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 August 9, 2013

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

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

Attention: Tom Wornom, Esq., Assistant District Attorney

Dear Sir, --

On February 14, 2013, our counsel William H. Schaap, Esq., of the New York Bar, transmitted to your office by FED EX my letter dated the 4th of the same month, addressed to you in behalf of an international organization with which I have been in consultation, and proposing a meeting out of the glare of the news media, under terms and conditions specified by you to assure discreet handling, between three or four representatives of Architects & Engineers for 9/11 Truth (hereinafter AE911Truth), and you and/or such members of your office as you should designate. Our purpose was -- and our hope still remains -- to discuss with your office the possibility of a special prosecutor and grand jury in New York County to consider evidence underlying our detailed offer of proof, set forth in my letter of February 4, 2013, whereof I enclose a copy for your convenience, that, on September 11, 2001, the Twin Towers and Building #7 at the World Trade Center collapsed on account of **controlled demolition**. Those responsible for the controlled demolition, whoever they may be, are guilty of arson, murder, manslaughter, and treason. Those covering up for the culprits are guilty of misprision of felony or treason. The only practical way such individuals can be discovered and accused is through impartial investigation, behind closed doors, by grand jury under the guidance of a special prosecutor of sufficient standing to assure his or her independence. We have suggested a special prosecutor in order to take political pressure off your office. We believe that a special grand jury is important also to clear those who have been suspected of wrongdoing, but are not guilty.

On July 11, 2013, your assistant Mr. Wornom, contacted our counsel Mr. Schaap, explaining that our petition had been received and recorded by your office, but that your office considered the events of 9/11 to be a federal matter. We appreciate the telephone call of Mr. Wornom to our counsel, but see fatal error in your position. We beg reconsideration. Mr. Schaap is temporarily indisposed, and, because time is short in what I am about to propose, he has

suggested that I write you directly in addressing the position of your office, considered part and parcel of our petition initially transmitted by him on the 14th of February last. Our position on the authority of your office is as follows:

Alexander Hamilton was very clear in saying that the power of Congress to regulate commerce, which was his particular cup of tea, did not include questions of "domestic police." See, The Federalist, No. 17, p. 118 (Mentor edition 1961). Hamilton stressed that the power of Congress is to regulate commerce proper, but does not extend to activities which are not commerce as such. See *The Federalist*, No. 22, pp. 143-144, and No. 34, p. 209 (Mentor edition 1961). And the United States Supreme Court has definitively confirmed in our time that, although the power of Congress is very broad -- I personally believe that the power is not limited by a distinction between interstate and intrastate events and transactions --, it does not include the power to regulate activities of a non-economic nature, even where they may have a substantial impact on commerce proper. This much is confirmed in the opinion of Chief Justice William Rehnquist in Lopez v. United States, 514 U. S. 549 (1995), and reaffirmed in the opinion of Chief Justice John Roberts in National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 567 U. S. --- (2012). Crimes of violence generally fall within the reserved powers of the States. This point is confirmed once again in *United States v. Morrison*, 549 U. S. 598 (2000). And from thence we may infer that the States retain jurisdiction over murder, manslaughter, and arson. So grave is this reality that it is at least questionable, in light of *Lopez* and Morrison, confirmed by Sebelius, that federal jurisdiction can be extended to the prosecution of Dzhokhar Tsarnaev in connection with the Boston marathon on the 15th of April last. And in fact, even if federal jurisdiction can be extended to Mr. Tsarnaev, or counsel for the accused should waive objection based limits on the power of Congress to regulate commerce, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certainly has reserved rights of prosecution, and prosecutors in Middlesex County are exercising it in proceedings against Mr. Tsarnaev. Likewise, your office certainly has reserved, if not exclusive rights of prosecution of murder, manslaughter, and arson in connection with 9/11.

The question of treason is worthy of special notice, because it emphasizes the authority of your office in connection with 9/11. In the Philadelphia Convention, the definition and punishment for treason, now specified in the third section, third article of the United States Constitution, gave rise to an extended debate. The phrase "against the United States" was inserted and retained, as the records of the convention show, because it was understood that the several States were each vested with sovereign power, and that, therefore, every State retained authority to prosecute and punish treason entirely distinct from the power of Congress over treason against the United States. See Jonathan Elliot (ed.), *Debates on the Federal Constitution*, J. P. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, 2nd edition 1859, Vol. 5, pp. 379, 447-451 (Madison's Notes, August 6 and 20, 1787).

It is, therefore, evident that your office has authority, indeed the most legitimate interest and the most unquestionable power to seek investigation and to undertake prosecution of the grave crimes committed against the State of New York on September 11, 2001. With this conclusion in mind, we wish to advise you that Richard Gage, chief executive officer of AE911Truth, will be in New York City on September 10-12, 2013, and he would be free to meet with you and/or members of your staff on the 10th or the 12th at a time and place and under such circumstances as you specify. Rest assured, once again, that we are not interested in publicity of any kind in connection with any meeting we may have with your office. If you are agreeable to such a meeting, kindly notify me or our counsel. Please feel free to contact Mr.

Schaap (143 West 4 th Street, New York, New York 10012, office telephone 212-995-2400) and/or myself (contact information set forth hereinabove), and we shall cooperate in every way to assure a businesslike meeting along lines which we have earlier proposed.

If an alternative date would better suit your circumstances, we shall certainly do our best to accommodate you. In order to arrange such an alternative date, please contact Mr. Schaap and/or me.

The courtesy of a reply, one way or another, is in any event requested reasonably in advance of the 10th of September so we can make necessary arrangements.

Thanking you for your attention, I remain

Respectfully yours,

Copy to Richard Gage, AIA