

“9/11 Truth” and the Failure of the Academic Community to Explore the Events of September 11, 2001

Academia's Treatment of Critical Perspectives on 9/11 – Documentary

By [Elizabeth Woodworth](#)

Global Research, September 05, 2014

Region: [USA](#)
Theme: [Terrorism](#)

(Produced and directed by Adnan Zuberi1)

As the academic year begins, and the 13th anniversary of 9/11 draws near, it seems timely to review this eye-opening documentary about the failure of academia to explore the evidence about the events of September 11. Indeed, there are literally dozens of peer-reviewed science articles challenging the American government narrative about 9/11 that academics simply do not talk about. These articles stand published in the science literature – for the most part unreported, unexamined, and unrefuted.

I. 9/11 Academic Failure in the Context of Traditional Scientific Publishing

In view of the magnitude of the 9/11 tragedy, and the persistent public doubts about its cause,[1] the scientific academy has been eerily silent.[2] Although many studies questioning the official account have been published in peer-reviewed science and engineering journals,[3] they have not generated debate in the literature, or reports in the media. This is virtually unprecedented, for new scientific research always stimulates a trail of discussion – be it through letters, rebuttals, or further studies.

Two examples of peer-reviewed articles that should have made sensational headlines and stimulated major academic discussion simply faded into obscurity:

1. An article published in the *Journal of Business* was reported by econometrician Dr. Paul Zarembka as showing a 99% statistical probability that high-volume insider trading occurred with American Airlines and United Airlines stocks in the days before 9/11;[4]
2. A nine-author article published in the peer-reviewed *Open Chemical Physics Journal* (2009) reported that unreacted nanothermite, which can be tailored to behave as an incendiary (like ordinary thermite), or as an explosive, was found in four independently collected samples of the World Trade Center dust.[5] Nanothermite is a high-tech substance not found in nature, yet there has been no published research follow-up to this landmark article's astonishing conclusions.

In short, the subject has been untouchable.

II. Glaring Anomalies in the Government Narrative That Should Have Aroused

Academic Concern

This documentary interviews a group of ten current and former Canadian and American university professors[6] about eye-opening contradictions in the official account.

Some of these include:

1. Ground Zero was the biggest crime scene in US history, yet the telltale steel girders were quickly trucked away before forensic examination could take place.
2. Originally there was to be no investigation, and only following intense political pressure from the families was an investigation mounted in 2003.
3. Paradoxically, the 9/11 Commission Report (2004) stated that its purpose was “to provide the fullest possible account of the events,” but “not to assign individual blame.”[7]
4. Nonetheless the Report accused al Qaeda of responsibility, basing 25% of its supporting footnotes on torture testimony, and providing no spokespersons to represent the accused.
5. The Executive Director of the 9/11 Commission, Philip Zelikow – a White House insider – framed the Report’s narrative in advance by providing an outline to the findings before the investigation had begun.
6. The NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) conclusions regarding the collapses of the Twin Towers and WTC7 were based on simplified models that defied Newtonian physics and were in conflict with direct observations.
7. After seven years of study, NIST granted that free-fall acceleration had taken place in 47-story steel-framed WTC Building 7, which was not hit by an airplane – but could only cite office fires to explain this unprecedented event.

III. Cultural Pressures to Delegitimize Inquiry into 9/11

How could these extraordinary anomalies have been ignored and overlooked by the academic community? The term “conspiracy theory” was first introduced into common use by the CIA following the publication of the Warren Commission report on the assassination of JFK, when “a public opinion poll recently indicated that 46% of the American public did not think that Oswald acted alone, while more than half of those polled thought that the Commission had left some questions unresolved.” The document, released following a FOIA request in 1976, outlined the CIA’s concern regarding “the whole reputation of the American government.”[8] The term “conspiracy theory,” which had formerly held neutral connotations, began to acquire a derogatory sense that identified certain topics as off limits to inquiry or debate. It has even been referred to as a “weaponized term.”[9]

One of the professors in the film referred to “the spiral of silence,” and another to “thought stoppers” – such as the charge of “conspiracy theory.” A third referred to 9/11 as “one government story that’s untouchable.” Another said that raising the subject in academic circles is somehow forbidden, unmentionable – that it sullies and profanes a person to bring it up. Sometimes persons who raise it are themselves attacked. Indeed a number of professors who persevered with research were vilified, harassed, and even dismissed for attempting work in this area.

