do.”¹⁴ A lie includes “anything meant to deceive or give a wrong impression.” Gates endorses the Aggie code 100 percent because, he says, “Choosing to join the community obligates each member to a code of civilized behavior.... We should all aspire to conduct ourselves with respect for others, the highest ethical standards and personal integrity.”¹⁵ Yet his statement, in which he declares my analysis of 9/11 “beyond the pale,” seems designed to deceive by implying that what happened on 9/11 is entirely settled and that there is no reason to suspect US government complicity. Gates leads by example and in this case the lesson for Aggies is that there is no need to challenge a serious analysis by pointing to deficiencies of logic and evidence. It is sufficient simply to denounce it. I fail to see any respect for “individuality and contributions” in that tactic.

The general problem, of course, goes far beyond the personalities at Texas A&M or the unique culture of Aggieland. Universities are

an integral part of the establishment and therefore independent-minded scholars face serious disincentives if their interests should stray “beyond the pale.” Brigham Young University physicist Steven Jones, for example, has had to reach an accommodation with his dean to continue his research on what brought down three buildings at the World Trade Center on 9/11. Professor Jones has received various communications from outside the university promising rewards if he changes his research agenda and punishments if he does not. Universities are big businesses, and growing revenues from government grants, legislative appropriations, and corporate contracts are key. Noble purposes still play a role but rarely dominate when they conflict with more money.

2020 Vision at A&M and the Space Command

A few years ago, Texas A&M initiated Vision 2020, the University’s “roadmap for attaining its quest to be recognized as a consensus ‘top 10’ public university by the year 2020.”¹⁶ With leaders like Gates in charge, I fail to see how A&M can achieve this.

Ironically, A&M’s Vision 2020 was initiated in 1997 by then-President Ray Bowen. In quite a coincidence, the US Space Command published “Vision for 2020” in February of 1997. As David Ray Griffin points out in the present volume, the mission statement at the head of this document reads: “US Space Command—dominating the space dimension of military operations to protect US interests and investment.”¹⁷ There is no mention of freedom, democracy, and human rights, but plenty about “full spectrum dominance,” which will involve merging “space superiority with land, sea, and air superiority” and doing it all to protect US commercial interests. Weaponization and dominance in space would include the power “to deny others the use of space.” As if to emphasize its aggressive intent, the logo of one of the program’s divisions is: “In Your Face from Outer Space.”¹⁸ At a minimum, should not the Defense Department revert to its previous name, the War Department?

The link between the crimes of 9/11 and the increased militarization of space is tighter than you might at first believe. At a press conference on 9/11 itself held by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, the chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee was berated in these words: “Senator Levin, you and other Democrats in Congress have voiced fear that you simply don’t have enough money for the large increase in defense that the Pentagon is seeking,

especially for missile defense.... Does this sort of thing convince you that an emergency exists in this country to increase defense spending?”¹⁹ The attacks of 9/11, understood as a new Pearl Harbor, were used by Rumsfeld to force Congress to increase the military budget, especially for the US Space Command.

Rumsfeld, moreover, was not alone in this lust among the DoD leadership. General Richard Myers, who was the acting chairman of the Joint Chiefs on 9/11, was previously head of the US Space Command. Widely known as “General Starwars,” he evidently supervised the writing of “Vision for 2020.” In addition, General Ralph E. Eberhart, who as commander of NORAD was in charge of the defense of North America on 9/11, was also the commander of Space Command.²⁰

These three men at the top of DoD, entrusted to “support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic,” inexplicably failed totally and catastrophically to defend America that day.²¹ The British, while not required to fall on their swords, at least have a tradition of high officials resigning in the event of abysmal failure on their watch. We are apparently quite different here, with conspicuous failure richly rewarded. But was the Rumsfeld-Myers-Eberhart 9/11 performance really a failure? It can be regarded as an example of “failing upward,” given the immense budget increases for the military, including the Space Command, that followed, along with the initiation of an endless war on terror, the invasion of two weak Muslim nations, and plans for more. How much of the new funding bonanza has spilled over to space-grant schools like A&M I know not.²²

Who is Robert M. Gates?

While I do not want to launch an ad hominem attack on Gates, we can hardly overlook his extraordinary credentials, experience, and qualifications. Why is this man president of a major state university? His appointment tells us a lot about the military-industrial complex, the global domination project (to use Richard Falk’s term²³), and the present and future of American universities.

Gates had a 26-year career as an intelligence professional, including 9 years on the National Security Council under four presidents of both major parties.²⁴ After starting at the CIA in 1966 as an intelligence analyst, he was the only entry-level CIA employee to rise to director. (He was appointed to that position by George H.

W. Bush in 1991.) The Bush family puts a premium on personal loyalty, and Gates is clearly a Bush family loyalist. Gates's own memoir, *From the Shadows*, whose subtitle proclaims himself "the ultimate insider," fawns over the first President Bush.²⁵ When Gates observed the Soviet Union's collapse from his CIA perch in 1991, this "joyless victory" perhaps led Gates to think about how to create a new enemy to sustain the enormous budgets of the CIA and the military-industrial complex. If he had special insight into the 9/11 hoax, this fact might partly explain his eagerness to "silence" an A&M faculty skeptic.²⁶

Gates was first nominated to be the director of Central Intelligence in 1987 by President Ronald Reagan, who was known as the Great Delegator (which may mean that Gates was really nominated by George H. W. Bush assisted by James Baker), at the height of the controversy over the criminal sale of arms to Khomeini and transfer of money to the Contras. But Gates, facing rejection, withdrew.²⁷ Tom Polgar, a CIA station chief and staffer on the Senate Select Committee on Iran-Contra, wrote in an op-ed piece: "My objections to Gates center on his performance during the Iran-contra affair.... Throughout it, Gates acted as if he was in a complete fog or was interested primarily in keeping the truth from being aired in public or from reaching Congress."²⁸ During Iran-Contra, Gates was CIA deputy director for intelligence, then the deputy director of Central Intelligence (hence the number two man), and finally the acting director. Gates was close to Iran-Contra figures and in a strong position to know about what was going on. Although Gates was an early target of investigations, Independent Counsel Lawrence E. Walsh ultimately decided not to prosecute Gates for perjury without stronger evidence. It appears that Gates tried to protect the Agency by leaving aggressive criminal activity to Col. Oliver North and company, but that Gates dissembled when he claimed to suffer from "recall failures" while testifying before the grand jury. In his Final Report of August 4, 1993, Walsh wrote:

Notwithstanding Independent Counsel's disbelief of Gates, Independent Counsel was not confident that Kerr's testimony, without the support of another witness to his conversation with Gates, would be enough to charge Gates with perjury or false statements for his testimony concerning the timing of his knowledge of the diversion.... The question was whether there was proof beyond a reasonable doubt that Gates deliberately lied in

denying knowledge of North's operational activities. A case would have depended on the testimony of [John] Poindexter. [Alan] Fiers would not testify that he supplied Gates with the details of North's activities. In the end, Independent Counsel concluded that the question was too close to justify the commitment of resources. There were stronger, equally important cases to be tried.²⁹

Gates gives us his take on Iran-Contra in his memoirs. It contains, of course, no admission of guilty conduct on his part. He just did not know much, he claims, saying:

What I describe below I learned only in the course of the Iran-Contra investigations.... I knew very little about the fund-raising and virtually nothing about the NSC's operational role.... I was caught in the middle.... The details of all this were known only to a handful of people at CIA headquarters. I was not among them.... I had no knowledge of Casey's close working relationship with North. (311, 391, 392, 415)

Being out of the loop on the main covert operation of the era does not fit the definition of the "ultimate insider," deputy director for intelligence since 1982, deputy director of central intelligence from April 1986 through March 1989, a man whose office adjoined Bill Casey's, and who shared his chief of staff (410). Gates admits some regret about his failure to act against criminals during the Iran-Contra Affair (416–417), but if he had actually known nothing, there would be no cause for regret. Gates was close to then Director Casey and asserts that "With respect to the Iran arms-for-hostages operation, Casey was involved from the beginning and... the only senior official who wholeheartedly backed the idea from the outset"(401). Despite Casey's deep involvement, Gates argues that Casey did not know about the diversion of funds to the Contras from the Iran operation. Knowing how Washington works, I consider this idea, which enhances the odds that Gates was in the dark, far-fetched. More plausible accounts suggest otherwise.³⁰

What to make of Gates's Iran-Contra behavior? At the very least, Gates did not live up to the Aggie Code. He, in effect, defended a government of (lawless) men, not a government of laws. The Boland amendment, with its restrictions on the executive, is indisputably binding law.³¹

The most glaring defect of Gates's sanitized screenplay about Iran-Contra is the absence of George H. W. Bush, whose presidential library and museum (along with the Bush School of Government and

Public Service) are at Texas A&M. On Christmas eve of 1992, Bush, defeated for reelection, pardoned six former government employees implicated in Iran-Contra, most prominently former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. Weinberger was scheduled to stand trial for lying to Congress about his knowledge of arms sales to Khomeini and concealing 1,700 pages of his personal diary detailing discussions with other officials about these matters. Because Weinberger's notes referred to Bush's endorsement of the secret shipments to Iran, thereby contradicting Bush's claims that he had only peripheral knowledge of the arms deal and aid to the Contras, Bush's pardon had the happy effect of thwarting an expected order to appear before a grand jury or be indicted.

A *New York Times* editorial on Christmas, entitled "Mr. Bush's Unpardonable Act," charged: "Mr. Bush remains implicated in Iran-Contra and in that sense he has shamelessly pardoned himself."³² A furious Lawrence Walsh, likening the pardons to Nixon's Saturday Night Massacre, charged: "The Iran-contra cover-up, which has continued for more than six years, has now been completed." Bush responded that the Walsh probe constituted an attempt to criminalize a policy dispute between the legislative and executive branches, although in his diary he confessed: "The pardon of Weinberger will put a tarnish, kind of a downer, on our legacy."³³ In addition to Weinberger, Bush pardoned Duane R. Clarridge, Clair E. George, Robert C. "Bud" McFarlane, Elliott Abrams, and Alan G. Fiers Jr.³⁴

Gates defends the absurd official tale about 9/11, according to which, in the words of the 9/11 Commission, "This immeasurable pain was inflicted by 19 young Arabs acting at the behest of Islamist extremists headquartered in distant Afghanistan."³⁵ But his status as an "ultimate insider," especially within the world of US intelligence, means that he surely knows better, much better. During Gates's CIA watch in the 1980s, the Agency created al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Osama bin Laden as anti-Soviet, pro-western assets. Although Gates would never admit it, he has to know that, in the words of Webster Tarpley, "High-profile international terrorism is not spontaneous: it is artificial and synthetic."³⁶

The evidence provided by Tarpley and many other writers, including some in the present volume, suggests that 9/11 is not about the sociology of the Middle East but about false-flag state terrorism on the part of the United States and one or more of its allies. The

Bush–bin Laden connection goes back to the 1970s.³⁷ Osama will prove elusive as long as he remains a “necessary enemy”³⁸ in the present American version of what Daniele Ganser and Ola Tunander, in this volume, call “the strategy of tension.”

Given the background of Robert M. Gates, it is hard to believe that he does not know this. His attempt to stifle any serious questioning of the official story about 9/11 can, accordingly, be suspected of being part of the cover-up.

Academics and Technical Experts on 9/11

9/11 has clearly become the linchpin of US domestic and foreign policy. Overwhelming evidence backs up this claim.³⁹ For example, on September 30, 2005, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said at Princeton University:

But if you believe, as I do and as President Bush does, that the root cause of September 11th was the violent expression of a global extremist ideology, an ideology rooted in the oppression and despair of the modern Middle East, then we must speak [sic] to remove the source of this terror by transforming that troubled region. If you believe as we do, then it cannot be denied that we are standing at an extraordinary moment in history.⁴⁰

It is a revealing statement, an unintended psychological projection of this administration’s madness. September 11th was indeed, as Rice says, the “violent expression of a global extremist ideology.” But the villains most likely were not those that she would have us believe. We stand at an extraordinary moment in history to be sure, witnessing an administration drunk on its own “global extremist ideology,” supposedly “transforming that troubled region” and running amuck in the world. Or consider this statement by neoconservative columnist Charles Krauthammer, in which the fear-card is played to the hilt: “For all the Vietnam nostalgia at the Washington march,” Krauthammer wrote in October 2005, “things are different today. In Vietnam it could never be plausibly argued that Ho Chi Minh was training commandos to bring down skyscrapers in New York City. Today, however, Americans know that this is precisely what our jihadist enemies are pledged to do.”⁴¹ As administration officials declared that day, 9/11 was an “opportunity,” an opportunity to reshape the world—including the US itself.

Why have so few academics and technical experts, such as

physicists and engineers, raised questions about the 9/11 gruel that government has pushed? Why so little investigation and research about this pivotal event in world history? The question almost answers itself with people like Mr. Gates in charge of major research institutions. Partly it is about intimidation, fear, self-censorship, careerism, and assorted incentives and disincentives.

Following the shock of 9/11, research academics and technical experts quickly learned to keep their hands off the subject. The experience of Van Romero, the vice president for research at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, where he was previously in charge of its research on the effects of explosives on buildings, is illustrative. Romero was quoted by the *Albuquerque Journal* as saying, on 9/11 itself: “My opinion is, based on the videotapes, that after the airplanes hit the World Trade Center there were some explosive devices inside the buildings that caused the towers to collapse.” Ten days later, Romero had changed his tune: “Certainly the fire is what caused the building to fail.”⁴² No new analysis was offered to support this denial that explosives were involved. Proving that hypocrisy pays, Romero has thrived, snaring \$15 million in federal money for anti-terrorism and being declared one of the top lobbyists in the country—indeed, a “superstar.”⁴³ It would appear that Romero’s change of tune was based on a deeper analysis not of the evidence but of his prospects for success as a lobbyist for governmental funds.

The message telegraphed to academics and scientists by the Romero incident shortly after 9/11 was later reinforced by the dismissal of environmental engineer Kevin Ryan. Ryan was the site manager of Environmental Health Laboratories, a division of Underwriters Laboratories, which had certified the steel components used in construction of the WTC towers for their ability to withstand fires.⁴⁴ In November of 2004, Ryan wrote a letter to Dr. Frank Gayle, a metallurgist at the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). Ryan’s letter challenged the preliminary NIST metallurgical findings on the WTC collapses, saying: “This story just does not add up. If steel from those buildings did soften or melt, I’m sure we can all agree that this was certainly not due to jet fuel fires of any kind, let alone the briefly burning fires in those towers.”

Explaining his reasons for this statement, Ryan said:

[S]teel components were certified to ASTM E119.... [T]he steel applied met those specifications. The time temperature curves for

this standard require the samples to be exposed to temperatures around 2,000°F for several hours.... [E]ven un-fireproofed steel will not melt until reaching red-hot temperatures of nearly 3,000°F... [T]he buildings should have easily withstood the thermal stress caused by pools of burning jet fuel.

Therefore, the suggestion by one expert “that 2,000°F would melt the high-grade steel used in those buildings makes no sense at all.” Ryan even pointed out that Gayle himself suggested “that the steel was probably exposed to temperatures of only about 500°F (250°C), which is what one might expect from a thermodynamic analysis of the situation.”

These findings were ignored, Ryan pointed out to Gayle, as the official summary effectively claimed

that these low temperatures caused exposed bits of the building’s steel core to “soften and buckle.” Additionally this summary states that the perimeter columns softened, yet your findings make clear that “most perimeter panels (157 of 160) saw no temperature above 250°C degrees.” To soften steel for the purposes of forging, normally temperatures need to be above 1,100°C,

four times higher. Ryan thereby rejected NIST’s implication that such low temperatures were able not only to “soften the steel in a matter of minutes, but lead to rapid structural collapse.”⁴⁵

The absurdity of the official story about the WTC collapses being caused by fires weakening WTC steel is further exposed by another fact: “Corus Construction Corporation performed extensive tests in multiple countries in which they subjected steel-framed carparks, which were uninsulated, to prolonged hydrocarbon fueled fires,” writes Jim Hoffman, “and the highest temperatures they recorded in any of the steel beams or columns was a mere 360°C. At that temperature, structural steel loses only about 1 percent of its strength.”⁴⁶ Besides the fact that steel conducts heat extremely well, so that the heat from the fire in any one part of one of the towers would have quickly been diffused throughout the rest of the building, the towers had redundant strength on the order of 600 percent.⁴⁷ Another problem with the official story is that if the fires were hot enough to cause massive steel columns to buckle, some of the aluminum façade should have melted, given the fact that aluminum melts at less than half the temperature required to melt steel.

For these and many other reasons, the official theory about the collapse of the WTC buildings is physically impossible. But the effect

of Ryan's speaking out was that he was fired. And what of the less courageous? Aside from the academics in the present volume and a few others, the academy, despite the security for many of tenure, has thus far not been much of a force for truth about 9/11, leaving it up to independent writers, researchers, and the alternative media to carry on the battle for truth and justice. With the academic silence on 9/11, there's "just us," as one wag put it.

Conclusion: Desanctifying the State

Honest analysis of the events of 9/11 is an example of what Murray Rothbard calls the "noble task of Revisionism," that is, "to debamboozle: to penetrate the fog of lies and deception of the State and its Court Intellectuals, and to present to the public the true history of the motivation, the nature, and the consequences of State activity."⁴⁸ Anyone who penetrates the fog of state deception to the truth, the reality behind the false appearances, effectively desanctifies the state in the eyes of the previously deceived public. That is why the establishment reacts sharply to discredit revisionists with credentials and prestige who get close to the truth about 9/11 and other gigantic hoaxes. If the truth about these matters were revealed and widely embraced, it would prove ruinous to the regime.

To desanctify our state in our time, we need to expose the fact that it is motivated by purposes not unlike those of regimes we have (rightly) been taught to despise. Hitler's Nazi state, claiming that it sought only *lebensraum* (room to live), sought suzerainty over resources in economic backwaters, as did fascist Japan. Today, the pugnacious and impulsive George W. Bush, leader of a well-endowed, continental-size nation, seeks "democracy" overseas—that is, global domination, which involves control over oil supplies in economic backwaters, secure pipelines, and related capital investments throughout central Asia, all the way to the Mediterranean. The leaders of other large nations, whether or not their countries are endowed with oil and natural gas, hardly look with favor on "the global domination project." Hence, the stage is primed for major war.

The main pretext for this global domination project has been the attacks of 9/11. Every time the Bush administration is confronted with facts showing that it has broken laws, engaged in torture, or committed other outrages, it deflects these criticisms, in effect justifying its actions, by appealing to 9/11, saying that "it changed

everything,” so that the president, to carry out his charge to protect the American people, cannot be hamstrung by pre-9/11 niceties.

To have any hope for a sane, peaceful, and better world, therefore, we must desanctify 9/11, showing that, far from being an attack by rag-tag terrorists that showed American to be so vulnerable that they must now give up their outmoded ideas about civil liberties and torture, it was a false-flag attack carried out by forces within our own government, aided by selected outsiders. Surely there can be no higher duty for academics and other intellectuals at this time than to expose the big lie of 9/11, thereby undermining the primary pretext for the global domination project.

Despite all the clampdowns,⁴ hoaxes, and ruses by the Bush administration, time is not on the side of the perpetrators of 9/11. As emotion fades, what remains is an absurd conspiracy theory to “explain” these crimes. Ask people in everyday life if they are satisfied with the official 9/11 explanation. I have found that very few are. Many suspect foul play, some kind of inside job. But the controlled media will not reveal this fact.

While history never repeats itself exactly, it rhymes, and the model is the JFK assassination. The rogue network behind this operation was never busted and it has carried on to the present. Less than one in five polled believe the Warren Commission “lone nut” theory, and a similar opinion is destined for the Kean–Zelikow cover-up about 19 young Arabs. This development, of course, could have breathtaking implications for public perception about the scope of rot in this nation.

Meanwhile, the 9/11 perpetrators hope to run out the clock. Yes, 9/11 researchers are having difficulty figuring out exactly what happened on 9/11 in important respects. But they have made magnificent progress showing the falsity of the official story, such as the official accounts of the destruction of the WTC and the strike on the Pentagon. There’s more to come in debunking official doctrine on 9/11. If the perpetrators are not indicted and convicted during their lifetimes, truth will disgrace them at the bar of history, ex-CIA director presidents of major universities notwithstanding.

Given the increased danger to our world by the global domination project, however, it is important that the truth about 9/11 be exposed sooner rather than later. The exposure could come about quite quickly if a large number of college and university professors from all over the country would take their unique position in our nation’s civic life seriously and assert their freedom

to investigate, across a variety of disciplines, the grave events of 9/11 and its cover-up. Scholars for 9/11 Truth was founded in December 2005, and has made remarkable progress along these lines.⁵⁰ With the present essay I hope to encourage more academics across the land to come forward and not be intimidated by colleagues, boards of trustees, or presidents, who, like Robert Gates, appear less interested in the truth than in protecting the powers that be.

as SACEUR from 1969 through 1974, during the years when the terrorist operations took place in Italy.

51 On the homepage of the National Security Archive at www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/news/20010430.

52 James Bamford, *Body of Secrets: Anatomy of the Ultra-Secret National Security Agency* (New York: Anchor Books, 2002) 91.

SEVEN: REYNOLDS

1 See www.lewrockwell.com/reynolds/reynolds12.html.

2 Texas A&M has since taken this web page down, but it can be found 911blimp.net/cached/DrGates-stmtTAMU.htm.

3 Hans-Hermann Hoppe, "Interview with Chronicle of Higher Education," Ludwig von Mises Institute, 27 February 2005 (www.mises.org/fullstory.aspx?Id=1756); Hans-Hermann Hoppe, "My Battle with the Thought Police," Ludwig von Mises Institute, 12 April 2005 (www.mises.org/story/1792).

4 Defense Secretary Rumsfeld claims: "This is not a criminal action. This is war" (Paul Thompson, *The Terror Timeline* [New York: Reganbooks, 2004] 463). But war does not excuse destruction of evidence.

5 For proof—plenty of it—that there was a cover-up, see David Ray Griffin, *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press, 2005).

6 See www.teamliberty.net/id267.html.

7 For a superb history of false-flag operations, see Webster Griffin Tarpley, *9/11 Synthetic Terror: Made in USA* (Joshua Tree, CA: Progressive Press, 2005).

8 *The Wordsworth Dictionary of Idioms* (Hertfordshire, UK: Wordsworth Editions, 1995) 258.

9 www.tamu.edu/00/data/about.html.

10 www.clearchannel.com.

11 www.salon.com/ent/clear_channel.

12 www.buzzflash.com/farrell/04/03/far04009.html.

13 Tarpley 443.

14 student-rules.tamu.edu/aggiocode.htm.

15 student-rules.tamu.edu/foreword.htm.

16 www.tamu.edu/vision2020.

17 The document, signed in February 1997 by then USAF Commander in Chief Howell M. Estes III, was at one time available at www.spacecom.af.mil/usspace but the website is now gone. As David Ray Griffin says, perhaps it was too candid. It can, in any case, still be found at Peace Action Maine (www.peaceactionme.org/v-intro.html). It was discussed by Jack Hitt, "The Next Battlefield May Be in Outer Space," *New York Times Magazine* 5 August 2001.

18 Quoted in Hitt.

19 David Ray Griffin, *The New Pearl Harbor* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch, 2004) 100.

20 www.af.mil/bios/bio.asp?bioID=5317.

21 www.mcc.org/ask-a-vet/military_oath.html. It appears that for them, obeying presidential orders is more important than defending the Constitution, which says, among other things, that the military should not go overseas to fight wars unless declared by Congress (www.lewrockwell.com/hornberger/hornberger61.html).

22 en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Space-grant_university.

23 “Resisting the Global Domination Project: An Interview with Prof. Richard Falk,” *Frontline* 20/8 (12–25 April 2003).

24 See Chapter 11 and Appendix C, for insight on Gates’s place within the elite ruling group of this country.

25 Robert M. Gates, *From the Shadows: The Ultimate Insider’s Story of Five Presidents and How They Won the Cold War* (New York: Touchstone, 1996). While Gates credits Western political pressure symbolized by SDI in winning the Cold War, the opposite interpretation, provided by Chalmers Johnson, is that Gates’s CIA had “an almost unbroken record of mistaken assessments” of the USSR during its final decade and that “US intelligence agencies did not see the crisis of the Soviet Union coming.... [T]he USSR succumbed to a domestic coup d’etat thanks to an internal process of delegitimization that Gorbachev himself had initiated. The United States had little or nothing to do with it” (Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire* [New York: Henry Holt, 2004] 17–18).

26 For the neoconservative argument that a “galvanizing event” like a new Pearl Harbor would promote the global domination project, see Project for the New American Century, *Rebuilding America’s Defenses* (September 2000) 63. This argument, in somewhat different words, had been made earlier in Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (New York: Basic Books, 1997) 24–25.

27 Lou Cannon and Bob Woodward, “Gates to Withdraw as CIA Nominee; Reagan’s Choice Facing Senate Rejection,” *Washington Post* 2 March 1987.

28 Tom Polgar, “Gates: The Wrong Choice to Head the CIA,” *Washington Post National Weekly Edition* 1–7 July 1991: 24.

29 See www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/walsh/chap_16.htm.

30 See, for example, James McConnachie and Robin Tudge, *The Rough Guide to Conspiracy Theories* (London and New York: Rough Guides, 2005), which says: “[C]ampaign chief, Bill Casey, devised the so-called Iran-Contra scheme, originally known only to a few top officials under the code name ‘the Enterprise.’ The money from the missile sales would be diverted directly to the Contras” (186).

