



August 11, 2006

Mr. Geoff Davidian  
4101 North Prospect Avenue  
Shorewood, WI 53211

Mr. Davidian:

The enclosed documents are being sent to you in response to your request for records regarding Dr. Kevin Barrett.

You will note that two attachments from two separate email messages to Provost Farrell appear to contain the same file. That file has a great deal of text shaded in various colors. On the copies enclosed, the shaded boxes appear as if we have redacted the text, which we have not. I will send to you via email one of the messages that has the original attachment, so you can read it clearly.

We have elected not to charge you for the reproduction of these documents. However, please know that if you make future requests for documents related to this matter, we may charge you the standard per-fee page for the records.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Eden T. Inoway-Ronnie'. The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Eden T. Inoway-Ronnie  
Executive Assistant to the Provost

Enclosures

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON**

College of Letters and Science

Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia  
1240 Van Hise Hall  
1220 Linden Drive  
Madison, Wisconsin 53706  
Telephone: 608/262-0524  
FAX: 608/265-3538  
E-mail: LangAsia@facstaff.wisc.edu

May 17, 2006

Kevin Barrett, Ph.D.  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dear Dr. Barrett:

This letter is confirmation of your appointment as Associate Lecturer in the Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia. This is a fixed term-terminal instructional academic staff appointment and is for the Fall semester of the 2006-07 academic year only with no presumption of reappointment. Final approval of this appointment is contingent on sufficient enrollment and no departmental faculty available to teach the course; it extends through the entire payrolling period noted below; it does not earn vacation and you are expected to work during the full appointment period except for days specifically listed as paid holidays.

Initial Evaluation: August 28, 2006 to January 11, 2007

Working title: Associate Lecturer in Islam:

Operational area: Languages and Cultures of Asia

Payroll dates: August 28, 2006 to January 11, 2007

Percent time: 50%

Salary: \$8,274 based on the full-time academic year rate: \$33,095.

Supervising faculty member: Ellen Rafferty, Chair of Languages and Cultures of Asia

General position responsibilities: Teach LCA 370, *Islam: Religion and Culture*.

Position Vacancy Listing (PVL) Number: S3061

Class begin date: September 5, 2006

Exam end date: December 23, 2006

Enclosed are copies of University of Wisconsin-Madison Academic Staff Policies and Procedures (ASPP) which govern academic staff appointments and the Rules of Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, s. UWS 8-13, 15, 18, 19, and 21, Wisconsin Administrative Code. As both documents provide information about academic staff appointments, it might be useful to know that each is now on the web; ASPP is <http://wiscinfo.doit.wisc.edu/acstaff/ASPP.pdf> and the UWS is at <http://www.legis.state.wi.us/rsb/code/uws/uws.html>.


Also enclosed are the Department's procedures for performance review, "Letter of Offer Attachment," and a summary of the benefits available to graduate assistants, employees-in-training, fellows and scholars, and short term academic staff. The benefit booklet itself is found at (<http://www.bussvc.wisc.edu/ecbs/bng-grad-book-toc-pv1041.html>). I recommend that you read the benefit information carefully. Since the enrollment period for many of the benefit programs is within 30 days of your employment begin date and because you may be eligible for some but not all of these programs, please contact Angela Powell within the first few days of your appointment to avoid any loss of benefits or the need to submit evidence of insurability.

This offer of employment is contingent upon verification of your identity and work authorization as required by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Additional information about work authorization documentation and the Form I-9 is found in the "Letter of Offer Attachment." Please note that Section one of the form I-9 must be completed and returned to the department on or before your date of hire.

It is the policy of the Department) of Languages and Cultures of Asia to provide reasonable accommodation for qualified employees with disabilities. If you need accommodation to perform the essential functions of your position, please contact Maggie Sullivan, the Division-Level Personnel Representative, at 263-2315 ([msullivan@ls.admin.wisc.edu](mailto:msullivan@ls.admin.wisc.edu)) or me.

Please respond in writing to this offer by May 26, 2006.

Sincerely,

  
Ellen Rafferty  
Professor and Chair

- Enclosures: ASPP  
UWS  
"Letter of Offer Attachment"  
Summary of Benefits  
PVL #53061  
Department's procedures for performance review

xc: L&S Payroll

## **PRESS RELEASE**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:  
Rep. Steve Nass (608) 266-5715

June 29, 2006

### **UW-MADISON MUST FIRE KEVIN BARRETT UW Lecturer Believes U.S. Government Behind 9/11 Attacks**

State Representative Steve Nass (R-Whitewater) called on Chancellor John Wiley to immediately fire UW-Madison Lecturer Kevin Barrett. Mr. Barrett is using his position at UW-Madison to advance his personal views that the 9/11 attacks were orchestrated by the U.S. Government and that al-Qaida is a CIA creation to divert public attention from the truth.

“The fact that Mr. Barrett uses his position at UW-Madison to add credibility to his outlandish claims is an unacceptable embarrassment to the people of Wisconsin and the UW System. Chancellor Wiley must act immediately to end any professional relationship between Barrett and the UW. He needs to be fired,” Nass said.

Mr. Barrett is scheduled to teach an Introduction to Islam class at UW-Madison this fall. In a radio interview last night, Mr. Barrett stated he has a part time, limited term contract with UW-Madison. Mr. Barrett isn't covered by tenure rights.

“This case isn't about academic freedom. I firmly believe this is a case of protecting students from the academic garbage that Mr. Barrett spews,” Nass said.

Mr. Barrett confirmed that he does discuss his 9/11 conspiracy theories in the classroom. Mr. Barrett asserts that his employment at both UW-Madison and Edgewood College (Madison) proves that other academics don't find his claims as phony.

“Mr. Barrett is free to stand on the street corner and advocate his nutty left-wing views. However, the taxpayers and tuition-paying families shouldn't pay this man one cent to perform his voodoo in a UW classroom,” Nass said.

###



June 30, 2006

Kevin Barrett  


Via email and certified mail

Dear Dr. Barrett:

I have made several attempts to contact you by phone. It has come to my attention that you were recently interviewed by a reporter on WTMJ radio and the content of that interview has raised doubts about whether you should be assigned to teach *Islam: Religion and Culture* this fall. I would like to talk with you about that interview and your ability to appropriately perform your duties as a Lecturer for the University of Wisconsin-Madison this fall semester.

I am aware that you have been offered, and have accepted, a position as a Lecturer for the fall 2006 semester to teach *Islam: Religion and Culture* (Languages and Cultures of Asia 370). I want to talk to you, review the record of your teaching and your plans for the course this fall, and, in consultation with the Dean of the College of Letters and Science and appropriate members of the department, make a determination regarding your appointment as a lecturer of this course in this fall semester.

Please contact me (262-1304) as soon as possible to set up an appointment with me, Dean Gary Sandefur and representatives of the Department of the Languages and Cultures of Asia to discuss your teaching of the fall course. If I do not hear from you by Wednesday, July 5, 2006, I will assume you do not wish to participate in this discussion and I intend to proceed with our assessment with the information we have available to us.

Sincerely,



Patrick V. Farrell  
Provost

cc: Gary Sandefur, Dean, College of Letters and Science  
Ellen Rafferty, Chair, Dept. of Languages and Cultures of Asia



**JIM DOYLE**  
**GOVERNOR**  
**STATE OF WISCONSIN**

---

---

**FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

---

<b>TO:</b> Don Nelson	<b>FROM:</b> Office of the Governor
<b>RE:</b> Letter from Mr. Kevin Barrett	<b>TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:</b> 4
<b>FAX NUMBER OF RECIPIENT:</b> 265.8011	
<b>PHONE NUMBER OF RECIPIENT:</b>	<b>PHONE NUMBER OF SENDER:</b> 266.1212

---

All materials are expressly for the named recipient. If you receive this fax in error, please immediately contact sender at the above-listed telephone number.

URGENT    FOR REVIEW    PLEASE REPLY    PLEASE RECYCLE

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

The following message was emailed on **7/6/2006 10:35:58 AM**

**Kevin Barrett**  
**10B University Houses**  
**Madison, WI 53705**  
**608-333-2859**  
[kevin@mujca.com](mailto:kevin@mujca.com)

**Re: Lecturer Threatens Governor's Job**

Lecturer Threatens Governor's Job

U.W.-Madison lecturer's letter to Governor Doyle warning that the Governor may be fired from his job for his intemperate statements.

Poll results: Barrett 86%, Doyle 14%  
<http://www.channel3000.com/news/9457154/detail.html>

\*\*\*

A Letter to the Governor  
July 5th, 2006  
Dear Governor Doyle,

It has come to my attention that you have suggested that I ought to be fired from my job as a University of Wisconsin-Madison lecturer. You apparently believe that I am incapable of performing well as an instructor of Islam 370 because I am convinced that the 9/11 Commission Report is a farcical cover-up, and that overwhelming evidence suggests top US officials were complicit in the attacks of September 11th, 2001.

I understand that you are under political pressure from your right flank, and that you may feel you have no choice but to call for my dismissal. You may be surprised when the 42% of the American people who believe the 9/11 Commission Report is a cover-up - and we may be over 50% in Wisconsin - decide to cast their votes for a candidate with more integrity. I understand that there are Green and Libertarian candidates running for governor, and I predict that the controlled demolition of our corrupt two-party system by the 9/11 truth movement may begin here in Wisconsin this fall, with you and Mr. Green serving as first victims.

Meanwhile, since you believe that those who dissent from the government line on these matters are unable to perform their duties as teachers, I have decided to help you in your crusade to weed out dissenters from the ranks of U.W.-Madison instructors. (Doesn't that plaque on Bascom Hill say we need to do a lot of "sifting and winnowing" of the faculty in search of the politically incorrect?) To that end, I have prepared a questionnaire for immediate distribution to all U.W.-Madison professors, lecturers and TAs.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

\*\*\*

Questionnaire for Instructors at the University of Wisconsin-Madison

Please note that your answers to the following questions will be used to determine your eligibility to teach at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

- 1) Do you believe that the Warren Report performed a thorough and unbiased investigation of the murder of JFK, and that its conclusion-that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone-is correct?
- 2) Do you believe that allegations of government involvement in the assassinations of Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., Malcolm X, John Lennon, Mel Carnahan, and Paul Wellstone, and the attempted assassination of Ronald Reagan, have been conclusively disproven?
- 3) Do you believe that Timothy McVeigh acted alone in Oklahoma City, and that the military officers, and others who deny this, and who who say his truck bomb could not possibly have done so much damage are crazy?
- 4) Do you believe that reports of massive CIA drug trafficking by Pulitzer-prize winning journalist Gary Webb--who committed suicide a few years ago with two gunshots to the head-are crazy?
- 5) Do you refuse to believe that the US government, at its highest levels, is just as corrupt as most other governments?
- 6) Do you believe that rumors of Western intelligence involvement in the Bali, Madrid, and London bombings are just that-rumors?
- 7) Do you believe top US officials, including LBJ, did everything they could to expose the truth about the attack on the USS Liberty by Israeli forces, and to gain justice for the victims?
- 8) Do you believe that FDR did everything in his power to protect the lives of our sailors at Pearl Harbor before the Japanese attack, and that the attack came as a complete surprise to him?
- 9) Do you believe your government always tells you the truth about gravely important matters?
- 10) Do you think that questions about the Constitutionality of the Federal Reserve--a private consortium of banks that creates money out of nothing, backed by nothing, at interest, thereby controlling the 80% of the world's currency that is in US dollars-are just a bunch of crazy conspiracy theories?
- 11) Do you agree that it is the Executive Branch, not the Legislative Branch or the people, that ought to have the power to decide when, where, how, and why the nation goes to war under the US Constitution?
- 12) Do you agree that the oath to defend the Constitution "against all enemies, foreign AND DOMESTIC" is referring to domestic enemies like Communists and Muslims, not top US officials who violate the Constitution?
- 13) Do you believe that Spanish forces sunk the Maine in 1898, and that the US invasion, occupation and annexation of Spanish colonies was a justified response to this outrage?
- 14) Do you believe that the US government did everything it could to protect the lives of the passengers on board the SS Lusitania?
- 15) Do you believe that the North Vietnamese attacked a US ship in the Gulf of Tonkin in 1964, and that the subsequent US escalation of the war was a justified response to this outrage?
- 16) Do you think that those who believe in Operation Northwoods -- 1962 plan for war-trigger fake terror attacks involving mass murders of Americans by covert US military forces -- are crazy?
- 17) Do you believe that Iraqi forces in Kuwait threw babies out of their incubators to die, and that the congressional authorization for Gulf War 1 based on the baby-incubator outrage was justified?
- 18) Do you believe that questions about the "October Surprise," in which George Bush 1 was rumored to have negotiated a deal with the Iranians to keep US hostages locked up until Reagan defeated Carter and took office, have been fully answered, and that the story has been conclusively debunked?
- 19) Do you believe that the US invaded Iraq in order to prevent Iraq from using WMDs against the US, and that the Iraqi threat was real and imminent?
- 20) Do you believe that the 9/11 Commission Report fully, truthfully, and adequately answered all of the serious questions that have been raised about the possibility of official complicity in the September 11th attacks?

Please note that "no" answers to any of the above questions indicate absurd beliefs and poor judgment, and may be grounds for immediate dismissal and/or non-renewal of contract.

Signed,

Steve Nass, Reichschancellor



## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Brian Mattmiller [bsmattmi@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 10, 2006 2:13 PM  
**To:** Amy Toburen  
**Cc:** Patrick Farrell; Dennis Chaptman; Doug Bradley; John Lucas; John Wiley; EDEN T  
**Subject:** Rep. Green statement

From Mark Green's office this afternoon:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
Monday, July 10, 2006  
On the Web: <http://www.votemarkgreen.com>

Contact: Rob Vernon  
Office: 920-435-2006  
Cell: 920-676-8417

Green: Enough is Enough. UW Should Show  
Kevin Barrett the Door Today

Also calls for Doyle to refute his Board of Regents president for  
supporting Barrett's right to  
teach that the U.S. government, not terrorists, is responsible for  
September 11 attacks.

GREEN BAY - Yesterday, University of Wisconsin-Madison lecturer Kevin  
Barrett - who has  
said he believes that the government used "controlled demolitions  
with explosives" on  
September 11 to bring down the World Trade Center buildings and that  
Karl Rove was involved  
in the death of a U.S. Senator - participated in a panel discussion  
at the Midwest Social Forum,  
held on the campus of the UW-Milwaukee.

At this panel - which was paid for by the Havens Center, a part of  
the University of Wisconsin-  
Madison Sociology Department - he again reiterated his intention to  
present his theories on  
September 11 in his university classroom.

On Monday, gubernatorial candidate Mark Green issued the following  
statement:

"This story just keeps getting worse and worse for both the  
University of  
Wisconsin and our entire state. Mr. Barrett has shown himself as  
unfit to teach  
our students as a math professor who would tell us that two plus two  
equals five.

"His opinions - including that Karl Rove was involved with the death  
of a U.S.  
Senator - have crossed over from absurd conspiracy theories into  
nonsensical  
ramblings. He is free to hold any nutty view he wants, but the  
taxpayers of  
Wisconsin should not be paying his salary.

"Jim Doyle should ask his hand-picked UW Board of Regents president -  
David  
Walsh - to apologize for defending Mr. Barrett's 'right' to teach his  
warped

views. If Mr. Walsh refuses to apologize, Jim Doyle should ask for his resignation.

"Finally, it is unbelievable to me that university officials are using tuition and taxpayer dollars to pay for a forum that is nothing more than a political gathering for extreme left-wing fanatics. At a time when Jim Doyle's Regents have increased in-state tuition by over 50% in just four years, how on earth can they justify spending money on this kind of conference?"

"Elect me governor, and we'll inject a heavy dose of Wisconsin values into the University of Wisconsin system."

# # #

## PRESS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE  
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:  
Rep. Steve Nass (608) 266-5715

July 10, 2006

### **UW-MADISON DEFENDS KEVIN BARRETT PROVOST PATRICK FARRELL HIDES BEHIND ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

State Representative Steve Nass (R-Whitewater) condemned the decision of UW-Madison Provost Patrick Farrell to defend the employment of Kevin Barrett as a lecturer. Mr. Barrett has been using his position at UW-Madison to advance his personal views that the 9/11 attacks were orchestrated by the U.S. Government and that al-Qaida is a CIA creation to divert public attention from the truth.

“Once again, the leadership of UW-Madison has displayed its ineptness and its disdain for the taxpayers. Provost Patrick Farrell is solely responsible for the continued embarrassment that Kevin Barrett will bring the university and the state,” Nass said.

Mr. Barrett is scheduled to teach an Introduction to Islam class at UW-Madison this fall. Mr. Barrett has a one semester, limited term contract with UW-Madison paying about \$8,500.

“If the overpaid administrators at UW-Madison feel justified in defending Kevin Barrett, then their decision will make it that much easier for me to fight for greater administrative cuts for the UW in the next budget. **They have academic freedom, but the taxpayers and the legislature have the power of the purse-string.**” Nass said.

Mr. Barrett confirmed that he does discuss his 9/11 conspiracy theories in the classroom. Mr. Barrett asserts that his employment at both UW-Madison and Edgewood College (Madison) proves that other academics don't find his claims as phony.

“The people of this state are middle-class families with traditional values, but this case demonstrates that the leadership of UW-Madison fears the wacky-left,” Nass said.

###



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**  
**Monday, July 10, 2006**  
**On the Web: <http://www.votemarkgreen.com>**

**Contact: Rob Vernon**  
**Office: 920-435-2006**  
**Cell: 920-676-8417**

## **Green: UW Administration Again Gets it Wrong on Decision to Keep Barrett**

*Governor Doyle's Board of Regents get their way on anti-American lecturer.*

**GREEN BAY** – University of Wisconsin-Madison lecturer Kevin Barrett – who has said he believes that the government used “controlled demolitions with explosives” on September 11 to bring down the World Trade Center buildings and that Karl Rove was involved in the death of a U.S. Senator – will be allowed to continue to present his theories in a university classroom, according to UW Provost Patrick Farrell. Farrell announced today that Barrett would be allowed to teach his class this Fall Semester at the UW, saying that his outlandish ideas on September 11 will “take a small, but significant, role in the class.”

In response to Farrell's decision, gubernatorial candidate Mark Green issued the following statement Monday:

*“I am a proud graduate of two UW schools. The UW system means so much to me, which is why I am so deeply troubled by today's decision.*

*“As I have already said, not a dime of either taxpayer or tuition dollars should be going to facilitate Mr. Barrett telling students that the September 11th attacks were a creation of the U.S. government. Mr. Barrett can dwell all he wants on the fringe left of society, but he should not be doing it under the banner of the University of Wisconsin.*

*“This should have been an easy call for UW officials, but I guess I shouldn't be surprised by their decision. When Jim Doyle's hand-picked Board of Regents president has repeatedly said that he thinks it is okay for Mr. Barrett to teach his clearly untrue conspiracy theories in a university classroom, this is the outcome we should have expected.*

*“Under Jim Doyle's stewardship, we have seen sex offender professors receive UW paychecks, outrageous back-up jobs for housekeepers and a 50 percent tuition increase for Wisconsin families at the very same time tuition for out-of-state students was reduced. Mr. Barrett is the latest bit of evidence showing the need to replace Jim Doyle and bring reform to the UW System.*

*“Teaching students lies is not a Wisconsin value. Elect me governor, and we will inject a heavy dose of Wisconsin values into the University of Wisconsin system.”*


###

P.O. Box 22306 • Green Bay WI, 54306 • 920-435-2006 • 920-430-7486 (fax)  
[www.votemarkgreen.com](http://www.votemarkgreen.com)

Underwritten by Green for Wisconsin, Rick Johnson, Treasurer



July 6, 2006



Mr. John Wiley  
Chancellor  
Bascom Hall  
500 Lincoln Drive  
Madison, WI 53706

Dear Chancellor Wiley:

It has come to my attention that University of Wisconsin-Madison lecturer Kevin Barrett is scheduled to co-lead a discussion this Sunday, July 9, 2006, at the Midwest Social Forum which is to be held at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

As has been widely reported, Mr. Barrett has very publicly said that he believes the U.S. government is responsible for the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. The description of the session he plans to co-lead this Sunday – titled "9/11: What Happened, Why, and What can be Done about it?" – states:

*Barrett will discuss strategies for turning the 9/11 psychological warfare operation against its perpetrators, and using 9/11 truth as a "magic bullet" that could demilitarize the American economy, overthrow corrupt elites, turn attention and resources toward pressing environmental concerns, and usher in a new era of peace and justice.*

Mr. Barrett is free to personally hold whatever belief he wants, inaccurate and irresponsible as it may be. However, he has said that he presents his "theories" to his students in the classroom. As I have already said, not a dime of either taxpayer or tuition dollars should be going to facilitate Mr. Barrett telling students that September 11 was a creation of the government.


His views on the worst terrorist attack on American soil are casting a negative shadow nationally on the university system and our entire state. I would encourage you to immediately fire Mr. Barrett before his Sunday discussion gives any more unwanted publicity to the university and the State of Wisconsin.

Thank you for your time, and I look forward to your response.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark Green".


Mark Green  
U.S. Congressman





July 10, 2006

John D. Wiley, Chancellor  
University of Wisconsin - Madison  
161 Bascom Hall  
Madison, WI 53706



Via Facsimile to (608) 262-8333

Dear Chancellor Wiley:

On behalf of members of the American Civil Liberties Union across Wisconsin, I am writing to you regarding the controversy that has been created over your institution's employment of Religious Studies lecturer Kevin Barrett. We fully expect that the University of Wisconsin-Madison will adhere to its proud tradition of academic freedom and due process, which are set forth in its faculty policies and procedures.

I'd suggest that the University's task is to evaluate Dr. Barrett's qualification and ability to teach his assigned course based on the course's content, not the content of his speech outside of the classroom regarding the attacks on our country on September 11, 2001.

When considering how to proceed, please take into account the following principles.

The ACLU believes that academic freedom and responsibility are the liberty and obligation to study, to investigate, to present and interpret, and to discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning. No limitations are implied other than those required by generally accepted standards of responsible scholarship. The right within and without institutions of higher learning to be free from any arbitrary limitations of investigation, expression, and discussion should be inviolate.

A teacher should not be dismissed for holding and expressing opinions, religious, political, social or otherwise, or be subject to any other sanctions. A teacher may be dismissed only for demonstrable incompetence, lack of professional integrity, abuse of the academic process or when personal behavior affects his or her professional performance in a demonstrably deleterious fashion.

Please let me know what procedures the University used, should it decide to terminate Barrett's contract or otherwise sanction him.

Milwaukee Office

207 E. Buffalo St., Suite 325  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-5774  
(414) 272-4032 • FAX (414) 272-0182  
e-mail: Liberty@aclu-wi.org  
<http://www.aclu-wi.org>

Madison Office


122 State St., Suite 507  
Madison, WI 53703  
(608) 346-2200 • FAX (608) 255-2688  
e-mail: DRiley@aclu-wi.org

Chancellor John D. Wiley  
July 10, 2006  
Page two of two.

I hope that our confidence in the University's decision making is justified.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris Ahmuty".


Christopher Ahmuty  
Executive Director

5804 N. Haymeadow Court Apt. 1A  
Peoria, IL 61615-3156  
July 6, 2006

JUL 10 2006

UW-Madison

Chancellor John Wiley  
University of Wisconsin  
161 Bascom Hall  
500 Lincoln Drive  
Madison, WI 53706



Dear Chancellor Wiley,

I am writing to commend a lecturer, Dr. Kevin Barrett, whom I understand you are reviewing. Dr. Barrett gave a very erudite and informative talk here in Peoria, IL on March 4, 2006. More recently Dr. Barrett hosted an enthusiastic, capacity crowd at the Wisconsin Historical Society in Madison on May 6, 2006 for University of Wisconsin alumnus Morgan Reynolds who served as George W. Bush's Labor Department Chief Economist in 2001-2002. On April 18, 2005 last year at the Madison campus he also organized a talk by Dr. David Ray Griffin, emeritus professor of religion and philosophy at the Claremont School of theology who has published over 25 books and 150 articles. Griffin's talk was broadcast on C-SPAN2 nationwide.

A am enclosing a free, complimentary copy of a DVD with PopX Films "Everybody's Got to Learn Sometime" produced by John J. Albanese. It also can be viewed online as a Google video. The video includes Bronze Star recipient Lt. Col. Anthony Shaffer's statement that a Pentagon program called Able Danger identified alleged 9/11 ringleader Mohammed Atta and three other hijackers in 2000. Republican congressman Curt Weldon of Pennsylvania defends Shaffer's charges. Also on the video is a charge by author Salman Rushdie that the U.S. knew of an imminent terrorist attack when they banned him from flying on September 3, 2001. Michael Meacher, British M.P. and UK Environmental Minister 1997-2003 says that, "at least 11 countries provided advance warning to the U.S. of the 9/11 attacks." Hon. Paul Hellyer, former minister of Canadian National Defense wonders "why did airplanes fly around for an hour and a half without interceptors being scrambled from Andrews (Air Force Base)?" He also wonders "Why did the President just sit at the schoolroom when he heard the (9/11) news?" Andreas Von Bulow, former German Intelligence Minister, asserts, "Pearl Harbor was not a surprise to the American Government, only to the American People and 9-11 is just another Pearl Harbor... War was prepared long before the Terror act of 9-11... Getting to the bottom to this crime begins with questioning the official theory." Retired U.S. Air


--- OVER---



Force Colonel and director of Advanced Space Programs (Star Wars) under Presidents Ford and Carter Dr. Robert Bowman charges that "The U.S. government at the highest levels may have committed treason and mass murder by purposely allowing 9/11 to happen."

I am also enclosing a free, complimentary copy of a DVD with a lecture by Brigham Young University physics professor, Dr. Steven E. Jones, "9/11 Revisited: Scientific and Ethical Questions" at Utah Valley State University on February 1, 2006. It also can be viewed as a Google video, and links to the video and a power point presentation can be found at the Scholars for 9/11 Truth website, <http://www.st911.org>. In the lecture Dr. Jones examines the physics and chemistry of the straight down, speedy, and symmetrical collapses of the World Trade Center Towers and adjacent Building 7 and the very hot molten and partially evaporated metal found at the sites. According to Jones burning jet fuel would not have been hot enough and he advances the hypothesis that the buildings were brought down by explosive devices set off in precise sequences such as in "controlled demolitions" of old buildings. He also says that pulverized concrete and smoke plume "squibs" clearly seen shooting out the sides of the buildings are further evidence for the theory that explosives were used. Expert witnesses also say they heard several explosions before and during the collapses. He notes that the World Trade Center buildings would be the first high-rise steel frame buildings in history to ever collapse from fire and impact damage as claimed in the official 9/11 story. Fire Engineering magazine called the investigation "a half baked farce" and demanded a stop to the "destruction of evidence". He also criticizes the Environmental Protection Agency for deleting warnings about highly toxic dust from its reports. He claims that the "smoking gun" bin Laden confession tape of December 13, 2001 is a fake and finds it strange that the FBI admitted that the hijackers left no paper trail. Jones asks who knew about the hijackers before 9/11 and who allowed them to fly hijacked planes for 1.5 hours without them being intercepted and forced to land. Jones calls for the release of all data held back and for a truly independent investigation by a Watergate-style special prosecutor.

I am also enclosing a pamphlet "911 The Fairy Tale From Hell" which outlines some major critics of the official 911 story and the major points of their arguments. Also enclosed is Dr. David Ray Griffin's outline "The 9/11 Commission Report: A 571-Page Lie" of his book "The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions" which he presented at his April 18, 2005 talk on the Madison campus. Retired U.S. Airforce Colonel George Nelson's call for legally required National Traffic Safety Board (NTSB) investigations and reports on the four crashes which have been lacking up to this time is also enclosed.



Jim Senyszyn

email: [jnsenyszyn@insigthbb.com](mailto:jnsenyszyn@insigthbb.com)  
home phone: (309) 689-9772

# 11 REMARKABLE FACTS ABOUT 9/11



2) Fire has never—prior to or after 9/11—caused any steel frame building to collapse. The sudden, vertical, explosive, and total collapses of the Twin Towers at near freefall speed can only be explained by controlled demolition.

3) The WTC steel, which if fully examined could have revealed the effects of explosives, was quickly shipped overseas and melted down. This was an unprecedented violation of federal crime scene laws.



4) Whenever contact is lost with any airplane, fighter jets routinely take to the air to investigate. This commonly occurs about 100 times per year in well under 20 minutes. But on 9/11, nearly two hours passed without any interceptions.



5) The Secret Service broke established protocols by allowing President Bush to remain in a well-publicized classroom “photo op” long after it was known that the US was under attack and he might well have been a target.



6) Unidentified insiders made millions on the stocks of American and United Airlines, and those of other corporations that were likewise impacted, by the attacks. These “put option” bets were made just prior to 9/11.

7) There were warnings of the impending attacks from at least eleven other countries. Also prior to 9/11, insiders such as John Ashcroft, top military officers and San Francisco Mayor Willie Brown were warned not to fly.



8) In September of 2000, a group of neocon hawks, many of whom would become key officials in the Bush administration, wrote that their proposed massive military buildup would proceed slowly—absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a new Pearl Harbor?



9) Some of the alleged 9/11 “suicide hijackers” are still alive and well, according to the BBC and *The Guardian*. At least five of the alleged hijackers may have trained at US military bases, as reported in *Newsweek* and other sources.



10) The Bush administration resisted the formation of the 9/11 Commission for 441 days. Similar investigations, such as those for Pearl Harbor, the JFK assassination and the space shuttle disasters, all started in about one week.




11) “The Jersey Girls”—four courageous 9/11 widows—finally forced the 9/11 Commission into existence and presented many questions, most of which were ignored. Under the leadership of Bush administration insider Philip Zelinkow, the final report failed to address any of the evidence pointing to official complicity.



DEMAND THE TRUTH!

There are hundreds of additional facts that contradict the official story of 9/11. It is time for a truly independent investigation that addresses all the questions asked by the citizens' 9/11 truth movement! You can help bring this about by educating yourself and others about 9/11. Go to [www.911truth.org](http://www.911truth.org) to learn more about these 11 facts, discover many others, and read about the many prominent authorities who support this movement. To find recommended books, magazines, and DVDs, and to obtain more of these cards, go to [www.911sharethetruth.com](http://www.911sharethetruth.com).

# 11 REMARKABLE FACTS ABOUT 9/11



## 1) The Mysterious Collapse of World Trade Center Building 7

It is commonly known that the Twin Towers fell on 9/11, but did you know that a third World Trade Center high-rise building also fell that day? WTC Building 7, a 47-story steel-framed skyscraper located one block from the Twin Towers collapsed at 5:20 that evening, imploding in the exact manner of a professionally engineered demolition. It fell suddenly, straight down, at near freefall speed, and landed in a compact pile of rubble, barely damaging any of the surrounding buildings—and these are but a few of ten characteristics of Building 7's collapse that are consistent only with controlled demolition. Further, the leaseholder of the three buildings, Larry Silverstein, said in 2002 on PBS that on the afternoon of 9/11 he suggested to the NYC fire department commander that they “pull” WTC 7. “Pull” is an industry term that means, “demolish.” But this scenario is impossible, because it takes a team of skilled people many weeks to design and implement large demolitions. Astonishingly, there is no mention of WTC Building 7's remarkable collapse in the 571-page 9/11 Commission Report.

(over)



**Once upon a time** there were 19 Magical Jihadists from a faraway land. They used itsy-bitsy box cutters to terrify 8 professional airline pilots. These pilots were so terrified of getting a nasty boo-boo they actually let the Magical Jihadists fly 4 commercial aircraft loaded with innocent passengers. Then the Magical Jihadists chanted a secret verse from their Koran making the planes disappear from all Air Traffic Control monitors. Now they could fly them all around the mighty USA air defense system, completely unbothered, for almost 2 hours. Even the mighty Harry Potter on a magic carpet couldn't find them!

Pretty cool, huh? You can read the rest of our government's fantastic modern-day Fairy Tale, (which surpasses *Alice In Wonderland* for sheer nonsense), by downloading a copy of the **9-11 Commission's Official Report**. <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/911/>.

But if you no longer believe in childish Fairy Tales and prefer the facts, then read this booklet detailing the grotesque truth about what really happened on 9-11. This information has been collected by thousands of regular people, not "Liberals", not "Bush Haters", but ordinary patriotic people with nothing to gain, and everything to lose.

**CHAPTER ONE:** Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies about the murderous attacks on 9-11, and by so doing; they put their careers, their lives, and their families at grave risk. These are brave actions selflessly taken by truly courageous patriots.

**CHAPTER TWO:** Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11 that have never been correctly reported, or just completely ignored by the mainstream media. Some items are outtakes of unguarded and unscripted live interviews and videos occurring immediately after the "attacks", which were broadcast only once, never to be rebroadcast or discussed again.

**CHAPTER THREE:** What all this means to you and your children's future.

**CHAPTER FOUR:** Video Clips <http://tyrannyalert.com/video.htm>

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO:** Morgan Reynolds, Former chief economist for the Department of Labor, former director of the Criminal Justice Center at the National Center for Policy Analysis in Dallas, currently professor emeritus at Texas A&M University

**WHERE:** United Press International (UPI), June 14, 2005  
and the Washington Times

<http://washingtontimes.com/upi-breaking/20050613-102755-6408r.htm>

**WHAT:** Reynolds comments that the official story about the collapse of the WTC is "bogus" and that it is more likely that a controlled demolition destroyed the Twin Towers and adjacent Building No. 7. "If demolition destroyed three steel skyscrapers at the World Trade Center on 9/11, then the case for an 'inside job' and a government attack on America would be compelling." "It is hard to exaggerate the importance of a scientific debate over the cause of the collapse of the twin towers and building 7. If the official wisdom on the collapses is wrong, as I believe it is, then policy based on such erroneous engineering analysis is not likely to be correct either. The government's collapse theory is highly vulnerable on its own terms. Only professional demolition appears to account for the full range of facts associated with the collapse of the three buildings"



**WHO:** Paul Craig Roberts is the John M. Olin fellow at the Institute for Political Economy, research fellow at the Independent Institute and senior research fellow at the Hoover Institution, Stanford University. A former editor and columnist for *The Wall Street Journal*, he writes a political commentary column for Creators Syndicate.

He served as assistant secretary of the Treasury for economic policy under President Reagan, and was credited with a major role in the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. He was awarded the Treasury Department's Meritorious Service Award for "his outstanding contributions to the formulation of United States economic policy."

**WHAT:** "I guess the real story about 9/11 is about what the people are actually saying. I've gotten hundreds of emails in response to my columns and many of them talk about not getting the truth from the government or the media about what really happened at the World Trade Center. I know many qualified engineers and scientists have said the WTC collapsed from explosives. In fact, if you look at the manner in which it fell, you have to give their conclusions credibility."

"The reasons they (the American people) were given by their president, vice president, secretary of defense, national security adviser, secretary of state, and the sycophantic media were nothing but a pack of lies."

Although professing to know "a little about engineering" from his undergraduate days at Georgia Tech, Roberts deferred formulating any serious conclusions about the fall of the WTC, but expressed doubt as to the credibility of the entire official version based on past government lies uncovered at Waco, Ruby Ridge and the threat of WMD in Iraq.

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO:** Steven E. Jones, Professor of research in fusion and solar energy at Brigham Young University.

**WHERE:** BYU website: <http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>

and Utah Deseret Morning News, both in print format and on the web at: <http://deseretnews.com/dn/view/0,1249,635160132,00.html>

**BREAKING UPDATE:** Professor Jones' updated work can now be found at **Scholars for 9/11 Truth**, <http://www.st911.org> comprized of Jim Fetzer, University of Minnesota Duluth distinguished McKnight professor of philosophy, and up of 50 academicians and others.

They include Robert M. Bowman, former director of the U.S. "Star Wars" space defense program, and Morgan Reynolds, former chief economist for the Department of Labor in President George W. Bush's first term.

**WHAT:** The group's charges include:

- Members of the Bush administration knew in advance that the 9/11 attacks would happen but did nothing to stop them.
- No Air Force or Air National Guard jets were sent to "scramble" the hijacked planes, which were clearly deviating from their flight plans, although jet fighters had been deployed for scramblings 67 times in the year prior to 9/11. The procedure for issuing orders for scrambling was changed in June 2001, requiring that approval could only come from the Secretary of Defense, but Donald Rumsfeld was not alerted soon enough on 9/11, according to Scholars group.
- The video of Osama bin Laden found by American troops in Afghanistan in December 2001, in which bin Laden says he orchestrated the attacks, is not bin Laden. The Scholars for 9/11 Truth compared the video with a photo of the "real" bin Laden and argue that there are discrepancies in the ratio of nose-length to nose-width, as well as distance from tip-of-nose to ear lobe.
- Molten metal was found in the subbasements of WTC sites weeks after 9/11; the melting point of structural steel is 2,750 degrees Fahrenheit and the temperature of jet fuel does not exceed 1,800 degrees. Molten metal was also found in the building known as WTC7, although no plane had struck it. Jones's paper also includes a photo of a slag of the metal being extracted from ground zero. The slag, Jones argues, could not be aluminum from the planes because in photographs the metal was salmon-to-yellow-hot temperature (approximately 1,550 to 1,900 degrees F) "well above the melting temperatures of lead and aluminum," which would be a liquid at that temperature.
- Building WTC7 collapsed in 6.6 seconds, which means, Jones says, that the steel and concrete support had to be simply knocked out of the way. "Explosive demolitions are like that," he said. "It doesn't fit the model of the fire-induced pancake collapse."
- No steel-frame, high-rise buildings have ever before or since been brought down due to fires. Temperatures due to fire don't get hot enough for buildings to collapse, he says.
- Jones points to a recent article in the journal New Civil Engineering that says WTC disaster investigators at NIST (the National Institutes of Standards and Technology) "are refusing to show computer visualizations of the collapse of the Twin Towers despite calls from leading structural and fire engineers."

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO:** David Shayler, Former British Secret Service agent (MI5 officer). He joined MI5 in Oct/1991 and worked there for five years. He started at F Branch (counter-subversion) in Jan/1992, and worked in T Branch (Irish terrorism) from August 1992 until October 1994.

**WHERE:** Shayler appeared on The Alex Jones Show to kick off what will be a wider public campaign to educate the public on 9/11 issues and government corruption.

**WHAT:** Shayler said that his suspicions were first aroused about 9/11 when the usual route of crime scene investigation was impeded when the debris was immediately seized and shipped off to China. "It is in fact a criminal offence to interfere with a crime scene and yet in the case of 9/11 all the metal from the buildings is shipped out to China."

"The more I look at it, you realize that it's not incompetence. There were FBI officers all over the country."

"There are so many questions that need to be answered, protocols being overridden within national defense, people actively being stopped from carrying out investigations. This wasn't an accident, they were aware there was intelligence indicating those kind of attacks, there were FBI intercepts saying it in the days before the attacks. When you look at it all, that is a big, big intelligence picture and yet these people were crucially stopped from doing their jobs, stopped from trying to protect the American people."



**WHO:** David Ray Griffin, professor of philosophy of religion at Claremont School of Theology and Claremont Graduate University and one of the co-directors of the Center for Process Studies.

**WHERE:** Dr. Griffin made a rare public appearance at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, April 18th, 2005 at 7:30 p.m. in 272 Bascom Hall.

And on the web: <http://911review.com/articles/griffin/nyc1.html>

**WHAT:** Professor Griffin takes a critical look at the official 9/11 Commission Report. Griffin argues that "omissions and distortions" in the report amount to a cover-up by government officials and says that the available evidence suggests that the Bush administration was complicit in the 9/11 attacks. Professor Griffin covers topics he says have been inadequately answered by the commission. These include questions surrounding the attack on the Pentagon, the way in which the World Trade Center towers collapsed, and the behavior of President Bush and his Secret Service detail following notification that a second plane hit the WTC.

## 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO:** Michael Meacher, MP Member of Parliament, Studied at New College, Oxford and London School of Economics. Before entering Parliament was a lecturer. MP for Oldham West (now Oldham West & Royton) since 1970. Privy Counsellor and Minister for the Environment 1997-2003. Member of the Shadow Cabinet (1983 - 1997). Member of UNISON, the Fabian Society, SERA and the Child Poverty Action Group.

**WHERE:** Guardian Unlimited, British Web Newspaper.  
<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/iraq/comment/0,,1036687,00.html>  
Article title: **This war on terrorism is bogus**

**WHAT:** "Not a single fighter plane was scrambled to investigate from the US Andrews airforce base, just 10 miles from Washington DC, until after the third plane had hit the Pentagon at 9.38 am. Why not?"

"There were standard FAA intercept procedures for hijacked aircraft before 9/11. Between September 2000 and June 2001 the US military launched fighter aircraft on 67 occasions to chase suspicious aircraft (AP, August 13 2002). It is a US legal requirement that once an aircraft has moved significantly off its flight plan, fighter planes are sent up to investigate. Was this inaction simply the result of key people disregarding, or being ignorant of, the evidence? Or could US air security operations have been deliberately stood down on September 11?"

"...it is not surprising that some have seen the US failure to avert the 9/11 attacks as creating an invaluable pretext for attacking Afghanistan in a war that had clearly already been well planned in advance. There is a possible precedent for this. The US national archives reveal that President Roosevelt used exactly this approach in relation to Pearl Harbor on December 7 1941. Some advance warning of the attacks was received, but the information never reached the US fleet. The ensuing national outrage persuaded a reluctant US public to join the second world war. Similarly the PNAC blueprint of September 2000 states that the process of transforming the US into "tomorrow's dominant force" is likely to be a long one in the absence of "some catastrophic and catalyzing event - like a new Pearl Harbor". The 9/11 attacks allowed the US to press the "go" button for a strategy in accordance with the PNAC agenda which it would otherwise have been politically impossible to implement."

"The conclusion of all this analysis must surely be that the "global war on terrorism" has the hallmarks of a political myth propagated to pave the way for a wholly different agenda - the US goal of world hegemony, built around securing by force command over the oil supplies required to drive the whole project."

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL - CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO:** Catherine Austin Fitts has been a Wall Street executive, a government official, and President of her own investment bank. She is currently the director of Solari. Fitts served as Managing Director and Member of the Board of Directors of the Wall Street investment bank, Dillon, Read & Co., Inc. and also as Assistant Secretary of Housing/Federal Housing Commissioner at HUD in the first Bush Administration.

**WHERE:** Article jointly written by Catherine Austin Fitts and Congresswoman McKinney on excellent 9/11 website  
<http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20041101130426916>

**WHAT:** "From the first, the Bush Administration resisted investigation and disclosure. Families of September 11 victims were forced to lobby the administration and Congress for a full and independent inquiry. They fought for 14 months, blocked every step of the way by the White House. The families demanded a full investigation, posing nearly 400 questions to the Kean Commission. The commissioners said they welcomed these queries. But their final report ignored most of the unanswered questions. Still posted on the website of the September 11 Family Steering Committee, these questions are a stark reminder of the Kean Commission's failures. Until the unanswered questions about 9/11 are laid to rest, by a truly independent investigation that does not declare legitimate avenues of inquiry off-limits, they will continue to haunt our country."



**WHO:** Robert M. Bowman PhD., Lt. Col., USAF (Ret.) head of advanced space programs for the Department of Defense [DOD], Combat Veteran, Rocket Scientist, Businessman, College Professor, Fighter Pilot, Executive in both government and industry, family man (seven children, twenty-one grandchildren), Bishop, and Peace Activist

**WHERE:** Posted on his personal Website:  
<http://www.rmbowman.com/ssn/Secrecy.htm>

**WHAT:** "Many people are convinced that George W. Bush knew what was going to happen and purposely allowed it to happen so he and his neo-conservative buddies could have the "new Pearl Harbor" they needed to justify their wars against Afghanistan and Iraq. Others go further. They are absolutely sure Cheney and company actually planned and carried out the attack. What is so disturbing is that their arguments are quite convincing. If an enormous cloud of suspicion is not to be permanently over the head of our government, the Bush Administration must "come clean," releasing information thus far withheld from the American people. Why did John Ashcroft and top Pentagon officials cancel plans to fly commercial airlines the morning of 9/11? If they knew what was about to happen, why wasn't it stopped? Who made all the millions of dollars selling short United and American Airlines [stock] just before 9/11? Why weren't the hijacked airliners intercepted by jet fighters and shot down before they could fly into the WTC and Pentagon? What did the air traffic controllers say, and to whom? Why did the FBI impound the tapes of those conversations? Why has the public never been told what was on them? Why weren't the congressional investigators told? If it was just a matter of incompetence or somebody not doing their job, why hasn't anyone been fired or reprimanded?"



# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO:** Nila Sagedevan, Commercial pilot and aeronautical engineer.

**WHERE:** Greg Szymanski's radio show, *The Investigative Journal*, on the Republic Broadcast Network

**WHAT:** "The government wants us to believe that a person who couldn't even solo a small Cessna took over the controls of a Boeing 757 jetliner and performed complicated maneuvers even myself or other experienced pilots could have never performed." "It's just not going to happen and, from my point of view, is impossible. If this was fabricated by the government so was the rest of the 9/11 story."

"You mean to tell me, the supposed inexperienced 5'8" Arab terrorist overpowered the pilot, who weighed more than 185 lbs and trained in the military. And then after that overpowered the co-pilot in the same manner, a person who also weighed upwards of 185 lbs," "I am not sure if anyone has been in the cockpit of one of these big jets, but I will tell you there isn't much space. How in the world would one man pull out two big pilots in cramped quarters while, at the same time, maintaining control of the airline? Again, it's just not going to happen."

"In the beginning right after 9/11, like most people, I believed most of what I heard about 9/11, not really giving much thought to a government conspiracy. However, about a year ago when I began gathering information related to my expertise as an aeronautical engineer and pilot, I began to see clearly how the government story regarding the four flights, their paths and their pilots didn't make sense."

"Now I am firmly convinced after looking at an enormous amount of evidence, as well as using well-establishing aviation principles, that something else crashed into the Pentagon since it couldn't have been a commercial jetliner."

"First of all, the supposed pilot would have been overwhelmed just looking at the complexity of the cockpit controls, he would have had no idea what to do, but we are led to believe that he was able to turn the jet around, head back to Washington D.C. and then bank at high speeds and at a low altitude, hitting a target which would have looked as small as thimble from the air. Again, it's impossible and you don't really need an expert to make this final determination."

"The evidence indicates that the airplane was flying low before it reached the Pentagon lawn since several light poles were sheared off several hundred yards away from the building. With that in mind, the plane was traveling at about 400 knots at about 20 feet off the ground for a long distance prior to hitting the Pentagon. "

"This in itself is an impossibility since the airplane would have been kept from hitting the ground by a cushion of air termed 'ground effect.' No pilot in the world would have been able to control the plane while maintained that air speed at 20 feet off the ground for that long a distance. Again, it's just impossible but here I will admit that an expert is needed in order to explain the standards of lift and drag associated with flying a large airliner. "

"I really don't understand how anyone could give the government's story any credibility after seeing the original pictures taken of the small hole left in the Pentagon wall by whatever flew into it. I am not totally sure what the military used but one thing for sure, it wasn't a 757 jetliner."

"I think if someone just looks at the hole left and then looks at the size of 757, experts aren't needed to determine it was an impossibility that a big jet hit the Pentagon wall, especially when there was very little wreckage visible after the crash."

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER ONE

Credible individuals that have come forward to expose the government's flimsy lies



**WHO: Respected Leaders and Families 9/11 Truth Statement** An alliance of 100 prominent Americans and 40 family members of those killed on 9/11  
**WHERE:** Posted on a dedicated website  
<http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20041026093059633>

**WHAT:** An alliance of 100 prominent Americans and 40 family members of those killed on 9/11 announced the release of the 911 Truth Statement, a call for immediate inquiry into evidence that suggests high-level government officials may have deliberately allowed the September 11th attacks to occur.

The Statement's list of signatories includes notables spanning the political spectrum, from Presidential candidates **Ralph Nader, Michael Badnarik, and David Cobb** to **Catherine Austin Fitts**, a member of the first Bush administration, as well as Washington veterans like Pentagon whistleblower **Daniel Ellsberg** and retired CIA analyst **Ray McGovern**. Other signers range from peace activists like Code Pink co-founder **Jodie Evans** and Global Exchange's **Kevin Danaher** to former US Ambassador and Chief of Mission to Iraq, **Edward L. Peck**; from environmentalists like **Randy Hayes** and **John Robbins** to business leaders such as **Paul Hawken** and **Karl Schwarz**, CEO of Patmos Nanotechnologies; from populist journalist **Ronnie Dugger** to renowned investigative reporter **Kelly Patricia O'Meara**.

The Statement also includes 43 noted authors, including New York Times #1 bestseller **John Gray**, as well as 18 eminent professors, historians, and theologians. Other notables include five-term Georgia Congresswoman **Cynthia McKinney**, singers **Michelle Shocked** and **Michael Franti**, and actors **Ed Asner** and **Mimi Kennedy**.

## We want truthful answers to questions such as:


- Why were standard operating procedures for dealing with hijacked airliners not followed that day?
- Why were the extensive missile batteries and air defenses reportedly deployed around the Pentagon not activated during the attack?
- Why did the Secret Service allow Bush to complete his elementary school visit, apparently unconcerned about his safety or that of the schoolchildren?
- Why hasn't a single person been fired, penalized, or reprimanded for the gross incompetence we witnessed that day?
- Why haven't authorities in the U.S. and abroad published the results of multiple investigations into trading that strongly suggested foreknowledge of specific details of the 9/11 attacks, resulting in tens of millions of dollars of traceable gains?
- Why has Sibel Edmonds, a former FBI translator who claims to have knowledge of advance warnings, been publicly silenced with a gag order requested by Attorney General Ashcroft and granted by a Bush-appointed judge?
- How could Flight 77, which reportedly hit the Pentagon, have flown back towards Washington D.C. for 40 minutes without being detected by the FAA's radar or the even superior radar possessed by the US military?
- How were the FBI and CIA able to release the names and photos of the alleged hijackers within hours, as well as to visit houses, restaurants, and flight schools they were known to frequent?
- What happened to the over 20 documented warnings given our government by 14 foreign intelligence agencies or heads of state?
- Why did the Bush administration cover up the fact that the head of the Pakistani intelligence agency was in Washington the week of 9/11 and reportedly had \$100,000 wired to Mohamed Atta, considered the ringleader of the hijackers?
- Why did the 911 Commission fail to address most of the questions posed by the families of the victims, in addition to almost all of the questions posed here? Why was Philip Zelikow chosen to be the Executive Director of the ostensibly independent 911 Commission although he had co-authored a book with Condoleezza Rice?

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 1. NO SCRAMBLED MILITARY JET INTERCEPTORS:

From the first official notification of a hijacking until the last hijacked plane crashed, one hour and forty-six minutes elapsed. During that time no serious attempts to scramble fighters to intercept the known four hijacked airliners were made. Prior to 9-11-2001, it was standard operating procedure to scramble or redirect already airborne military fighters to assist air traffic control when an aircraft, even small civilian aircraft, is off it's flight plan, and non-responsive radio contact. At that time, the average number of military sorties scrambled to intercept various airplanes reported to be off course was between 90 and 100 annually, yet on September 11<sup>th</sup>, four hijacked passenger airliners were flying in the most restricted and protected airspace in the world, and there were *NO INTERCEPTIONS*.



## 2. NO STEEL BUILDINGS HAVE EVER COLLAPSED FROM FIRE:

In the over one hundred year history of steel high-rises and skyscrapers there has never been a single one, which has collapsed due to fire. On September 11, 2001 there were three such structures, which fell, World Trade Center Buildings Numbers One, Two and Seven. Since that time, there have been no others.

### EXAMPLES OF OTHER STEEL HIGH-RISE BUILDING FIRES:



1988

The First Interstate Bank Building fire in Los Angeles, which burned out of control for **3 1/2 hours** and gutted 4 floors of the 64 floor tower (it did not collapse)




1991

The One Meridian Plaza fire in Philadelphia, which burned out of control for **18 hours** and gutted 8 floors of the 38 floor building; (it did not collapse)



2004

The Caracas fire, which burned out of control for **17 hours** in Venezuela's highest skyscraper, by which time all floors from the 34th to the top had been burned. (it did not collapse)



2005



The Madrid, 32-story Windsor Tower fire, which burned out of control for over **10 hours**, and was not extinguished for over **24 hours**. (it did not collapse)

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 3. FIRES WERE ALMOST SELF-EXTINGUISHED:

The smoke billowing from the towers deteriorated into a slow thick black pall, indicating an oxygen-starved fire. Smoke of this color and consistency is a product of a fire that is being deprived of an essential component, and consequently must be a relatively "cool" fire.




## 4. NO EVIDENCE OF HIGH TEMPERATURE STEEL-MELTING INFERNO:

People, soon to be victims of the collapse, were seen standing at the jagged holes in the towers, waving for help. How could they stand there if an inferno capable of melting steel was raging behind them?



Woman standing in entry hole



Man standing next to entry hole

## 5. ALL FOUR AIRLINERS CARRIED MUCH LESS JET FUEL THAN REPORTED:

All reports stated the hijacked airliners as starting out with a full load of fuel (23,980 US Gallons max capacity, max range 6,600 nautical miles). The reality is they carried only enough fuel to reach their scheduled destination, with an additional nominal amount for safety. Fuel is extremely heavy, and needless added weight results in added expense. Airliners are never "over-fueled" beyond the trip requirements. This fact further compromises the "steel melting inferno" theory of the collapses.

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO


Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 6. TOWER COLLAPSE SPEED DEFIED THE LAWS OF PHYSICS:


The towers, as they collapsed, actually fell at the speed of an object falling with zero resistance, as if in complete free-fall. It is physically impossible for any structure falling down upon itself to achieve this tremendous rate of fall.

Even if the tower fell at two floors per second, an incredibly fast rate, it would have taken over 50 seconds to complete the fall.

WTC Tower One actually completed its collapse in 10 seconds, with WTC Tower Two in just 9.5 seconds.



## 7. UNEXPLAINED COLLAPSE OF BUILDING SEVEN:



Building Seven (WTC7) collapsed in exactly the same "controlled demolition" style as the 2 main Towers, although an airliner did not strike it. Official reports determined that fire caused the collapse, as in WTC1 and WTC2. The construction design of WTC7 was completely different from WTC1 and 2, and did not rely on trusses from a central core, but was a more standard construction steel frame covered with brick.

WTC 7 was actually designed and built far stronger than a typical building of its size because it straddled a pre-existing electric plant. Yet WTC7 fell in the exact "controlled demolition" type collapse as WTC1 and WTC2. The 9-11 Commission's Report did not even mention Building Seven at all, and when a representative of the commission was directly asked why WTC7 was omitted from the massive report, he replied that they did not think it was significant enough to be included.

The photo of Building Seven at the left is the largest visible fire at any point before the collapse. Does this look like a steel-melting towering inferno?

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 8. WTC OWNER ADMITS TO CONTROLLED DEMOLITION OF BUILDING SEVEN:

There is an incredibly self-incriminating video interview with Larry Silverstein wherein he stated that he decided Building Seven would have to be "pulled" to prevent any further loss of life, and so they "pulled it". Pulling a structure is common industry terminology for a controlled demolition. A copy of this interview video available on request. This "pulled" 47-story building then collapsed exactly as WTC1 and WTC2 had. Mr. Silverstein has since refused to comment on this issue.



### TRANSCRIPT:

"I remember getting a call from the, er, fire department commander, telling me that they were not sure they were gonna be able to contain the fire, and I said, "We've had such terrible loss of life, maybe the smartest thing to do is pull it." And they made that decision to pull and we watched the building collapse."

Video Clip: [www.infowars.com/Video/911/wtc7\\_pbs.WMV](http://www.infowars.com/Video/911/wtc7_pbs.WMV)

- Larry Silverstein

- CEO Silverstein Properties, Inc.

The lease of WTC1 and WTC2 was purchased by Larry Silverstein, an extremely savvy NYC real estate mogul, three months before the attack for a cost of 3.2 billion to be paid to the NYC Port Authority over 99 years. Silverstein was the original owner of WTC7, and is the current owner of the soon to be completed Building 7. <http://www.silversteinproperties.com/management.htm>)

## 9. LEASING THE WTC COMPLEX SHOULD HAVE BEEN A FINANCIAL DISASTER:

Larry Silverstein leased this property even though it was well known within the industry that the WTC1 and WTC2 had been constructed with asbestos fire retardant coating on the internal steel structure. Asbestos coated all columns up to the 64th floors, only switching to a less effective and non-toxic product in 1971 when New York City banned the use of asbestos as a building material. Asbestos is now known to be an extremely toxic carcinogen, and would eventually have to have been remediated at a cost that would surely have exceeded the buildings resale value.

## 10. HOWEVER, LEASING THE WTC COMPLEX BECAME A FINANCIAL WINDFALL:

After signing the lease, Larry Silverstein promptly increased the insurance on these buildings to \$7.2 billion; double their purchase price prior to the attack. After their destruction, the potential white elephant complex became an instant double-your-money windfall to the tune of a 3.5 billion in pure profit to Silverstein. A wise sage once said, always follow the money trail.

## 11. CONTROLLED DEMOLITION PREPARATION PROCESS:

Preparing a structure like the 47 story WTC7 building for controlled demolition requires specially trained demolition experts, complete building blueprints, specialized explosive charges, remote control detonators, and many weeks to plan and actually install the explosives and wire them. This is no spur of the moment project that can just be thrown together in a few hours - and a few hours was all that expired from the initial attack to the demolition of WTC7. There is no doubt WTC7 was destroyed by a controlled demolition, so the question that remains glaringly unanswered is, when was this building wired for destruction, by whom, and for what purpose. Video Clips:

Real time video of WTC collapse: [www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/WTC7\\_Collapse.wmv](http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/WTC7_Collapse.wmv)

With Dan Rather's comments: [www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/911.wtc.7.knocked.down.wmv](http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/911.wtc.7.knocked.down.wmv)

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 12. EVIDENCE OF FOREKNOWLEDGE OF THE COLLAPSE:

During an interview on 9/11 with Rudy Giuliani, he claims that he was advised by an authority to exit the lobby of one of the towers because the tower was about to collapse. How could ANYONE have known the towers were going to collapse? Absolutely no steel structures had ever collapsed before.



“I went down to the scene and we set up headquarters at 75 Barkley Street, which was right there with the police commissioner, the fire commissioner, the head of emergency management, and we were operating out of there when we were told that the World Trade Center was going to collapse. And it did collapse before we could actually get out of the building, so we were trapped in the building for 10, 15 minutes, and finally found an exit and got out, walked north, and took a lot of people with us.” – Rudy Giuliani

## 13. NYC FIREFIGHTERS RADIO COMMENTS FROM WITHIN THE TOWERS:

There are radio recordings of NYC Firefighters that had reached the 78<sup>th</sup> floor of the South Tower, in different stairwells. An excerpt of these recordings is as follows:

**Ladder 15:** “What stair are you in Orio?”

**Ladder 15:** “ Chief, What stair you in?”

**Battalion Seven Chief:** “South stairway Adam, South Tower.”

**Ladder 15:** “Floor 78?”

**Battalion Seven Chief:** “Ten-four, numerous civilians, we gonna need two engines up here.”

**Ladder 15:** “Alright ten-four, we’re on our way.”

**Battalion Seven Chief:** “I’m gonna need two of your firefighters Adam, stairway to knock down two fires. We have house line stretched. We could use some water on it, knock it down, kay?”



Sadly, this was just eleven minutes before they were killed in the demolition. Their conversation indicates they believed they could knock down the fire with standard equipment, contradicting the “raging steel-melting inferno” theory. **VideoClip:** [www.tyrannyalert.com/videos/nyfd.mpg](http://www.tyrannyalert.com/videos/nyfd.mpg)

## 14. EXPERT WITNESSES SAW AND HEARD MULTIPLE EXPLOSIONS:

NYC Firefighters, trained and experienced in critical observations during cataclysmic events report hearing multiple massive explosions, going off in a sequence that they actually attribute to what a controlled demolition sounds like. Since that time, all Firefighters and Police actually witnessing these events have been slapped with a government-mandated gag order.



--- What did we do? We made it outside.

--- We made it at least two blocks and we started running.

--- Floor by floor it started popping out..

--- It was as if they had detonated - as if they were planning to take down a building, **boom boom boom boom boom**...

--- ...all the way down. I was watching it and running.

**VideoClip:** [www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/discussion\\_in\\_firehouse.wmv](http://www.whatreallyhappened.com/IMAGES/discussion_in_firehouse.wmv)

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## HERO ON DUTY HEARD EXPLOSIONS IN THE NORTH TOWER BASEMENT.

William Rodriguez, declared a hero for saving numerous lives at Ground Zero, was the janitor on duty the morning of 9/11 who heard and felt explosions rock the basement sub-levels of the north tower just seconds before the jetliner struck the top floors.



"When I heard the sound of the explosion, the floor beneath my feet vibrated, the walls started cracking and it everything started shaking," said Rodriguez, who was huddled together with at least 14 others.

"Seconds after the first massive explosion below in the basement still rattled the floor, I hear another explosion from way above," said Rodriguez. "Although I was unaware at the time, this was the airplane hitting the tower, it occurred moments after the first explosion."

Rodriguez was checking into work in an office on sub-level 1 when the north tower was hit, seemingly out of harms way. However, the sound and concussion of a massive explosion in the sub-levels right below his feet changed that.

"When I heard the sound of the explosion, the floor beneath my feet vibrated, the walls started cracking and it everything started shaking," said Rodriguez, who was huddled together with at least 14 others.

Rodriguez said Anthony Saltamachia, supervisor for the American Maintenance Co., was one of the people in the room who stands ready to verify his story.

"Seconds after the first massive explosion below in the basement still rattled the floor, I hear another explosion from way above," said Rodriguez. "Although I was unaware at the time, this was the airplane hitting the tower, it occurred moments after the first explosion."

But before Rodriguez had time to think, co-worker Felipe David stormed into the basement office with severe burns on his face and arms, screaming for help and yelling "explosion! explosion! explosion!"

David had been in front of a nearby freight elevator on sub-level 1 about 400 feet from the office when fire burst out of the elevator shaft, causing his injuries.

"He was burned terribly," said Rodriguez. "The skin was hanging off his hands and arms. His injuries couldn't have come from the airplane above, but only from a massive explosion below. I don't care what the government says, what scientists say. I saw a man burned terribly from a fire that was caused from an explosion below."

"I know there were explosives placed below the trade center. I helped a man to safety who is living proof, living proof the government story is a lie and a cover-up."

"I have tried to tell my story to everybody, but nobody wants to listen. It is very strange what is going on here in supposedly the most democratic country in the world. In my home country of Puerto Rico and all the other Latin American countries, I have been allowed to tell my story uncensored. But here, I can't even say a word."

After Rodriguez escorted David to safety outside the WTC, he returned to lead the others in the basement to safety as well. While there, he also helped two other men trapped and drowning in the basement elevator shaft, another result he says of the explosives placed below the tower.

In fact, after leading these men to safety, he even made another trip back into the north tower, against police orders, in order to rescue people from the top floors.

"I never could make it to the top, but I got up to the 33<sup>rd</sup> floor after getting some of my equipment and a face mask out of the janitor's closet," said Rodriguez, adding he heard a series of small explosions going off between the 20<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> floors, unrelated to the airplane strike, while making his way through the stairwell to the top floors.

Rodriguez said he finally reached the 39<sup>th</sup> floor before being turned back by fire fighters and then, reluctantly, started his descent back down and his own flight to safety while, at the same time, hearing explosions coming from the South Tower.




# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 15. ALL CONCRETE IN THE TOWERS WAS PULVERIZED TO POWDER

The steel-reinforced concrete was actually reduced to a talcum powder-like residue. Huge piles of nothing but dust from what was a massively strong 110-story structure. There simply is no way that this concrete falling from a height of 110 stories could cause such destruction to such highly reinforced material. Additionally, all of the contents of the offices were also reduced to dust and fractional pieces of themselves. Joe Casaliggi of Engine 7 describes with obvious puzzlement his experience in several days of rescue efforts helping dig through the wreckage of the towers, only to discover that the contents including office furniture, computers and telephone equipment had been almost completely reduced to dust.




**TRANSCRIPT:** "You have two 110-story office buildings: you don't find a chair, you don't find a telephone, a computer... the biggest piece of a telephone I found was half a keypad, and it was this big (holds up thumb and forefinger). *The buildings collapsed to dust.*" - Joe Casaliggi of Engine 7

## 16. CRIMINAL DESTRUCTION AND DISPOSAL OF ALL PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

The Science Committee of the House of Representatives reported that the WTC investigation was hampered by the destruction of crucial evidence. The committee report of March 6, 2002 says, "some of the critical pieces of steel were gone before the first [investigator] ever reached the site."

Although the terror attacks of September 11 were clearly criminal acts of mass murder, no effort was made to preserve the integrity of the crime scenes and the essential evidence was disposed of like garbage.

Former New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani oversaw what many experts consider to be massive criminal destruction of evidence.




The pattern of destruction of physical evidence is nowhere more apparent than in the rapid removal and recycling of the steel from Ground Zero. The structural steel was the most important evidence regarding the mass murder of September 11th. No amount of indulgence of forelorn hopes of finding survivors in the rubble, nor urgency of uncovering human remains for speedy identification, can justify the destruction of the evidence.

The remains of the Twin Towers should have been afforded at least the same level of respect as the artifacts in an archeological dig, or remnants of an aviation disaster. Instead they were treated as garbage to be disposed of as quickly as possible.

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 17. FIREFIGHTERS TRADE MAGAZINE CONDEMNS 9-11 EVIDENCE DESTRUCTION



Fair Lawn, NJ, January 4, 2002-Bill Manning, *Fire Engineering's* editor in chief, summoned members of the fire service to "A Call to Action." In his January 2002 Editor's Opinion, "Selling Out the Investigation" he warns that unless there is a full-blown investigation by an independent panel established solely for that purpose,

**By Bill Manning**  
**Editor, Fire Engineering Magazine**

"Did they throw away the locked doors from the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire? Did they throw away the gas can used at the Happyland Social Club Fire? Did they cast aside the pressure-regulating valves at the Meridian Plaza Fire? Of course not. But essentially, that's what they're doing at the World Trade Center."

"For more than three months, structural steel from the World Trade Center has been and continues to be cut up and sold for scrap. Crucial evidence that could answer many questions about high-rise building design practices and performance under fire conditions is on the slow boat to China, perhaps never to be seen again in America until you buy your next car."

"Such destruction of evidence shows the astounding ignorance of government officials to the value of a thorough, scientific investigation of the largest fire-induced collapse in world history. I have combed through our national standard for fire investigation, NFPA 921, but nowhere in it does one find an exemption allowing the destruction of evidence for buildings over 10 stories tall."

**Prof. Glenn Corbett** of John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City wrote in the January 2002 issue of *Fire Engineering*; "The World Trade Center disaster demands the most comprehensive detailed investigation possible. No event in our entire fire service history has ever come close to the magnitude of this incident. You would think we would have the largest fire investigation in world history. You would be wrong," he wrote, "We are literally treating the steel removed from the site like garbage, not like crucial fire scene evidence."

## 18. CRITICAL AIRPORT VIDEOS WITHHELD WITH NO REASON GIVEN:

There are multiple cameras recording every inch of all airports, yet there is no released video of the actual passengers on the way to boarding these fateful flights. All video from all airport cameras were immediately confiscated and have never been made available. Only one short segment of Mohammed Atta simply walking in an airport in Maine has ever been released. Videos of this nature would clearly show whether or not the accused hijackers actually boarded the airliners, so the question of the day is; why are they being withheld?

## 19. "HIJACKERS" BLATANT OUT-OF-CHARACTER BEHAVIOR:

Witnesses report some of the supposed hijackers spending the night before the attack in a strip club, drinking and loudly carrying on, actually calling attention to themselves. Afterward there were copies of the Koran and other obvious personal identification conveniently left behind. This behavior is completely out of character for devoutly religious Muslims who planned to commit suicide the next day in the name of Allah, but a hallmark of a time-honored tactic called a *false flag operation*.


# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 20. DICK CHENEY TRACKED FLIGHT 77'S FLIGHT PATH UNTIL IT CRASHED:

The government has consistently stated that it did not know where the aircraft were before they struck, however the Secretary of Transportation, Norman Mineta testified before the 9/11 Commission that VP Dick Cheney, from the **Presidential Emergency Operating Center**, actually monitored flight 77 on the final approach to it's crash into the Pentagon. How could one of the most heavily defended buildings in the world have been successfully attacked, when the Vice President of the United States, in charge of counter-terrorism on 9/11, methodically watched it approach from many miles away?

### TRANSCRIPT:



**Norman Mineta:** "During the time that the airplane coming in to the Pentagon, uh, there was a young man who would come in and say to the Vice President, the plane is fifty miles out, the plane is thirty miles out, and when it got down to the plane is ten miles out, uh, the young man also said to the Vice President, 'do the orders still stand?' and, uh, the Vice President turned and whipped his neck around and said 'of course the orders still stand, have you heard anything to the contrary?', while at the time I didn't know what that all meant, and uh..."

**Lee Hamilton:** "The flight you're referring to is the one."

**Norman Mineta:** "The flight that came into the Pentagon"

**Lee Hamilton:** "The Pentagon, yeah..."

**Norman Mineta:** "... and then later I heard of the fact that the airplanes had been scrambled from Langley to come up to DC, but those planes were still about ten minutes away..."

**Langley Air Force Base** is located in Hampton Virginia. Langley is the home of The **Air Combat Command (ACC)**, the major command (MAJCOM) of the United States Air Force whose mission is to provide air combat forces (mostly aircraft), to other commands, including both commands within the Air Force as well as the unified commands that include elements from different branches of the armed forces.

Norman Mineta testified, "*airplanes had been scrambled from Langley to come up to DC, but those planes were still about ten minutes away*". Langley is located less than 150 miles by direct line of flight from Washington, DC. The scrambled combat-ready F-16 fighters would arrive no later than fifteen minutes flying at subsonic speed, and could have actually arrived in less than seven minutes if they were allowed to fly at maximum airspeed.

Shortly after the first signs of trouble of Flight 77, clearly by at least 8:50, the military knows that this airliner has been hijacked. The Pentagon is struck around 9:38, which means that all official parties involved knew Flight 77 was hijacked for forty-eight minutes, and yet they supposedly waited until Flight 77 was on a ten-mile approach from the Pentagon to order a scramble from Langley.

CSPAN testimony Video Clip: <http://www.tyrannyalert.com/videos/hamilton.wmv>

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## 21. PRESIDENT BUSH WAS KNOWINGLY VULNERABLE THROUGHOUT 9-11 ATTACK:



On the morning of September 11, 2001, President Bush attended a scheduled, publicized visit to Booker Elementary School in Florida. Prior to meeting with the students, he and the Secret Service viewed the aftermath of the airliner crash into WTC Tower 1 on the school's television.

Disregarding this horrible incident, he proceeded to the classroom to engage in the scheduled book reading photo-op with the students. He was in the classroom for over 15 minutes, during which time Tower 2 was attacked. Incredibly, he simply continued reading with the children



Even after being informed of the second attack by Andrew Card, his Chief of Staff, President Bush foolishly continued reading in the classroom for an additional nine minutes. The second crash made it plain to all that a coordinated terrorist attack was in progress. Finally he stood up, put his book down, and asked to be excused from the classroom.

However, instead of sensibly being whisked to safety, he lingered to deliver a speech to the teachers, reporters and students. Absolutely no attempt was made by the Secret Service to remove the President from this vulnerable location, even though two airliners had completed their murderous attacks, and at least two more hijacked airliners were aloft, missing from all radar, their whereabouts unknown



There's no doubt the President of the United States would be a terrorist's primary target. The Booker School schedule was known far enough in advance to have this school included in the terrorist's attack plan. The potential for this disastrous scenario would be instantly obvious to the elite, highly trained professionals charged with protecting the President; however, they calmly stayed in the bull's-eye, leaving the President vulnerable, and endangering the chain of command for the defense of the United States. The only logical answer for this bizarre behavior is; they had advance knowledge he wouldn't be a target. Video Clip: [www.tyrannyalert.com/videos/bushbooker.mpg](http://www.tyrannyalert.com/videos/bushbooker.mpg)

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

## CONCLUSIONS

If you have taken the time and effort to read this report, it should be very clear that our government, at some of the highest levels, was directly involved with the crime of September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001. In fact, this crime could never have been committed without them.

The question you are probably asking yourself is: **WHY?** – Why would our own elected officials, who seem so benevolent, want to destroy a national landmark and murder 3,000 innocent people? The answer to this question can be summed up in one word; **POWER**

This insane greed and insatiable lust for power is nearly impossible to understand or relate to by people like you and me – but we must force ourselves to comprehend its existence. Historically, we know of these types of purely evil people in every nation that ever existed; yet we are guilty of foolishly doubting that conscience-less maniacs such as these could ever rise to power in our wonderful country. They rely on this kind of naivety to get away with their grabs for even more power, but they could not survive if we collectively became aware of their true nature. They can never be satisfied, no matter how much power they have, they need more power, no matter how much wealth they have, they need more wealth. And the torture and murder of innocents along the way is simply gravy.

Immediately after the attacks, the Patriot Act was introduced by the administration, and hurriedly passed by the congress (after a nice dose of Anthrax was delivered to them, by the “terrorists”, remember?). Then came the Patriot Act 2. These acts are nothing more than a suspension of liberties, a steady consolidation of power, and an elimination of unwelcome dissent. George Bush is fond of telling us his simplistic reason for the attacks as being “the terrorists hate our freedoms”, but the only attack on our freedoms has been the steady elimination of them by the heavy-handed twin Patriot Acts. And you can count on the fact that they have much more planned for us in the near future, and if it takes another 9-11 type event to properly convince us, that will not be a problem for them.

They want us to believe that we have a shadowy new enemy that must be rooted out all over the world. All our national treasure, our military personnel, and our God given freedoms are the asking price for protection from these horrible, brilliant, dedicated, fanatical terrorists. And by their own admission, this is a “war” that will never be won, so welcome to their New World Order; *Your Papers, Please!*

The attacks on Afghanistan, and then Iraq, are direct outgrowths of this power-grab, and to date over 2,000 of our military have been killed, thousands horribly mutilated, and hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis, men women, children have been slaughtered. Like it or not, you and I helped finance this.

George Bush's initial reason for this war was WMD's – weapons of mass destruction. Remember Condi Rice's “*the smoking gun might be a mushroom cloud*” threat? After two years NO WMD's have been found, not even ONE.

Then Bush shifted the reason for this war to the need to remove the horrible bloody tyrant, Saddam Hussain. Now Saddam's in custody, and still the war rages.

Then he restated his reason for the war as bringing democracy to the people of Iraq, but obviously the majority of the Iraqi citizens don't want our democracy, or us either. Can you blame them?

Now Bush's latest reason for this war has morphed into a supposed connection to Iraq for the attack of 9-11. But we're no longer fooled by any of their lies, because we know who was responsible, and it damn well wasn't Iraq.

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER TWO

Twenty-one amazing and shocking facts about the attacks on 9-11

The war drums have begun sounding for Iran and Syria, (and they can't even subdue Iraq). Senator Durbin's carefully crafted remarks against our military begin the process of promoting a wild-eyed unthinking jingoistic patriotism. Time to buckle your seatbelt for another "9-11" type event intended to further whip the country into a such a patriotic fervor that the reinstatement of the draft will seem an acceptable price to pay to retaliate against those Iranian terrorists that "hate our freedoms."

The media's response to the facts presented here are simply ad hominem personal attacks and disparaging name-calling, names such as WING NUT, MOON BAT, CONSPIRACY THEORIST, TINFOIL HAT CROWD, etc. Don't YOU be afraid to join the ranks of those who have realized that the government's fantastic explanations are the real "conspiracy theory".

## **A Patriot Must Be Ready To Defend His Country Against His Government**

This document has been compiled from research performed over the last three years. Absolutely every effort has been made to insure the accuracy of the content of this document. There were many other incriminating facts that were omitted due to our inability to corroborate the information to our satisfaction. We feel that every bit of evidence must stand on it's own, as we understand that if a reader is able to factually disprove any item, then they will have a tendency to simply discredit the balance, and we want to avoid this at all costs.

### **Who We Are**

We are a diverse group of patriotic Americans with the singular common goal of returning the United States back to the people, as the Constitution mandates.

If you would like more information or additional copies of this expose,


Please contact us at:

**[webmaster@TyrannyAlert.com](mailto:webmaster@TyrannyAlert.com)**

# 911 - THE FAIRY TALE FROM HELL – CHAPTER THREE

Why should I care about who caused 9-11?

I don't really see the connection with that event which happened almost 5 years ago, and my personal daily life.



Do you want your children living in a United States modeled after the old USSR?

It all started with 9-11, and 9-11 is a government lie.

It will only end when you stand up and say you've had enough.

## The 9/11 Commission Report: A 571-Page Lie

by Dr. David Ray Griffin  
Sunday, May 22, 2005

In discussing my second 9/11 book, *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*, I have often said, only half in jest, that a better title might have been "a 571-page lie." (Actually, I was saying "a 567-page lie," because I was forgetting to count the four pages of the Preface.) In making this statement, one of my points has been that the entire *Report* is constructed in support of one big lie: that the official story about 9/11 is true.

Another point, however, is that in the process of telling this overall lie, *The 9/11 Commission Report* tells many lies about particular issues. This point is implied by my critique's subtitle, "Omissions and Distortions." It might be thought, to be sure, that of the two types of problems signaled by those two terms, only those designated "distortions" can be considered lies.

It is better, however, to understand the two terms as referring to two types of lies: implicit and explicit. We have an explicit lie when the *Report* claims that the core of each of the Twin Towers consisted of a hollow steel shaft or when it claims that Vice President Cheney did not give the shoot-down order until after 10:10 that morning. But we have an implicit lie when the Commission, in its discussion of the 19 alleged suicide hijackers, omits the fact that at least six of them have credibly been reported to be still alive, or when it fails to mention the fact that Building 7 of the World Trade Center collapsed. Such omissions are implicit lies partly because they show that the Commission did not honor its stated intention "to provide the fullest possible account of the events surrounding 9/11." They are also lies insofar as the Commission could avoid telling an explicit lie about the issue in question only by not mentioning it, which, I believe, was the case in at least most instances.

Given these two types of lies, it might be wondered how many lies are contained in *The 9/11 Commission Report*. I do not know. But, deciding to see how many lies I had discussed in my book, I found that I had identified over 100 of them. Once I had made the list, it occurred to me that others might find this summary helpful. Hence this article.

One caveat: Although in some of the cases it is obvious that the Commission has lied, in other cases I would say, as I make clear in the book, that it appears that the Commission has lied. However, in the interests of simply giving a brief listing of claims that I consider to be lies, I will ignore this distinction between obvious and probable lies, leaving it to readers, if they wish, to look up the discussion in *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*. For ease in doing this, I have parenthetically indicated the pages of the book on which the various issues are discussed.

Given this clarification, I now list the omissions and claims of *The 9/11 Commission Report* that I, in my critique of that report, portrayed as lies:

1. The omission of evidence that at least six of the alleged hijackers---including Waleed al-Shehri, said by the Commission probably to have stabbed a flight attendant on Flight 11 before it crashed into the North Tower of the WTC---are still alive (19-20).
2. The omission of evidence about Mohamed Atta---such as his reported fondness for alcohol, pork, and lap dances---that is in tension with the Commission's claim that he had become fanatically religious (20-21).
3. The obfuscation of the evidence that Hani Hanjour was too poor a pilot to have flown an airliner into the Pentagon (21-22).
4. The omission of the fact that the publicly released flight manifests contain no Arab names (23).
5. The omission of the fact that fire has never, before or after 9/11, caused steel-frame buildings to collapse (25).



6. The omission of the fact that the fires in the Twin Towers were not very big, very hot, or very long-lasting compared with fires in several steel-frame buildings that did not collapse (25-26).
7. The omission of the fact that, given the hypothesis that the collapses were caused by fire, the South Tower, which was struck later than the North Tower and also had smaller fires, should not have collapsed first (26).
8. The omission of the fact that WTC 7 (which was not hit by an airplane and which had only small, localized fires) also collapsed---an occurrence that FEMA admitted it could not explain (26).
9. The omission of the fact that the collapse of the Twin Towers (like that of Building 7) exemplified at least 10 features suggestive of controlled demolition (26-27).
10. The claim that the core of each of the Twin Towers was "a hollow steel shaft"---a claim that denied the existence of the 47 massive steel columns that in reality constituted the core of each tower and that, given the "pancake theory" of the collapses, should have still been sticking up many hundreds of feet in the air (27-28).
11. The omission of Larry Silverstein's statement that he and the fire department commander decided to "pull" Building 7 (28).
12. The omission of the fact that the steel from the WTC buildings was quickly removed from the crime scene and shipped overseas before it could be analyzed for evidence of explosives (30).
13. The omission of the fact that because Building 7 had been evacuated before it collapsed, the official reason for the rapid removal of the steel---that some people might still be alive in the rubble under the steel---made no sense in this case (30).
14. The omission of Mayor Giuliani's statement that he had received word that the World Trade Center was going to collapse (30-31).
15. The omission of the fact that President Bush's brother Marvin and his cousin Wirt Walker III were both principals in the company in charge of security for the WTC (31-32).
16. The omission of the fact that the west wing of the Pentagon would have been the least likely spot to be targeted by al-Qaeda terrorists, for several reasons (33-34).
17. The omission of any discussion of whether the damage done to the Pentagon was consistent with the impact of a Boeing 757 going several hundred miles per hour (34).
18. The omission of the fact that there are photos showing that the west wing's façade did not collapse until 30 minutes after the strike and also that the entrance hole appears too small for a Boeing 757 to have entered (34).
19. The omission of all testimony that has been used to cast doubt on whether remains of a Boeing 757 were visible either inside or outside the Pentagon (34-36).
20. The omission of any discussion of whether the Pentagon has a anti-missile defense system that would have brought down a commercial airliner---even though the Commission suggested that the al-Qaeda terrorists did not attack a nuclear power plant because they assumed that it would be thus defended (36).
21. The omission of the fact that pictures from various security cameras---including the camera at the gas station across from the Pentagon, the film from which was reportedly confiscated by the FBI immediately after the strike---could presumably answer the question of what really hit the Pentagon (37-38).
22. The omission of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's reference to "the missile [used] to damage [the Pentagon]" (39).

23. The apparent endorsement of a wholly unsatisfactory answer to the question of why the Secret Service agents allowed President Bush to remain at the Sarasota school at a time when, given the official story, they should have assumed that a hijacked airliner might be about to crash into the school (41-44).
24. The failure to explore why the Secret Service did not summon fighter jets to provide air cover for Air Force One (43-46).
25. The claims that when the presidential party arrived at the school, no one in the party knew that several planes had been hijacked (47-48).
26. The omission of the report that Attorney General Ashcroft was warned to stop using commercial airlines prior to 9/11 (50).
27. The omission of David Schippers' claim that he had, on the basis of information provided by FBI agents about upcoming attacks in lower Manhattan, tried unsuccessfully to convey this information to Attorney General Ashcroft during the six weeks prior to 9/11 (51).
28. The omission of any mention of the FBI agents who reportedly claimed to have known the targets and dates of the attacks well in advance (51-52).
29. The claim, by means of a circular, question-begging rebuttal, that the unusual purchases of put options prior to 9/11 did not imply advance knowledge of the attacks on the part of the buyers (52-57).
30. The omission of reports that both Mayor Willie Brown and some Pentagon officials received warnings about flying on 9/11 (57).
31. The omission of the report that Osama bin Laden, who already was America's "most wanted" criminal, was treated in July 2001 by an American doctor in the American Hospital in Dubai and visited by the local CIA agent (59).
32. The omission of news stories suggesting that after 9/11 the US military in Afghanistan deliberately allowed Osama bin Laden to escape (60).
33. The omission of reports, including the report of a visit to Osama bin Laden at the hospital in Dubai by the head of Saudi intelligence, that were in tension with the official portrayal of Osama as disowned by his family and his country (60-61).
34. The omission of Gerald Posner's account of Abu Zubaydah's testimony, according to which three members of the Saudi royal family---all of whom later died mysteriously within an eight-day period---were funding al-Qaeda and had advance knowledge of the 9/11 attacks (61-65).
35. The Commission's denial that it found any evidence of Saudi funding of al-Qaeda (65-68).
36. The Commission's denial in particular that it found any evidence that money from Prince Bandar's wife, Princess Haifa, went to al-Qaeda operatives (69-70).
37. The denial, by means of simply ignoring the distinction between private and commercial flights, that the private flight carrying Saudis from Tampa to Lexington on September 13 violated the rules for US airspace in effect at the time (71-76).
38. The denial that any Saudis were allowed to leave the United States shortly after 9/11 without being adequately investigated (76-82).
39. The omission of evidence that Prince Bandar obtained special permission from the White House for the Saudi flights (82-86).

40. The omission of Coleen Rowley's claim that some officials at FBI headquarters did see the memo from Phoenix agent Kenneth Williams (89-90).
41. The omission of Chicago FBI agent Robert Wright's charge that FBI headquarters closed his case on a terrorist cell, then used intimidation to prevent him from publishing a book reporting his experiences (91).
42. The omission of evidence that FBI headquarters sabotaged the attempt by Coleen Rowley and other Minneapolis agents to obtain a warrant to search Zacarias Moussaoui's computer (91-94).
43. The omission of the 3.5 hours of testimony to the Commission by former FBI translator Sibel Edmonds--testimony that, according to her later public letter to Chairman Kean, revealed serious 9/11-related cover-ups by officials at FBI headquarters (94-101).
44. The omission of the fact that General Mahmoud Ahmad, the head of Pakistan's intelligence agency (the ISI), was in Washington the week prior to 9/11, meeting with CIA chief George Tenet and other US officials (103-04).
45. The omission of evidence that ISI chief Ahmad had ordered \$100,000 to be sent to Mohamed Atta prior to 9/11 (104-07).
46. The Commission's claim that it found no evidence that any foreign government, including Pakistan, had provided funding for the al-Qaeda operatives (106).
47. The omission of the report that the Bush administration pressured Pakistan to dismiss Ahmad as ISI chief after the appearance of the story that he had ordered ISI money sent to Atta (107-09).
48. The omission of evidence that the ISI (and not merely al-Qaeda) was behind the assassination of Ahmad Shah Masood (the leader of Afghanistan's Northern Alliance), which occurred just after the week-long meeting between the heads of the CIA and the ISI (110-112).
49. The omission of evidence of ISI involvement in the kidnapping and murder of Wall Street Reporter Daniel Pearl (113).
50. The omission of Gerald Posner's report that Abu Zubaydah claimed that a Pakistani military officer, Mushaf Ali Mir, was closely connected to both the ISI and al-Qaeda and had advance knowledge of the 9/11 attacks (114).
51. The omission of the 1999 prediction by ISI agent Rajaa Gulum Abbas that the Twin Towers would be "coming down" (114).
52. The omission of the fact that President Bush and other members of his administration repeatedly spoke of the 9/11 attacks as "opportunities" (116-17).
53. The omission of the fact that The Project for the New American Century, many members of which became key figures in the Bush administration, published a document in 2000 saying that "a new Pearl Harbor" would aid its goal of obtaining funding for a rapid technological transformation of the US military (117-18).
54. The omission of the fact that Donald Rumsfeld, who as head of the commission on the US Space Command had recommended increased funding for it, used the attacks of 9/11 on that very evening to secure such funding (119-22).
55. The failure to mention the fact that three of the men who presided over the failure to prevent the 9/11 attacks--Secretary Rumsfeld, General Richard Myers, and General Ralph Eberhart---were also three of the strongest advocates for the US Space Command (122).
56. The omission of the fact that Unocal had declared that the Taliban could not provide adequate security for it to go ahead with its oil-and-gas pipeline from the Caspian region through Afghanistan

and Pakistan (122-25).

57. The omission of the report that at a meeting in July 2001, US representatives said that because the Taliban refused to agree to a US proposal that would allow the pipeline project to go forward, a war against them would begin by October (125-26).

58. The omission of the fact that Zbigniew Brzezinski in his 1997 book had said that for the United States to maintain global primacy, it needed to gain control of Central Asia, with its vast petroleum reserves, and that a new Pearl Harbor would be helpful in getting the US public to support this imperial effort (127-28).

59. The omission of evidence that some key members of the Bush administration, including Donald Rumsfeld and his deputy Paul Wolfowitz, had been agitating for a war with Iraq for many years (129-33).

60. The omission of notes of Rumsfeld's conversations on 9/11 showing that he was determined to use the attacks as a pretext for a war with Iraq (131-32).

61. The omission of the statement by the Project for the New American Century that "the need for a substantial American force presence in the Gulf transcends the issue of the regime of Saddam Hussein" (133-34).

62. The claim that FAA protocol on 9/11 required the time-consuming process of going through several steps in the chain of command--even though the Report cites evidence to the contrary (158).

63. The claim that in those days there were only two air force bases in NORAD's Northeast sector that kept fighters on alert and that, in particular, there were no fighters on alert at either McGuire or Andrews (159-162).

64. The omission of evidence that Andrews Air Force Base did keep several fighters on alert at all times (162-64).

65. The acceptance of the twofold claim that Colonel Marr of NEADS had to telephone a superior to get permission to have fighters scrambled from Otis and that this call required eight minutes (165-66).

66. The endorsement of the claim that the loss of an airplane's transponder signal makes it virtually impossible for the US military's radar to track that plane (166-67).

67. The claim that the Payne Stewart interception did not show NORAD's response time to Flight 11 to be extraordinarily slow (167-69).

68. The claim that the Otis fighters were not airborne until seven minutes after they received the scramble order because they did not know where to go (174-75).

69. The claim that the US military did not know about the hijacking of Flight 175 until 9:03, when it was crashing into the South Tower (181-82).