IV. The Fallout from 9/11:

Although 9/11 itself has seldom been questioned within the academy, its implications and

fallout have been permissible fields of study, and include:

1. The perpetual, ubiquitous “global war on terror,” starting with the 2001 occupation of Afghanistan, and the loss of billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives;
2. The 2003 occupation of Iraq (believed by many soldiers to have been justified by 9/11), with the further loss of billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of lives;
3. The ongoing military involvement in Middle East countries such as Libya and Syria;
4. The fear and mistrust of Muslims caused by the Saudi identities of the alleged hijackers – which has undermined any possibility of global harmony and unification;
5. The suspension of US constitutional guarantees such as *Habeas Corpus* and *Posse Comitatus* (forbidding US army intervention in state and municipal affairs since 1878);
6. The introduction of electronic surveillance in violation of the US Fourth Amendment (1789) – confirmed in 1967 as applying to electronic surveillance as a violation of “the reasonable expectation of privacy”;
7. Inconvenience and congestion in air travel worldwide.

It is uncanny that in spite of these horrific impacts, the academic community has remained silent about the trigger event itself – barring a few courageous professors who have researched the glaring incongruities of 9/11 and the subsequent violations of international law. As mentioned above, these people have met with derision, discipline, and even dismissal. In summary: 30-40% of the population suspects that 9/11 was a false flag operation, constituting a state crime against democracy. Rather than exploring the evidence that is visible in plain sight, most of the academy simply looked the other way. One can only hope that the academy will reverse its position and work to remove the long shadow it has helped to cast over 21st century human civilization.

V. Addendum: Success of the Documentary Since its Release in late 2013

A winner at the University of Toronto Film Festival, “9/11 in the Academic Community” has been widely hailed as essential viewing:

Lance deHaven-Smith, Florida State University Professor of Public Policy, writes:

“This documentary confronts the academy’s uncritical response to the defining event of our times.”

Morton Brussel, Professor Emeritus of Physics at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has stated:

“The main thesis of the film concerns the silence of the academic community on this vital issue. I think it is extremely important and very well produced.”

Prof. Kenneth Westhues, Professor Emeritus, Department of Sociology and Legal Studies, University of Waterloo, and a Member, Society for Academic Freedom and Scholarship, has written,

“Canadian academic historian Michiel Horn has observed that as a rule, professors are milquetoasts. Here is documentary proof of Horn’s observation, on the subject of this century’s first great day of infamy. This film also documents exceptions to Horn’s rule: professors with guts enough to raise critical questions. Highly recommended, especially for provoking reasoned political discussion and debate.”

Paul Almond, Officer of the Order of Canada, and Award Winning Former Director of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC):

“People can benefit from learning about the event which clearly changed not only American consciousness, but that of the whole world. I believe this documentary should be shown as widely as possible.”

Dr. Roger W. Bowen, General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, and Professor of Political Science and President of the State University of New York at New Paltz:

“Academic freedom protects scholars who report inconvenient truths from the uninformed, but, as Adnan Zuberi reminds us, academic freedom is also the responsibility of scholars to pursue the truth.”

Friedrich Steinhäusler, Professor of Physics at Salzburg University, Former Co-Director of the NATO ARW on Catastrophic Terrorism, and Past Chairman, US/German Transatlantic Expert Group on Terrorism:

“I hope that this material will be made available to the wider international academic community in order to foster a wider, fact-based discussion among researchers and students alike.”