31 Relevant here is the wisdom of libertarian economist and historian Murray Rothbard who said, “only a few key people need be in on the original crime, while lots of government officials can be in on the subsequent cover-up, which can always be justified as ‘patriotic,’ on ‘national security’ grounds, or simply because the president ordered it. The fact that the highest levels of the US government are all-too capable of lying to the public, should have been clear since Watergate and Iran-Contra” (“The J.F.K. Flap,” in Lew Rockwell, ed., *The Irrepressible Rothbard* [Burlingame, CA: Center for Libertarian Studies, 2000] 307).

32 Kitty Kelley, *The Family: The Real Story of the Bush Dynasty* (New York: Doubleday, 2004) 533.

33 Kelley 533.

34 See www.answers.com/topic/george-bush. There is powerful evidence that Bush, the effective chief of all covert action and *de facto head* of US intelligence, was at the center of Iran-Contra; see www.tarpley.net/bush18.htm.

35 The 9/11 Commission Executive Summary (www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report_Exec.htm) 2.

36 Tarpley 7–8. He continues: “It requires expert terrorist controllers. Because of this, the starting point for realistic appraisal of 9/11 is not primarily

the sociology of the Middle East, but rather the historical record of NATO and CIA state-sponsored terrorism in western Europe and elsewhere in the post-World War II period. For it is here, and not in some distant cave of the Hindu Kush, that we can find the methods and personnel which produced 9/11.”

37 Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed, *The War on Truth: 9/11, Disinformation, and the Anatomy of Terrorism* (Northampton, MA: Olive Branch, 2005) 130–33; Craig Unger, *House of Bush, House of Saud* (New York: Scribner, 2004); J. H. Hatfield, *Fortunate Son* (Brooklyn: Soft Skull, 2002); Alex Jones, *9-11 Descent into Tyranny* (Austin, TX: AEJ, 2002) 66.

38 Ahmed chs. 4–6.

39 Besides the evidence I cite in this section, see the books by Ahmed, Griffin, and Tarpley, as well as several of the other essays in the present volume.

40 www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2005/54176.htm.

41 *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, October 3, 2005: 4B.

42 911research.wtc7.net/disinfo/retractions/romero.html.

43 “Tech Receives \$15 M for Anti-Terrorism Program” (infohost.nmt.edu/mainpage/news/2002/25sept03.html), citing *Influence Magazine* December 2002. Strangely, when the Pentagon was attacked, Romero was in Washington, DC, en route to an office building near the Pentagon to seek new funding for his institute.

44 www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20041112144051451.

45 E-mail to Frank Gayle, deputy chief of the metallurgy division, Material Science and Engineering Laboratory, at the National Institute for Standards and Technology (www.septembereleventh.org/newsarchive/2004-11-11-ryan.php).

46 911research.wtc7.net/talks/towers/text.

47 911research.wtc7.net/wtc/analysis/fires/steel.html.

48 Murray N. Rothbard, “The Case for Revisionism (and against A Priori History),” Mises Institute 22 June 2004 (www.mises.org/fullstory.aspx?control=1541).

49 A little-known outrage for our so-called democracy, once a constitutional republic, happened on November 1, 2001, when President George W. Bush signed Executive Order 13233, which ordered that a former president’s private papers can be released only with the approval of both that former president (or his heirs) and the current one. Since the Reagan administration had a “stop the clock” granted, new Iran-Contra evidence can be withheld indefinitely, protecting Bush’s father from further revelations. Prior to this new secrecy order, “the National Archives had controlled the release of documents under the Presidential Records Act of 1978, which stipulated that all papers, except those pertaining to national security, had to be made available 12 years after a president left office.” Since when can executive fiat overrule national law? Congress must contest this usurpation.

50 www.st911.org.

EIGHT: FALK

1 There has been a great deal of writing recently on this theme of American exceptionalism and its implications for international law and world order. See two recently published edited volumes for the range of viewpoints: Amy Bartholomew, ed., *Empire’s Law: The American Imperial Project and ‘War to Remake the World’* (London: Pluto Press, 2006), and Michael Ignatieff, ed., *American Exceptionalism and Human Rights* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), especially John Ruggie’s contribution, “American Exceptionalism,