70. The omission of any explanation of (a) why NORAD's earlier report, according to which the FAA had notified the military about the hijacking of Flight 175 at 8:43, was now to be considered false and (b) how this report, if it was false, could have been published and then left uncorrected for almost three years (182).

71. The claim that the FAA did not set up a teleconference until 9:20 that morning (183).

72. The omission of the fact that a memo by Laura Brown of the FAA says that its teleconference was established at about 8:50 and that it included discussion of Flight 175's hijacking (183-84, 186).

73. The claim that the NMCC teleconference did not begin until 9:29 (186-88).

74. The omission, in the Commission's claim that Flight 77 did not deviate from its course until 8:54, of the fact that earlier reports had said 8:46 (189-90).
75. The failure to mention that the report that a large jet had crashed in Kentucky, at about the time Flight 77 disappeared from FAA radar, was taken seriously enough by the heads of the FAA and the FBI's counterterrorism unit to be relayed to the White House (190).
76. The claim that Flight 77 flew almost 40 minutes through American airspace towards Washington without being detected by the military's radar (191-92).
77. The failure to explain, if NORAD's earlier report that it was notified about Flight 77 at 9:24 was "incorrect," how this erroneous report could have arisen, i.e., whether NORAD officials had been lying or simply confused for almost three years (192-93).
78. The claim that the Langley fighter jets, which NORAD had previously said were scrambled to intercept Flight 77, were actually scrambled in response to an erroneous report from an (unidentified) FAA controller at 9:21 that Flight 11 was still up and was headed towards Washington (193-99).
79. The claim that the military did not hear from the FAA about the probable hijacking of Flight 77 before the Pentagon was struck (204-12).
80. The claim that Jane Garvey did not join Richard Clarke's videoconference until 9:40, after the Pentagon was struck (210).
81. The claim that none of the teleconferences succeeded in coordinating the FAA and military responses to the hijackings because "none of [them] included the right officials from both the FAA and the Defense Department"---although Richard Clarke says that his videoconference included FAA head Jane Garvey as well as Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld and General Richard Myers, the acting chair of the joint chiefs of staff (211).
82. The Commission's claim that it did not know who from the Defense Department participated in Clarke's videoconference---although Clarke's book said that it was Donald Rumsfeld and General Myers (211-212).
83. The endorsement of General Myers' claim that he was on Capitol Hill during the attacks, without mentioning Richard Clarke's contradictory account, according to which Myers was in the Pentagon participating in Clarke's videoconference (213-17).
84. The failure to mention the contradiction between Clarke's account of Rumsfeld's whereabouts that morning and Rumsfeld's own accounts (217-19).
85. The omission of Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta's testimony, given to the Commission itself, that Vice-President Cheney and others in the underground shelter were aware by 9:26 that an aircraft was approaching the Pentagon (220).
86. The claim that Pentagon officials did not know about an aircraft approaching Pentagon until 9:32, 9:34, or 9:36---in any case, only a few minutes before the building was hit (223).
87. The endorsement of two contradictory stories about the aircraft that hit the Pentagon---one in which it executed a 330-degree downward spiral (a "high-speed dive") and another in which there is no mention of this maneuver (222-23).
88. The claim that the fighter jets from Langley, which were allegedly scrambled to protect Washington from "Phantom Flight 11," were nowhere near Washington because they were mistakenly sent out to sea (223-24).
89. The omission of all the evidence suggesting that the aircraft that hit the Pentagon was not Flight 77 (224-25).

90. The claim that the military was not notified by the FAA about Flight 93's hijacking until after it crashed (227-29, 232, 253).
91. The twofold claim that the NMCC did not monitor the FAA-initiated conference and then was unable to get the FAA connected to the NMCC-initiated teleconference (230-31).
92. The omission of the fact that the Secret Service is able to know everything that the FAA knows (233).
93. The omission of any inquiry into why the NMCC initiated its own teleconference if, as Laura Brown of the FAA has said, this is not standard protocol (234).
94. The omission of any exploration of why General Montague Winfield not only had a rookie (Captain Leidig) take over his role as the NMCC's Director of Operations but also left him in charge after it was clear that the Pentagon was facing an unprecedented crisis (235-36).
95. The claim that the FAA (falsely) notified the Secret Service between 10:10 and 10:15 that Flight 93 was still up and headed towards Washington (237).
96. The claim that Vice President Cheney did not give the shoot-down authorization until after 10:10 (several minutes after Flight 93 had crashed) and that this authorization was not transmitted to the US military until 10:31 (237-41).
97. The omission of all the evidence indicating that Flight 93 was shot down by a military plane (238-39, 252-53).
98. The claim that Richard Clarke did not receive the requested shoot-down authorization until 10:25 (240).
99. The omission of Clarke's own testimony, which suggests that he received the shoot-down authorization by 9:50 (240).
100. The claim that Cheney did not reach the underground shelter (the PEOC [Presidential Emergency Operations Center]) until 9:58 (241-44).
101. The omission of multiple testimony, including that of Norman Mineta to the Commission itself, that Cheney was in the PEOC before 9:20 (241-44).
102. The claim that shoot-down authorization must be given by the president (245).
103. The omission of reports that Colonel Marr ordered a shoot-down of Flight 93 and that General Winfield indicated that he and others at the NMCC had expected a fighter jet to reach Flight 93 (252).
104. The omission of reports that there were two fighter jets in the air a few miles from NYC and three of them only 200 miles from Washington (251).
105. The omission of evidence that there were at least six bases with fighters on alert in the northeastern part of the United States (257-58).
106. The endorsement of General Myers' claim that NORAD had defined its mission in terms of defending only against threats from abroad (258-62).
107. The endorsement of General Myers' claim that NORAD had not recognized the possibility that terrorists might use hijacked airliners as missiles (262-63).
108. The failure to highlight the significance of evidence presented in the Report itself, and to mention other evidence, showing that NORAD had indeed recognized the threat that hijacked airliners might be used as missiles (264-67).

109. The failure to probe the issue of how the "war games" scheduled for that day were related to the military's failure to intercept the hijacked airliners (268-69).

110. The failure to discuss the possible relevance of Operation Northwoods to the attacks of 9/11 (269-71).

111. The claim---made in explaining why the military did not get information about the hijackings in time to intercept them---that FAA personnel inexplicably failed to follow standard procedures some 16 times (155-56, 157, 179, 180, 181, 190, 191, 193, 194, 200, 202-03, 227, 237, 272-75).

112. The failure to point out that the Commission's claimed "independence" was fatally compromised by the fact that its executive director, Philip Zelikow, was virtually a member of the Bush administration (7-9, 11-12, 282-84).

113. The failure to point out that the White House first sought to prevent the creation of a 9/11 Commission, then placed many obstacles in its path, including giving it extremely meager funding (283-85).

114. The failure to point out that the Commission's chairman, most of the other commissioners, and at least half of the staff had serious conflicts of interest (285-90, 292-95).

115. The failure of the Commission, while bragging that it presented its final report "without dissent," to point out that this was probably possible only because Max Cleland, the commissioner who was most critical of the White House and swore that he would not be part of "looking at information only partially," had to resign in order to accept a position with the Export-Import Bank, and that the White House forwarded his nomination for this position only after he was becoming quite outspoken in his criticisms (290-291).

I will close by pointing out that I concluded my study of what I came to call "the Kean-Zelikow Report" by writing that it, "far from lessening my suspicions about official complicity, has served to confirm them. Why would the minds in charge of this final report engage in such deception if they were not trying to cover up very high crimes?" (291)

**Statement made at a press conference in Alexandria, VA on 3/13/2006  
by George Nelson, Colonel, U.S. Air Force (retired).**

I'm George Nelson; I served four years of enlisted service, and 30 additional years as a commissioned officer in the Air Force---- Please, let me begin by saying, that I get no pleasure or personal satisfaction whatsoever from speaking out in opposition to the US government's official conclusions, and the 911 Commission's official report of the tragedy that occurred on September 11th, 2001.

I'm a trained aircraft accident investigator. I completed the University of Southern California's accident investigation course in 1989. I was an aircraft maintenance manager throughout my military career and was assigned additional duties as a member of accident investigations for the Air Force.

In every case of an aircraft loss, an accident investigation was always conducted and a report was issued through command channels, and it made no difference if the loss was due to an obvious accident or if it had been shot down by enemy fire. An investigation was always conducted, and a report was always filed, even if the plane was under 5,000 feet of water and not recoverable.

In the case of all four reported aircraft losses on 9-11, each one was reported to have been carrying commercial passengers aboard scheduled commercial airliners. Federal Aviation regulations in Part 121, governs the operations of all scheduled airlines that operate inside the United States, including foreign airlines, which transit through our airports in commercial operations. In the case of each aircraft loss that occurred on 9-11, the regulations are very clear and unambiguous-- investigations were required, and the reports would have covered the loss circumstances in excruciating detail, including all collateral damage incurred.

Especially in the cases of such horrendous loss of life, collection of physical evidence would have been paramount in determining the precise causes of each loss. Scientific and reasoned deductions are permitted only after an exhaustive search and analysis of physical evidence has been completed.

Hundreds of parts from each of those four aircraft are critical for safety of flight, and as such, must be meticulously controlled by only one-of-a-kind, dedicated, serial numbers. These parts are required by FAA regulations to be tracked and removed and replaced at a designated number of flying hours or a number of actual cycles. Just like the toughness of black boxes, these components are virtually indestructible and relatively easy to find among the crash wreckage.

Each of the aircraft would have two engines that are nine feet in diameter, and would have had many of the critical, serialized parts installed. Several sets of massive landing gears would have been easy to find and identify, and each of these parts would have been linked to one, and only one aircraft in the world.

The aircraft parts from the two World Trade Center buildings, the Pentagon and the hole in the ground at Shanksville, Pennsylvania would have disclosed the specific identity of each aircraft, and those parts did not "vaporize" as some Pentagon spokespersons have reported.

The parts may have since "vaporized" but not during the reported crashes. The well-known "Black Boxes" were reported to have been found, but were immediately confiscated and seem to have since, disappeared.

Independent news photographers and investigators at Shanksville, Pennsylvania were kept far away from the reported aircraft crash site by security cordons and guards. The public could only view the crash site by an aerial photo. The photo shows an impact area only 20 feet long by 10 feet wide, and the photo shows no sign of crash wreckage inside the small area. Most small fighter planes create larger holes than that, and again, no aircraft accident report has been made public. This only serves to heighten the public's growing skepticism of the 911 Commission report.

And then we have the reported crash of a Boeing 757 with a 125-foot wingspan that was reported to have crashed into the Pentagon. It made a 16-foot diameter hole in the building at ground floor, and penetrated three inner rings of the building and left an almost perfect circular hole as it exited the third inner ring of the building.



If an aluminum Boeing 757 had struck that fortified building, there would have been more aluminum on the ground outside than what went inside, yet there was little visible evidence of an airplane crash on the outside. What physical evidence that could have been of some value, was immediately carted away under cover. And once again, there's the annoying problem of the missing Black Boxes.

In the interest of time, I'm going to relate just one more piece of key evidence. The aircraft that was reported in the government's official story to have crashed into the south tower was United Airlines, Flight 175 carrying 65 passengers, including the crew and five hijackers. One of the television news cameras captured the Boeing 767, just as it was banking into a left turn, seconds before striking the building. Underneath the fuselage, installed across the starboard aircraft wing root, is a visible, large piece of equipment that most viewers have called a "Pod".

Many have speculated what purpose the "Pod" might have served on a passenger carrying, scheduled airliner, but such speculation is pointless at the present time. The fact is, that such extraneous equipment would have never have been installed on a Part 121, scheduled airliner in the first place. Every piece of equipment proposed for use on an aircraft after its production must be issued a Supplemental Type Certificate by the FAA prior to installation. No record of an STC was found that would authorize such external equipment to be used on a Part 121, Boeing 767 airliner.

This leads to a more disturbing speculation, that the airplane seen hitting the south tower was not UAL flight 175, but a plane that had been substituted for flight 175.

The National Transportation Safety Board decides which of three organizations will take the lead role in Part 121 accident investigations. Sometimes the NTSB will assume the lead, and in some cases they will assign lead responsibility to the FAA, but most always if criminal foul play is suspected, the lead role will be assigned to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the technical assistance of both the FAA and NTSB.

It's fair to say, in this case that the NTSB suspected criminal foul play on 9-11, so which agency had primary responsibility for the investigations and required reporting? Where are the reports? Where is the physical evidence to back up those reports?

Does anyone recall TWA Flight 800 that was bound from the US to Paris about four years ago? The FBI was assigned the lead role, suggesting that foul play was suspected, and the FBI gave almost daily reports on the evening news channels, but ultimately the FBI's conclusion was, that a spark in one of the internal fuel tanks caused the fatal explosion. At least we all knew in that case, there was an investigation conducted, such as it was.

I could go on and on with the many weaknesses in the 9-11 Commission's report, but there's little reason to belabor the details, so I'd like to offer just two or three websites where anyone who's the least bit interested can find most every weakness in the 9-11 Commission report. In these few minutes we've just begun to scratch the surface.

For further information, we suggest you research the following websites for yourself, but there are many more credible sources available. Check out--- [www.st911.org](http://www.st911.org); [www.physics911.net](http://www.physics911.net) or [www.wingtv.net/](http://www.wingtv.net/).

I'm frequently asked by people hearing me speak about 9-11, "Why in the world are you speaking out about this tragedy? Doesn't it worry you?" I answer the same way every time I'm asked---- "Because I'm a man with a conscience.


You can see by my age that I must have grandchildren, and I do. I'm about to turn this country that I deeply love, over to my children and my grandchildren. And as I look around, I don't like what I see happening to it.

Thanks for listening.

<http://populist-party.dailykos.com/storyonly/2006/3/28/234477167>

Kevin Barrett

**Subject:** Dr. Kevin Barrett  
**From:** Gustavo Espada <espada@fas.harvard.edu>  
**Date:** Fri, 30 Jun 2006 11:19:41 -0400  
**To:** board@uwsa.edu, rep.nass@legis.state.wi.us  
**CC:** v911t@yahoogroups.com



Chancellor's Office

JUL 07 2006

UW-Madison

Dear Representative Nass and Regents of the University of Wisconsin,

It is with great concern that I write to you with regard to Kevin Barrett, an instructor at the UWMadison campus and founder of Muslim Jewish and Christian Alliance for 9-11 Truth. While I am not affiliated with that group, I am an associate member of Scholars for 9-11 Truth and auxiliary (non-veteran) member of Veterans for 9-11 Truth, two other important associations of individuals united to expose the fraudulent account of the events of 9-11 that has been enshrined by the Bush administration and the deeply flawed 9-11 Commission. It is my understanding that Representative Nass has called for Dr. Barrett's dismissal, and I write because this would be the gravest of injustices.

I understand that because our assertions regarding what actually happened on 9-11 are so very different from that account your initial reaction may be to dismiss our position as absurd. I would urge you to use caution in coming to conclusions on this matter without reviewing the available evidence that thoroughly discredits the official version of events. We have all been victims of a coordinated effort to mislead the public with regard to the responsibility for the crimes committed on 9-11 and more and more people every day are becoming aware of the fact.

Please understand that we are all responsible for defending our country from its enemies, both foreign and domestic, and that not becoming informed despite the numbers of people echoing our concerns is not an excuse for allowing this threat to go unaddressed--it is a failure of your patriotic duty. Having grown up overseas as a dependent of a 20 year Foreign Service Officer in the U.S. diplomatic corps, I have a strong ingrained interest in our government's integrity and have committed myself to defending our constitution and people--I urge you to do the same.

Please familiarize yourself with the issues--I recommend starting at [www.truth911.net](http://www.truth911.net), a comprehensive and accurate source of information on the subject. Kevin Barrett's many supporters will be watching his case with interest and taking all appropriate measures to protect his right to speak the truth on a critical problem facing our nation without unwarranted sanctions by individuals with dubious motives.

Regards,

Gustavo Espada  
Harvard College Class of 1996 (Sociology)

--  
--

Gustavo Espada Financial Assistant Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations Harvard University 2 Divinity Ave. #222 \* Cambridge, MA 02138 P- 617.495.2755 / F- 617.496.6040

For instructions, information, and forms pertaining to the Department, Faculty, Students and Staff are encouraged to visit the Virtual Staff Assistant online at <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~ealc/gusweb/gushome2.htm>

**Subject:** Sept. 11 claim stirs UW probe  
**From:** "B Shore" <bshore2@wi.rr.com>  
**Date:** Fri, 30 Jun 2006 11:58:29 -0500  
**To:** <board@uwsa.edu>

*From today's Milwaukee Journal Sentinel.*

*I did not attend your schools, but wish you to be aware that I have already heard some pretty severe reaction to this article from some alumni acquaintances, by 10 am this morning. These people were really angry, and the reaction was: "I am not sending UW any more donations, if that's what they are tolerating."*

*David Walsh needs to be aware that this type of publicity does nothing to enhance the reputation of the university, to attract donors or public tax support. I compare this person's personal views, which should not be part of university based curriculum, as akin to the guy who is running the Hitler museum in Walworth county.*

*Thought you should know you don't operate in a bubble.*

*Barbara Shore*

*14860 Woodland Place*

*Brookfield, WI 53005*

*(262) 783-7039*

*Bshore2@wi.rr.com*



## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Kristi V. Thorson [kthorson@bascom.wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 13, 2006 11:29 AM  
**To:** atoburen@wisc.edu; Eden Inoway-Ronnie  
**Cc:** Don Nelson  
**Subject:** Fwd: Senator Grothman - Constituent Question - Academics at UW Madison

Need some help with a response....

>>> "Grothman, Glenn" <Glenn.Grothman@legis.state.wi.us> 7/13/2006 11:18 AM >>>  
Dear Kristi,

Since you are a legislative liaison on behalf of the UW and the State Legislature, I would appreciate your assistance in responding to this constituent's email regarding the Kevin Barrett debacle which seems to be an on-going UW phenomena.

Sincerely,

Jolene R. Churchill, Assistant  
Senator Glenn Grothman  
20th Senate District  
266-7513

It is just incomprehensible to me that a professor who has such outrageous theories as Kevin Barrett is considered qualified and desirable to teach the students at a Wisconsin college. Why would anyone want his child exposed to such irrational mental processes?

I would really be interested in knowing who is responsible for assessing the credentials of applicants for teaching in the Wisconsin system, who has oversight, what are the criteria for dismissal, and what authority the legislature has to intervene.

This is really an embarrassment to the citizens of Wisconsin to have a person who has such outrageous theories teaching in our system.

Thank you.

7/13/2006

22357 Columbia Street  
Dearborn, MI 48124-3431  
313-277-5095  
[pvs6@Cornell.edu](mailto:pvs6@Cornell.edu)

6 July 2006

Representative Stephen L. Nass  
State Capitol - Room 12 West  
P.O. Box 8953  
Madison, WS 53708

**Subject: Your Issuance of a Muzzle Order Against Academia**  
**Reference: Professor Kevin Barrett (UW-Madison)**

Dear Representative Nass:

On March 20, 1775 the Second Virginia Convention met in secret and at a secret location. The specific reason for the secrecy involved a British overlord Lieutenant-Governor Dunmore and the Royal Marines. The general reason for the secrecy involved what was/has recently been defined as fascism (The latter was codified by Benito Mussolini.). During this convention, the patriot Patrick Henry gave a speech which concluded with:

*"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!"*

For your information, it was *this* form of patriotism that eventually led to historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

However, in December 2005 the republican George Bush is reported to have thrown an adolescent temper tantrum while demanding re-issuance of a traitorous document entitled "the USA PATRIOT Act." During a meeting at our White House this Bush was reminded of the treasonous effects this fascist document has had on the Constitution. Regarding the latter Bush declared:

*"I don't give a goddamn. I'm the President and the Commander-in-Chief. Do it my way ...  
(it's just) a goddamned piece of paper."*

By the patriotism of the Founding Fathers (and the women that brought them into the world) we are blessed with the First Amendment. This amendment allows this Bush character to say anything he wants (except the yelling of "Fire!" in a movie theater wherein, say, the film Who Killed John O'Neill is featured.).

Us taxpayers and citizens, have the right to strongly disagree with Bush and his claim that the Constitution is just *"a goddamned piece of paper."* We even have the right to demand that he be censured, admonished and severely criticized for making such a statement while he places our military men and women in harms-way defending an Iraqi Constitution.

BUT . . . the taxpayers do NOT have the legal or moral right to muzzle your fellow republican Bush . . . even Bush is protected by the United States Constitution. Indeed, you and Bush have the right to *burn* a copy of that precious document, if that's what your conscience dictates.

I, for one, have absolutely no intention of supporting or engaging in any activity that threatens the political and moral sanctity of the United States Constitution. However, I also have no intention of letting you or Bush trample on our rights. Your recent diatribe regarding Professor Kevin Barrett does just that, and in that context I intend to expose your lack of patriotism, your abject ignorance, and your blatant duplicity/hypocrisy at every opportunity. Your recent attack on the United States Constitution may be justification for your removal from public office.

The issue of academic freedom is vital to the survival of America as a constitutional republic, and I will fight your traitorous vitriol to the point of your political demise if necessary. Recently a particular dolt, while accepting his nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court, referred to our nation as a "constitutional democracy," which is absurdly ignorant . . . or was it? Promoting the lie that the United States is a "constitutional democracy" indicated a purposeful plan to subvert the genius of the Founding Fathers. As a constitutional republic we are a nation of laws; laws that protect the rights of both individuals and institutions, such as the University of Wisconsin. For your information, these laws protect Professor Barrett and his proposed course lectures from your personal opinions, no matter how ignorant the latter may be. The law also protects your right to challenge the veracity and accuracy of his material, but NOT your yelling of "Fire!" in the movie theater, as you have essentially done. A few constitutionally protected, and specific examples:

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that as many as ten of the alleged 19 "suicide hijackers" are known to be alive by the Bush Administration, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that the U.S. has absolutely "no hard evidence" that Osama bin Laden had any connection to the murders of 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that World Trade Center Building Seven was NOT struck by an aircraft on 9/11 but collapsed symmetrically without U. S. Government explanation, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that a structural steel building has NEVER collapsed due to fire, in human history, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that both World Trade Center Building One and Two collapsed at 'free fall speed' in complete contradiction to the government's fairy tale about "pancake theory," you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that Ms. Edna Cintron was essentially murdered on 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that the U.S. corporate media purposely misquoted eyewitness accounts of what the latter stated about the events at the Pentagon on 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that the lead Osama bin Laden counter-terrorist expert, FBI agent John O'Neill, was murdered prior to 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that Marvin Bush (younger brother of George Bush) was a director at the company that ran security under a contract that expired on September 13, 2001 at the World Trade Center, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If the Professor Barrett lectures include review of the many papers written by Dr. David Ray Griffin who claims that the '911 Commission Report' is filled with lies, omissions and distortions, you have a right to challenge those papers but you do not have the right censor the review or muzzle Professor Barrett.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that Hani Hanjour's head could not possibly have penetrated all the way through to the inner wall of the Pentagon C-ring on 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that World Trade Center leaseholder and real estate developer Larry Silverstein admitted that a decision was made, late in the afternoon on 9/11, to "pull it" regarding WTC-7, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that the public stock of United Airlines and American Airlines were the subject of unprecedented "put options" mere days prior to the murders of 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that five Mossad agents were seen early on the morning of 9/11 on the New Jersey coast preparing to film the horror across the Hudson River, and were later arrested but then mysteriously sent home to Israel by the Bush Administration, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that the 1962 Operation Northwoods document was frighteningly familiar to the murders that occurred on 9/11, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Barrett were to lecture that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld refuses to confirm that American Airlines Flight 77, a Boeing 757, crashed into the Pentagon and has instead publically stated that a "missile" was used, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If the Professor Barrett lectures include the showing of documentary films such as Loose Change - Second Edition, or In Plane Sight, you have a right to challenge the content of those documentaries but you do not have the right censor the showing or muzzle Professor Barrett.

If the Professor Barrett lectures include review of the paper written by BYU physicist Professor Steven Jones entitled, Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Collapse?, you have a right to challenge the content of that paper but you do not have the right censor the review or muzzle Professor Barrett.

If the Professor Barrett lectures include review of the numerous 9/11 related internet postings by Alex Jones, you have a right to challenge the content of the Alex Jones sites but you do not have the right censor the review or muzzle Professor Barrett.

If the Professor Barrett lectures include review of the many papers written by former Bush Administration official Professor Morgan Reynolds, you have a right to challenge the content of those papers but you do not have the right censor the review or muzzle Professor Barrett.

I could go on, but I wanted to drive into your subjective head the legal fact that you also cannot in any way threaten the fiscal well-being of a public institution such as the University of Wisconsin through use of your political position. You cannot use your political position **"to add credibility to your outlandish claims"** of knowledge about the events of September 11, 2001, which is what you have ostensibly done. Your proposed censoring of a fine institution such as the University of Wisconsin **"is an unacceptable embarrassment to the people of Wisconsin and the UW system."** Specifically, you sir are a hypocrite.

Admittedly, I am deeply concerned with the *leit motiv* that involves government funding of the American universities, and all the corrupting influence that comes with those all-too-often politically premised decisions. I am also concerned about administrators who grab at short-term financial issues, and in so-doing denigrate the fundamental purpose of their own position in higher education. In this respect, in some instances, they remind me of the U.S. Congress.

In my opinion, based on the foresight and genius of what Bush calls "a goddamned piece of paper," it is rare indeed that the powers-that-be seek to muzzle the liars; Of what harm to the social station of the former do these liars pose? It is always those that seek and disseminate the truth that are the subject of tyranny. **Always.**

Specifically, if Professor Kevin Barrett is a total crackpot, then a decision by the University to allow his course will expose his incompetence, and your brilliance. If, on the other hand, the course proposed by the professor leads to the inculcation of critical thinking in his students (rather than mindless political blather), and furthers the exposure of truth and justice, then we all win. In the former scenario the students walk away by virtue of an informed choice and learning experiences that will be shared with other students. In the latter scenario the students are encouraged and gather to learn more, again by virtue of an informed choice and learning experiences that will be shared with other students. I am assuming that you would guard such a choice for your children/relatives as well.

Frankly, I am very confident that if the professor had an opinion of 9/11 which mirrored yours, then we would not have heard from you. In any case, I am hopeful that the University administration does not shirk its social responsibilities. I am also hopeful that the University will not ignore you or muzzle you, but will allow the course as proposed.

Cordially,

Paul V. Sheridan

P.S. Give me liberty or give me death . . . understood?

Attachments



Courtesy Copy List  
(As of July 6, 2006)

Mr. Patrick Farrell  
Mr. Gary Sandefur  
Mr. W. Lee Hansen  
Mr. Robert Kreiser  
Ms. Ellen Rafferty  
Mr. Brian Mattmiller  
Mr. Robert Kreiser  
Mr. Donald Downs  
Ms. Sandy Cullen  
Mr. Dylan Avery  
Professor Morgan Reynolds  
Professor Steven Jones  
Professor Kevin Barrett  
Mr. Alex Jones  
Mr. David VonKleist  
Ms. Debbie Lewis  
Ms. Danielle Corcoran  
Dr. David Ray Griffin



FedEx Express  
Customer Support Trace  
3875 Airways Boulevard  
Module H, 4th Floor  
Memphis, TN 38116

U.S. Mail: PO Box 727  
Memphis, TN 38194-4643  
Telephone: 901-369-3600

07/07/2008

Dear Customer:

The following is the proof of delivery you requested with the tracking number **853542968761**.

---

**Delivery Information:**

---

Status:	Delivered	Delivery location:	17 W MAIN ST
Signed for by:	J.RUDOW	Delivery date:	JUL 7, 2008 10:08
Service type:	Priority Envelope		

**NO SIGNATURE IS AVAILABLE**

FedEx Express Proof of delivery details appear below, however no signature is currently available for this FedEx Express shipment. Availability of signature images may take up to 5 days after delivery date.

---

**Shipping Information:**

---

Tracking number:	853542968761	Ship date:	JUL 6, 2008
Recipient:		Shipper:	
REP STEVE NASS		PAUL SHERIDAN	
STATE CAPITOL		PAUL V SHERIDAN	
MADISON OFFICE RM 12WEST		22367 COLUMBIA ST	
53708 US		481243481 US	

Thank you for choosing FedEx Express.

FedEx Worldwide Customer Service  
1.800.GoFedEx 1.800.463.3339

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 12:43 AM  
**To:** pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu  
**Subject:** Kevin Barrett

Dear Sir,

My name is [REDACTED], a former student at the University, and a former student of Kevin Barrett in particular. I would like to take a moment to address the questions that are being raised about Mr. Barrett's appropriateness of his teachings, particularly regarding his ideas of the 9-11 attacks being an "inside job."

To begin, I would like to make note that at no time during any of his lectures for introduction to Islam, did Mr. Barrett ever bring up even a remote reference to his personal opinions regarding 9-11. His class was filled with amazingly interesting information and ideas about the Muslim faith.

Being Jewish myself, I was admittedly, at first at least, reticent to embrace the study of Islam in anything more than a perfunctory manner. It was only through Mr. Barrett's passion for a multicultural understanding of the faith that led me to opening my mind to ideas about Islam, and particularly the peaceful aspects of it.

I can honestly say that the class that I took with Mr. Barrett was both very challenging, and incredibly rewarding. It would be a travesty if you let a culture of fear of ideas that people do not agree with being silenced through intimidation to prevail at the university. I can only say that I would be ashamed to be part of the University, and would feel obliged to turn my back on it in both a social and financial manner if Kevin Barrett is punished for his ideas. It is the freedom of ideas that makes the University of Wisconsin-Madison what it is.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 8:12 AM  
**To:** downs@polisci.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** PYRiesen@HHLAW.com; Danielle Corcoran; Jim Fetzer; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; Samara Derby  
**Subject:** are you willing to defend your remarks, Professor Downs?



Pasted Graphic.tiff  
(22 KB)



ATT00089.txt (541 B)



ATT00092.txt (565 B)

Dear Donald Downs,

re: Your remarks reported in the Wisconsin State Journal:

<http://www.madison.com/wsj/mad/top/index.php?ntid=89540&ntpid=2>

\*\*\*

Political science professor Donald Downs called Barrett's opinion "absurd," but said he shouldn't be fired for what he says in class.

However, he said, Barrett's views reflect on his judgment, and the university might consider that next time he vies for a teaching position.

\*\*\*

Since you seem to be suggesting that in the future I ought to be denied the opportunity to earn a living because my "absurd" opinions reflect poor judgment, I hope you are willing to set the name-calling aside, and stand up and defend your view in an honest, open, rational debate. I propose a debate on the following proposition:

**"Resolved: That it is absurd to doubt the conclusions of the *9/11 Commission Report* and to suggest that a new, honest and impartial investigation, focused on the possibility of official complicity, is a matter of the greatest national and international urgency; and that anyone who holds these absurd views has poor judgment, and should not be hired to teach at the University of Wisconsin."**

I propose that you argue for the above proposition, and that Jim Fetzer, co-founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, argue against it. Professor Fetzer has graciously expressed his willingness to engage you in this debate, or a debate on a similar proposition, in the public forum of your choice.

If you do not wish to defend your attack on my judgment and suitability to teach in an open, honest debate, I will have no choice but to consider pursuing the same kind of debate in a legal, rather than academic, forum.

I am copying this to Professor Fetzer and also to Philip Riesen, who has expressed an interest in representing me should this debate be forced into the legal arena.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

Kevin Barrett  
Coordinator, Muslim-Jewish-Christian Alliance for 9/11 Truth <http://mujca.com>

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 9:22 AM  
**To:** scott.jaschik@insidehighered.com; scott.jaschik@insidehighered.com  
**Cc:** Samara Derby; Danielle Corcoran; Jim Fetzer; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu  
**Subject:** Re: seeking to talk to you/get reaction on Madison investigation



Pasted Graphic.tiff  
(22 KB)



ATT00105.txt (1  
KB)



ATT00108.txt (1  
KB)

Dear Scott Jaschik,

Thank you for your interest. In answer to your question, no, I do not feel that my academic freedom has been violated -- at least not yet. I understand that my position on 9/11, while more-or-less shared by 42% of the American people (Zogby 5/06) and roughly 60% of Muslims worldwide, is controversial, and I have certainly displayed an unusual degree of commitment to that position in my volunteer work as a 9/11 truth activist. I believe that University instructors who are strongly committed to a particular point of view often need to be reminded not to inflict their own point of view on their students, and to give roughly equal weight to all defensible viewpoints when considering controversial issues in class. (This is as true of professors who are committed to the official version of 9/11 as to those who question it.)

I also understand that in the contexts of activism and advocacy, I use a rhetorical approach that would be completely inappropriate in a university classroom. So I understand why the Office of the Provost has reacted with concern and feels compelled to take a closer look at the matter. Their actions thus far have been exemplary.

For what it's worth, I do feel that Rep. Nass, and to a lesser extent Professor Downs, have *attempted* to violate my academic freedom. I am confident that they will be unsuccessful in this attempt.

I would also like to point out that any introductory Islam course that does not confront the fact that roughly 60% of the world's Muslims do not accept the official version of 9/11, and at least briefly explore the various reasons for this, would be doing a disservice to the students. Imagine a Jewish Studies course called Introduction to Judaism that implicitly or explicitly accepted the Protocols of the Elders of Zion as authentic, and failed to take into account the fact that most Jews do not agree. (This comparison is of course an exaggeration in service to a point.) The fact is that most Muslims believe or suspect that 9/11 was a psy-op designed to instill Islamophobia in the American and Western population, and justify wars of aggression against Muslim countries. Courses in Islamology need to examine this belief, and (among other things) attempt to discern to what degree it is rationally founded; and if it is completely irrational, what factors have produced it. I do not intend to make this a major part of my own course, but simply to touch on it during the one week devoted to issues surrounding the "war on terror." I invite observers to attend those lectures and judge for themselves whether my handling of this difficult but important subject is fair and balanced.

Again, I appreciate your interest. Please alert me if and when you publish anything on this matter.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** are you willing to defend your remarks, Professor Downs?  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 8:11:33 AM CDT  
**To:** downs@polisci.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** PYRiesen@HHLAW.com, DCorcoran@madison.com, jfetzer@d.umn.edu, pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu, samara@madison.com

Dear Donald Downs,

re: Your remarks reported in the Wisconsin State Journal:

<http://www.madison.com/ws/mad/top/index.php?ntid=89540&ntpid=2>

\* \* \*

Political science professor Donald Downs called Barrett's opinion "absurd," but said he shouldn't be fired for what he says in class.

However, he said, Barrett's views reflect on his judgment, and the university might consider that next time he vies for a teaching position.

\* \* \*

Since you seem to be suggesting that in the future I ought to be denied the opportunity to earn a living because my "absurd" opinions reflect poor judgment, I hope you are willing to set the name-calling aside, and stand up and defend your view in an honest, open, rational debate. I propose a debate on the following proposition:

"Resolved: That it is absurd to doubt the conclusions of the *9/11 Commission Report* and to suggest that a new, honest and impartial investigation, focused on the possibility of official complicity, is a matter of the greatest national and international urgency; and that anyone who holds these absurd views has poor judgment, and should not be hired to teach at the University of Wisconsin."

I propose that you argue for the above proposition, and that Jim Fetzer, co-founder of Scholars for 9/11 Truth, argue against it. Professor Fetzer has graciously expressed his willingness to engage you in this debate, or a debate on a similar proposition, in the public forum of your choice.

If you do not wish to defend your attack on my judgment and suitability to teach in an open, honest debate, I will have no choice but to consider pursuing the same kind of debate in a legal, rather than academic, forum.

I am copying this to Professor Fetzer and also to Philip Riesen, who has expressed an interest in representing me should this debate be forced into the legal arena.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

Kevin Barrett  
Coordinator, Muslim-Jewish-Christian Alliance for 9/11 Truth <http://mujca.com>

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Thomas C. Reeves [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 9:56 AM  
**To:** pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu  
**Subject:** Kevin Barrett case

The Megn Twohey piece in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel on the Kevin Barrett case fails to tell us anything of the man's academic credentials, official status within the University, and years of teaching experience. I'm writing an extended article on this case and would appreciate some information about Barrett. I cannot locate him on the website.

I find your initial statement on the matter, by the way, solid and persuasive.

Cordially,

Thomas C. Reeves, Ph.D.  
Emeritus Prof. of History, U.W. Parkside (1970-2001)



## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Debra Lauder [ddl@bascom.wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 10:11 AM  
**To:** Caty Ahrens  
**Cc:** Casey Nagy; John Wiley; Pat Farrell; Amy Toburen  
**Subject:** Complaint Caller

Caty,

You're probably aware of the controversy regarding Kevin Barrett teaching a course this fall. If not, let me know and I'll elaborate. We've been receiving emails and calls of complaint about the situation. I just received a call from Gordon Brunsell who is very upset that we are even considering allowing Barrett to teach our students. Mr. Brunsell said he is in the midst of funding a scholarship, so I thought I should let you know about his call. He did not threaten to withdraw his funding, but he is clearly unhappy with this situation.

Deb

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Eden Inoway-Ronnie [etinoway@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 10:16 AM  
**To:** 'Dennis Chaptman'; choornstra@vc.wisc.edu; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; gsandefur@ls.admin.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** 'Amy Toburen'; 'Cherie Krenke'; 'Kristi V. Thorson'; 'Don Nelson'; 'Casey Nagy'; 'Brian Mattmiller'  
**Subject:** RE: Jessica McBride blog

At WHA's request, Pat will do the WHA radio call-in show this afternoon, 4 or 4:30 pm. Peter Donalds will call Pat at his home number. Peter plans to call Pat right now to firm up details. It is my understanding that this will be on Public Radio across the state.

Amy and Dennis - if you have tips for Pat on questions he's likely to get and any other general advice, please tap him a note. Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Dennis Chaptman [mailto:dchaptman@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 10:00 AM  
**To:** 'EDEN T INOWAY-RONNIE'; choornstra@vc.wisc.edu; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; gsandefur@ls.admin.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** Amy Toburen  
**Subject:** Jessica McBride blog

Here is a link to Jessica McBride's blog. She is the conservative talk radio host who interviewed Kevin Barrett the other night. The four-part audio of that interview can be accessed from the right side of the page, under "Jessica's Podcasts." I thought the audio might be useful to you in coming days.

[http://www.620wtmj.com/\\_content/talk/jessicamcbride/index.asp](http://www.620wtmj.com/_content/talk/jessicamcbride/index.asp)

Dennis

**Dennis Chaptman**  
University Communications  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
28 Bascom Hall, 500 Lincoln Drive  
Madison, WI 53706  
(608) 262-9406

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Mary Pier (by way of WAA) [pierm@nph.wels.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 11:50 AM  
**To:** pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** Paula Bonner; Mike Fahey  
**Subject:** FWD: FYI - This man needs to be fired! I have two children attending UW Madison...I do not want people like this teaching my children. Signed, Mary E. Pier

This man needs to be fired! I have two children attending UW Madison...I do not want people like this teaching my children. Signed,  
Mary E. Pier

Wis. lawmaker wants lecturer fired for 9-11 conspiracy views

MADISON, Wis. (AP) -- A state lawmaker is calling on the University of Wisconsin-Madison to fire a part-time instructor who has spoken out on his beliefs that figures in the U.S. government, not al-Qaida, were behind the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks.

Kevin Barrett is scheduled to teach a class in the fall in the UW-Madison Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia, UW-Madison Provost Patrick Farrell confirmed in a statement Thursday.

But Farrell said Barrett's comments on a Milwaukee radio talk show "raised some legitimate concerns about the content and quality of instruction in his planned fall course, 'Islam: Religion and Culture.'"

During his appearance Wednesday night on Jessica McBride's show on WTMJ, Barrett disputed most of the widely accepted information about the attacks that brought down the World Trade Center in New York City when airliners were flown into the twin towers.

Advertisement

Among other things, he claimed the group believed to have carried out the attacks was "a bunch of losers who couldn't even fly planes," and that evidence indicates the buildings were brought down by controlled demolitions.

He acknowledged discussing Sept. 11 in teaching classes, but said it was only to give both sides of the issue, not to convert anyone to his point of view.

"I'm trying to teach them how to think, not what to think," he told McBride.

On Thursday, state Rep. Stephen Nass, R-Whitewater, issued a statement demanding Barrett be fired immediately, calling him an embarrassment and accusing him of spewing "garbage."

"Mr. Barrett is free to stand on the street corner and advocate his nutty left-wing views. However, the taxpayers and tuition-paying families shouldn't pay this man one cent to perform his voodoo in a UW classroom," Nass' statement read.

Farrell said UW officials would give Barrett's course plans a close review.

"We plan to meet with Mr. Barrett to discuss those plans, review his syllabus, his reading list and examine past supervisor and student evaluations. We expect to complete this process within 10 working days," he said.

"Mr. Barrett is entitled to his own personal political views. But we also have an obligation to ensure that his course content is academically appropriate, of high quality, and that his personal views are not imposed on his students."

Barrett said he welcomed the scrutiny.

"I look forward to the chance to discuss this with anyone who's interested, and I understand why this would raise concerns," he told the Wisconsin State Journal late Thursday. "When professors have a strong commitment to a point of view, it's important that they not impose their views on students."

He also said he was happy his remarks stirred a reaction.

"Well, I'm glad it worked," he said. "I've been working on this 9/11 truth activism for a couple of years now, and we've been pretty desperate to get any publicity to get people to take a look at this matter."

According to Farrell, Barrett accepted a one-semester appointment as an associate lecturer beginning Aug. 28. He termed it a 50 percent appointment with a salary of \$8,247.

He said Barrett received his doctorate from UW-Madison in 2004 in African languages and literature and folklore, and has taught only one other course since that time at UW-Madison.

This fall's course would be the first taught by Barrett on Islam at UW-Madison, he said.

Barrett also is scheduled to teach in the fall at Edgewood College, a private liberal arts college in Madison.

Ed Taylor, an Edgewood College spokesman, said Barrett was a part-time adjunct faculty member due to teach a class in the fall called "Topics in Human Issues: Challenge of Islam."

There was no immediate response when The Associated Press left a message at a phone listing for a Kevin J. Barrett on Thursday night and also tried all other similar listings while seeking further comment from him.

© 2006 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed. Learn more about our [Privacy Policy](#).

Copyright © Journal Broadcast Group  
[Click here for terms, privacy policy and usage](#) | [Annual EEO Report](#)

Developed by Journal [Interactive](#)

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** william.groskopf@thomson.com  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 11:59 AM  
**To:** pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** mtwohey@journalsentinel.com  
**Subject:** Kevin Barrett

**Importance:** High  
**Sensitivity:** Confidential

Mr. Farrell,

As long time tax payer in the state of Wisconsin, I feel I must voice my opinion on the current issue revolving around Kevin Barrett and his beliefs on 9-11.

If he wants to voice his beliefs and theories on what really took place on 9-11 let him stand on a soap box in the commons and do so. However I can't condone any of my tax dollars being spent to aid him in his "mission of enlightenment". As one of your employers, I would like to hear what you personally plan to do to put and end to this situation. Please call or e-mail me using the contact information below.

William E. Groskopf

262 / 789-8919

E-Mail to: [william.groskopf@thomson.com](mailto:william.groskopf@thomson.com)

**\*\*\*The information contained in this communication may be confidential or legally privileged and is intended only for the recipient named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately advise the sender and delete the original and any copies from your computer system.\*\*\***

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Eden Inoway-Ronnie [etinoway@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 11:59 AM  
**To:** pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu  
**Cc:** 'Gary D SANDEFUR'  
**Subject:** Blog info with Barrett Syllabus

Pat,

In case you don't have time to read the blog, here is what she posted about his syllabus. I don't yet have any official copy of what he may have submitted to the dept. as his syllabus for this course...

"Barrett's planned syllabus

Here is Barrett's planned syllabus for his fall course. Note the inclusion of the Cobb/Labarsky book as required reading. Barrett is listed as an editor. Here's the summary of that book on Amazon.com:

### Book Description

Inspired by David Ray Griffin's internationally acclaimed book *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions about the Bush Administration and 9/11*, this anthology presents a variety of perspectives on 9/11 and empire from authors who identify with one of the major Abrahamic traditions. Co-edited by a major Christian theologian (John Cobb), a Jewish scholar (Sandra Lubarsky), and a Muslim scholar (Kevin Barrett), the book features essays by 9/11 revisionists and activists alongside those of noted writers and scholars, including several of the leading religious intellectuals of our time. The writers offer reflections on 9/11 and empire informed by the moral principles of their religious traditions as well as by the obligation to engage in thoughtful dialogue with those of other traditions. While the question of the Bush administration's and US military and intelligence leaders' possible complicity in 9/11- and the moral implications of facing that possibility-is at the forefront of the book's agenda, it also addresses the way 9/11 has been used to expand the US empire's "global domination project"-raising profound moral questions that confront all of us, whatever our views on 9/11 complicity and whatever our faith, worldview, or national/ethnic identification.

### UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Department of Languages and Cultures of Asia;  
African Languages and Literature; Religious Studies  
COURSE 370-ISLAM: RELIGION AND CULTURE (4 CREDITS)  
Fall 2006

INSTRUCTOR: Kevin J. Barrett. Office 12th Floor Van Hise (room TBA)  
Office Hours: [TBA] Email: kjbarret@wisc.edu  
. Phone 262-3418 . Class listserv: islam-370@lists.students.wisc.edu  
Class meets: Tues. and Thurs. 1:00-2:15 in 3425 Sterling; Wed. at 12:05 in 114 Van Hise

COURSE DESCRIPTION: Introduction to Islam as a religion-a fourteen-centuries-old holistic worldview that is also a system of belief and practice. Examination of the major creeds and theologies within Islam as well as its characteristic social and mystical expressions. Consideration of Islam's contributions to world culture, its modern day image in the world media, and its American faces.

### REQUIRED TEXTS:

Approaching the Qur'an: The Early Revelations. Introduced and translated by Michael Sells. Ashland, OR: White Cloud Pr., 1999. [with CD: Call to Prayer and Six Suras] Aslan, Reza. No god but God: The Origins, Evolution, and Future of Islam. NY: Random House, 2005.  
Barrett, Cobb and Lubarsky, eds. 9/11 and the American Empire: Christians, Jews and Muslims Speak Out. Northampton, MA: Interlink, 2006. Murata, Sachiko and William C. Chittick. The Vision of Islam. New York: Paragon House, 1994.  
X, Malcolm. The Autobiography of Malcolm X.

**TEXTS RECOMMENDED FOR PURCHASE:**

Denny, Frederick M. An Introduction to Islam. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1994. Or: Esposito, John The Oxford Dictionary of Islam. Or: Glasse, Cyril. The Concise Encyclopedia of Islam.

**COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING:**

1. Mid-term Examination: Take-home essay exam given out Oct. 19 (Thurs.) and due in class on Oct. 24 (Tues.); about 20% of the grade. 2. Summary Report/Critical Review of a video: about 5 pages due Nov. 21 (Tues.); about 20% of the grade. [Students may select video tapes from the list of Recommended Materials attached here or other video tapes of their choice with instructor's approval.] 3A. Final Examination (Undergraduates): Either: Take-home essay exam given out Dec.12 (Tues.) and due in my mailbox no later than 12:00 noon Tuesday, December 19th); Or: In-class final exam during the scheduled exam period (7:45 a.m. Dec. 23rd ). About 40% of the grade. 3B. Research Paper (Graduate Students): 15-25 pages on a topic of the student's choice with the instructor's approval; due on the last day of class; about 40% of the grade. 4. Regular Attendance and Participation in Class Discussions; about 20% of grade.

**TENTATIVE COURSE SCHEDULE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS:**

Week 1-2 (Sept. 5-14): Introduction: Approaching the Qur'an Required reading and listening: Sells, Approaching the Qur'an

Week 3-4 (Sept. 19- 28): The Qur'anic Worldview  
Required reading: Sells; Murata and Chittick, Introduction and Part One

Weeks 5-7 (Oct. 3-12): The Qur'anic Worldview, Continued Required reading: Murata and Chittick, Parts Two and Three; Aslan p.194-219

Week 8 (Oct. 17-19): Worldview and History  
Finish Murata and Chittick; Aslan through p. 106  
Mid-term Take-Home Exam Given Oct. 19th (Thurs.)

Weeks 9-10 (Oct. 24-Nov. 2): Worldview and History, Continued  
\*\* Mid-term Take-Home Exam Due Oct. 24 (Thurs.)  
Finish Aslan; Yasmin Ahmed essay in 9/11 and the American Empire

Week 11 (Nov. 7-9): "The Clash of Civilizations"  
Required reading: Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations"; Masud essay in 9/11 and the American Empire  
Film: BBC-TV The Power of Nightmares (part 3).

Week 12: (Nov. 14-16): "The War on Terror"  
Required reading: Lewis, <http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=105001985>  
Esposito (on-line), Nafeez Ahmed article in 9/11 and the American Empire

Week 13-14 (Nov. 21-30; no class Nov. 23): (African)-American Islam  
Required reading: The Autobiography of Malcolm X

Week 15 (Dec. 5-7) (African)-American Islam, Continued  
Required reading: The Autobiography of Malcolm X; film Malcolm X

Week 16 (Dec. 12-14): Islam and Expressive Culture  
\*\* Critical Review Due Nov. 26 (Tues.)  
Required reading: TBA.

\*\* Final Exam Questions Distributed to Undergraduates Dec. 12 (Tues.)  
\*\* Graduate Student Research Papers Due Dec. 12 (Tues.)

\*\* Final Exams Due in my mailbox/Van Hise 12th Floor by 12:45 pm on Dec. 20 \*\*

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Brian Mattmiller [bsmattmi@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 12:55 PM  
**To:** Patrick Farrell  
**Cc:** EDEN T INOWAY-RONNIE  
**Subject:** Fwd: Professor Kevin Barrett

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Tricia Dickinson <[pmdickinson@wisc.edu](mailto:pmdickinson@wisc.edu)>  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 12:42:41 PM CDT  
**To:** Amy Toburen <[atoburen@wisc.edu](mailto:atoburen@wisc.edu)>, BRIAN S MATTMILLER <[bsmattmi@wisc.edu](mailto:bsmattmi@wisc.edu)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Professor Kevin Barrett

FYI, here is an email CIVC received. I will have them forward the Provost's statement.

td

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** askbucky askbucky <[askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu](mailto:askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu)>  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 11:50:45 AM CDT  
**To:** [pmdickinson@wisc.edu](mailto:pmdickinson@wisc.edu)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Professor Kevin Barrett

**From:** Rick Moore <[rmoore@sync1.com](mailto:rmoore@sync1.com)>  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 9:06:56 AM CDT  
**To:** [askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu](mailto:askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu)  
**Subject:** Professor Kevin Barrett

I must say that I am very disturbed by the article that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal/Sentinel today regarding the views of Professor Kevin Barrett.

As an alum, I always revered our campuses diversity and the freedom to speak ones beliefs. This however crosses a line, and I'm glad to see that the Provost and the University are looking into it.

Professor Barrett is entitled to his opinion, but unless he is specifically teaching a course about 9-11, his opinion on this tragedy should be kept out of the classroom. There are plenty of



places that he can air and discuss his views on campus.

I will not be particularly disturbed if he is rebuked, but allowed to continue in his duties. As I said, everyone is entitled to their opinion misguided as it is. He must however apologize to the U.W. community.

I'm not asking him to renounce his beliefs, but he must acknowledge that he does not have the right to force his unrelated views of this subject onto his students.

I will be monitoring how the U.W. handles this problem. I am sure that many of my fellow alumni will be monitoring it as well. Donations are a huge part of any University, I hope that you will take all of the necessary steps to resolve this situation, so you do not jeopardize yours.

Sincerely,  
Richard A. Moore  
B.A. '92

Tricia Dickinson  
Marketing Director  
University Communications  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
608/265-9005

Forward. Thinking.

## Eden Inoway-Ronnie

---

**From:** Brian Mattmiller [bsmattmi@wisc.edu]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 30, 2006 12:55 PM  
**To:** Patrick Farrell  
**Cc:** Eden Inoway-Ronnie  
**Subject:** Fwd: 9/11 Censorship against Mr Barrett

Hi -- We are getting some emails of outrage and/or support on the Barrett issue, primarily coming in through the Visitors Center. I will forward a few to you so you can get the tenor of the commentary. FYI -- we are forwarding your statement to all who write to us.

Thanks,  
Brian

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Tricia Dickinson <[pmdickinson@wisc.edu](mailto:pmdickinson@wisc.edu)>  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 12:42:31 PM CDT  
**To:** Amy Toburen <[atoburen@wisc.edu](mailto:atoburen@wisc.edu)>, BRIAN S MATTMILLER <[bsmattmi@wisc.edu](mailto:bsmattmi@wisc.edu)>  
**Subject:** Fwd: 9/11 Censorship against Mr Barrett

FYI, here is an email CIVC received. I will have them forward the Provost's statement.

td

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** askbucky askbucky <[askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu](mailto:askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu)>  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 11:49:42 AM CDT  
**To:** [pmdickinson@wisc.edu](mailto:pmdickinson@wisc.edu)  
**Subject:** Fwd: 9/11 Censorship against Mr Barrett

**From:** LUDWIG HUBER <[ludwig@huber.net](mailto:ludwig@huber.net)>  
**Date:** June 30, 2006 10:03:01 AM CDT  
**To:** [askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu](mailto:askbucky@redgym.wisc.edu)  
**Subject:** 9/11 Censorship against Mr Barrett

It is an outrage to censor and prohibit alternative views on 9/11.  
What have we become? A dictatorship? Can the Republican party now tell us what to think?

Every IDIOT by now knows that "Al Qaeda" is nothing more than a global boogeyman!

The whole 9/11 hijacker story is based on the most FLIMSIEST EVIDENCE: purported cell phone calls from the planes when cell phone calls arent at all possible from airliners at altitude - try it yourself. And that way, in turn, the whole WAR ON TERROR was based on this unconvincing evidence! An OUTRAGE is that!

The official version of 9/11 is a LIE, and more and more people are ready to DIE rather than let this LIE continue to exist!

Tricia Dickinson  
Marketing Director  
University Communications  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
608/265-9005

Forward. Thinking.