Alvin A. Lee, President Emeritus, McMaster University:

“Whatever else is done by the men and women who work in our universities, it is essential, I believe, that large numbers of them stand sufficiently outside society intellectually to see, understand, and interpret what is going on. I find it troubling that so few—there are credible exceptions—have seriously engaged with the question of what actually happened on 9/11 and why. There are so many holes and limitations in the official version that it calls out for rigorous intellectual fact-finding and analysis.”

This film reveals a new pathology that infests our society, in which it is taboo for even academics to pursue politically disturbing truths. Let us hope that the film will continue to open the way for more open discourse on 9/11, and the overwhelming body of research that contradicts the official narrative.

Notes

[1] A Scripps Howard/Ohio University poll showed in 2006 that “more than a third of the American public suspects that federal officials assisted in the 9/11 terrorist attacks or took no action to stop them so the United States could go to war in the Middle East.” “Third of Americans suspect 9-11 government conspiracy,” Thomas Hargrove, August 8, 2006

(<http://www.aldeilis.net/english/nj/012.pdf>.)

[2] A “9/11 Research Guide” from Florida International University lists only government reports, film and media, and fictional resources. <http://libguides.fiu.edu/content.php?pid=242646&sid=2003753>.

[3] The following articles are peer-reviewed journal papers that address issues surrounding the day of 9/11/2001 from a critical perspective. Academics are encouraged to take an interest in 9/11 research. (<http://911inacademia.com/journal-papers/>.) See also: The 9/11 Consensus Panel, “Evidence-Based Literature Sources Opposing The Official Story of September 11” (<http://www.consensus911.org/references-evidence-based/>).

[4] Allen M. Poteshman, “Unusual Option Market Activity and the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001,” *Journal of Business*, 79 (2006): 1703-26. Two subsequent financial articles provided further evidence of insider trading, but these econometric investigations have not been challenged in any professional or governmental responses. (<http://www.consensus911.org/point-g-2/>).

[5] Niels H. Harrit, Jeffrey Farrer, Steven E. Jones, Kevin R. Ryan, Frank M. Legge, Daniel Farnsworth, Gregg Roberts, James R. Gourley, and Bradley R. Larsen, “[Active Thermite Material Observed in Dust from the 9/11 World Trade Center Catastrophe](#),” *The Open Chemical Physics Journal*, 2009, 2: 7-31 (<http://www.benthamscience.com/open/tocpj/articles/V002/7TOCPJ.htm>).

[6] Dr. David MacGregor, Prof. Sociology, Univ. Western Ontario; Dr. Michael Truscello, Asst. Prof. English, Mt. Royal Univ., Dr. Graeme MacQueen, Prof. Emeritus Religious Studies, McMaster Univ., Dr. Richard Lee, Prof. Emeritus Anthropology, Univ. of Toronto; Dr. John McMurtry, Prof. Emeritus Phil. at Guelph Univ., Dr. Walter Pitman, Former President of Ryerson Univ. and Order of Canada; Dr. Omar M. Ramahi, Prof. Electrical and Computer Engineering, Univ. of Waterloo; Dr. Paul Zarembka, Prof. Economics, SUNY, Buffalo; Dr. Robert Korol, Prof. Emeritus Civil Engineering, McMaster Univ., Dr. Lynn Margulis (1938-2011) was a Distinguished University Professor in the Department of Geosciences at the University of Massachusetts. More information at: (<http://911inacademia.com/cast/>).

[7] *The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004*, p. xvi (<http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>).

[8] CIA, “Concerning Criticism of the Warren Report,” CIA Document #1035-960 (<http://www.jfkclancer.com/CIA.html>).

[9] “‘Conspiracy Theory,’ Foundations of a Weaponized Term,” James F. Tracy, *Global Research*, January 22, 2013 (<http://www.globalresearch.ca/conspiracy-theory-foundations-of-a-weaponized-term/5319708?print=1>).

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Elizabeth Woodworth](#), Global Research, 2014

[**Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page**](#)

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Elizabeth
Woodworth](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca