

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Matt Kjeldsen [m.kjeldsen@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 10:00 AM
To: dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Please Debate Dr. Fetzer

Dear Professor Downs,

I would like to encourage you to debate Dr. Fetzer and, in so doing, help to clear up the 9/11 issue through intelligent, academic discourse. I received a BS from UT (Austin) and I certainly can't claim to be on your level, but I developed this test as a way to open the public's eyes to the science of 9/11. Please take the test and if you can pass it, you will be able to use the information in the debate.

Thank you for your time.

Matt Kjeldsen
512 443 8951

The Nordsman Test—A Real 'Patriot Act'

(Prove the Government account of 911 and win \$1,000,000)

Answer these three questions of the 911 Commission Report. If you are unable to scientifically answer even one question, you must, as an intellectual and more importantly, as a patriot, question the official explanation of the terrorist attack of September 11, 2001.

A ball dropped from the top of the WTC would fall at free fall speed. If the ball encountered any resistance along the way, such as wind, it would obviously fall slower. The towers both fell at almost free fall speed. Both collapsed to the ground in about 10 seconds. 110 stories completely collapsed in about 10 seconds. If the pancake theory, which is the official explanation, is correct, then every floor hit the floor beneath it, causing it too to fall and so on until it reached the bottom. For simplicity sake, let's lop off the tops of the buildings and just work with the bottom 100 floors for a moment. This means that every floor dropped in .1 seconds. Ten floors dropped in one second. A hundred floors dropped in ten seconds. Galileo's Law of Falling Bodies calculates the time an object will travel in free fall speed. Distance = $16.08 \times (\text{seconds squared})$. The distance of the south tower from top to bottom was 1362 feet. 16.08×84.7 (or 9.2 seconds squared) = 1362 feet. A ball would drop from the top in 9.2 seconds. The south tower fell in about ten seconds.

Question 1: Based on the pancake theory, each floor would naturally have encountered resistance from the floor beneath it. Where did the resistance go?

Larry Silverstein, owner of the WTC complex, admitted in a PBS documentary, that in consultation with 'a fire captain' on September 11, 2001, the decision was made to 'pull' WTC Building 7. 'Pull' is the accepted term in the demolition industry meaning to implode; the use of carefully placed and

precisely timed explosives to collapse a building inward onto itself. Silverstein has since, issued a statement through a publicist, stating that he meant, 'pull it', as to the removal of people from the building. There were two small fires and some visible damage to WTC 7 from the collapse of the towers. However, there were buildings much closer to the towers with more substantial damage and fires, and yet, they are repaired and standing today. Larry Silverstein, having admitted to pulling Building 7, creates our next conundrum.

Question 2: Since it is literally impossible to wire a building to implode in less than eight hours (the time from the first collapsed tower to the time WTC 7 collapsed) and since nobody has even admitted to wiring the building to implode on September 11, 2001; how did WTC Building 7 collapse into its own footprint at free fall speed? Hint. You will not find this explained in the 911 Commission Report.

The WTC towers were a marvel of engineering. There were 47 steel re-enforced columns that formed the core of each building. The steel was certified to ASTM E119, which means samples were exposed to 2000 degrees Fahrenheit for several hours and they did not weaken or melt. Keep in mind that the steel in the towers was wrapped in a blanket of asbestos insulation. The majority of the ten thousand gallons of jet fuel burned off immediately in the initial impact in fireballs. The maximum temperature of a flame in open air is 1800 degrees Fahrenheit. FEMA and NIST claim a temperature of only 900 degrees Fahrenheit was reached to weaken the steel. The fires remaining after the initial explosions were emanating black smoke, which is the sign of a fire starving for air or oxygen.

Question 3. Part 1: How did a fire that at maximum, reached 1800 degrees for a very short period of time, sever 47 steel re-enforced columns, at exactly the same time, causing the symmetrical collapse of the towers?

Part 2: What caused the steel columns to sever at almost every single floor facilitating the collapse? In other words, if the columns were severed due to jet fuel at the impact site of the planes, then after the pancaking of the floors, there should have been the remains of the 47 columns, which were never exposed to fire.

If you cannot answer all three of these questions using science and logic, then it is your patriotic duty to pass this test on to as many people as possible, especially highly intelligent, logically motivated thinkers. Patriotism should be enough, but Jimmy Walter is offering \$1,000,000 to anyone who can prove that the trade centers came down without explosives. Please see the following link.

<http://www.reopen911.org/Contest.htm>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Maguinnane@cs.com
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 10:06 AM
To: don.stacey@comcast.net; dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett

Anyone afraid of debate is afraid of losing; there could be no other reason. If one is afraid to lose, especially with regard to a debate over 9/11, then that individual is afraid of facing the truth.

But there can be no room for fear here.

If September 11 *is* what has become to be called an 'inside job', our country is in grave peril. When you look at the Patriot Acts I and II, the national I.D. card in the make, the wiretapping of American citizens, the unconscionable goings-on the Middle Eastern countries that have never done anything whatsoever to arouse a sleeping bully (you heard me), then public debate over what occurred on that fateful day in 2001 becomes not just a frivolous display of sparring egos, as debates often are, but utterly necessary.

What are you waiting for?

Marilyn A. Guinnane
Santa Rosa, CA

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Bryan Downey [bryancdowney@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 10:18 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: concerning Kevin Barrett

I'm sure you are a very busy person but please do your research on just one aspect of the september 11 attacks; building 7.

This is a very scary time for the U.S. and the world. People like Kevin Barrett are heroes for voicing their concerns.

<http://www.prisonplanet.com/011904wtc7.html>

Do You Yahoo!?

Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jack Gordon [jackgor@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 10:45 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: CRITICAL THINKING RE KEVIN BARRETT

Dear Prof. Farrell,

Before hearing any further input on Kevin Barrett, you owe it to your children and grandchildren (if any) to read the papers below and to see LOOSE CHANGE 2 by downloading it...<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5137581991288263801>

THE 2 MUST READ PAPERS ON 9/11

[1] **The Destruction of the World Trade Center:**

Why the Official Account Cannot Be True

By David Ray Griffin

Authorized Version (with references & notes)

<http://www.911review.com/articles/griffin/nyc1.html>

The implications are indeed disturbing. Many people who know or at least suspect the truth about 9/11 probably believe that revealing it would be so disturbing to the American psyche, the American form of government, and global stability that it is better to pretend to believe the official version. I would suggest, however, that any merit this argument may have had earlier has been overcome by more recent events and realizations. Far more devastating to the American psyche, the American form of government, and the world as a whole will be the continued rule of those who brought us 9/11, because the values reflected in that horrendous event have been reflected in the Bush administration's lies to justify the attack on Iraq, its disregard for environmental science and the Bill of Rights, its criminal negligence both before and after Katrina, and now its apparent plan not only to weaponize space but also to authorize the use of nuclear weapons in a preemptive strike.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: An earlier version of this essay was the basis for lectures delivered in West Hartford, Connecticut, Manchester and Burlington, Vermont, and New York City in October, 2005. Griffin is the author of numerous books, two on the subject of the 9/11/01 attacks:

Prof. Griffin is also the author of 2 of the most important books on 9/11:

- The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions about the Bush Administration and 9/11
- The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions]

[2] Why Indeed Did the WTC Buildings Collapse?

By Steven E. Jones

<http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>

Department of Physics and Astronomy

Brigham Young University

Provo, UT 84604

ABSTRACT

In writing this paper, I call for a serious investigation of the hypothesis that WTC 7 and the Twin Towers were brought down, not just by impact damage and fires, but through the use of pre-positioned cutter-charges. I consider the official FEMA, NIST, and 9-11 Commission reports that fires plus impact damage alone caused complete collapses of all three buildings. And I present evidence for the controlled-demolition hypothesis, which is suggested by the available data, testable and falsifiable, and yet has not been analyzed in any of the reports funded by the US government.

LOOSE CHANGE 2

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5137581991288263801>

With a sincere request for knowledge-based reason,

Jack Gordon

"When all who are honestly mistaken hear the truth, they will either quit being mistaken or cease being honest."

"The most potent weapon in the hands of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed."....Steve Biko

"A nation of sheep will beget a government of wolves"....Edward R. Murrow

"Silence is betrayal"....Martin Luther King

"In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act"...George Orwell

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jim Sadowski [sadow@milwpc.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 11:23 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Mr. Farrell,

My son graduated from UW-Madison in December 2002. As a parent who wrote tuition checks for four and a half years and someone who owns football season tickets, I am completely opposed to retaining Kevin Barrett as a lecturer-----on absolutely any topic.

I do believe in presenting diverse theories and beliefs to college students. It is the interchange of ideas and beliefs that is a vital part of one's education. However, to bring in a lecturer who is truly part of the lunatic fringe (even for UW-Madison) will not allow for the **objective** presentation of differing viewpoints.

In Friday's *Wisconsin State Journal*, Barrett stated that he will present all defensible sides of important issues. Yea, sure he will. Further in the article, a direct quote attributed to Barrett states: "I would present the dominant American interpretation of the so-called war on terror, as well as alternative interpretations...".

This guy's bias and prejudice is already showing when he refers to the war on terror as the "so-called" war on terror. Yea, this guy will really present an objective analysis.

Since I know you wouldn't hire a lecturer who theorized that Islam is a religion built on hatred and cultural racism, why is hiring Bennett any different.

Let's at least try to present some objectivity in the people's republic of Madison.

Please give this matter your serious consideration.

Jim Sadowski
15135 Arrowhead Place
Brookfield, WI 53005-2910

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: DeAnne [ddingwall@adelphia.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 11:30 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Provost Farrell,

I sincerely hope you do not succumb to political pressure and penalize Kevin Barrett in any way. You and UW are admired for having open-minded faculty willing to freely discuss the difficult issues of the day.

Sincerely,
DeAnne Dingwall
Colorado Springs, Colorado
University of Texas, Class of '59

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: DeAnne [ddingwall@adelphia.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 11:40 AM
To: dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Prof. Downs,

If you feel so strongly about Kevin Barrett's opinion of the events of 9/11 and his right to express it, I hope you will accept the opportunity to express yourself. A debate with Prof. Fetzer will be a grand example of our First Amendment rights. I encourage you to accept.

Sincerely,
DeAnne Dingwall
Colorado Springs, Colorado
University of Texas, Class of '59

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: TommyFocus2000@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 12:03 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett - I support him 100%

I am in Tampa, FL. I am retired, having served in Florida state government for twenty years. I also taught Criminal Law and Constitutional Law at the community college level. I am a Vietnam veteran who served honorably. I am a father and a grandfather, and a proud gay man. During my lifetime, I have learned that many liars in government and elsewhere, tend to fight the truth by projection - claiming their opponents are lying! They also tend to use their positions in society to demonize and discredit those with whom they disagree - or those whose political, moral and social beliefs or principles differ from their own.

You must know Dean, that this is what is happening in this case. The loudmouths and bigots and war mongers are out in full force, in your beautiful state, attempting to turn Professor Barrett into the devil's own lover. I have lived in areas of the country where bigotry and ignorance are as bright and common as the bright sunset in Key West. I have lived in enlightened areas, such as Boston, as well as in Europe, where false self-righteousness is laughed out of the room. I was taught by Roman Catholic nuns throughout grade school and high school. While of course their teaching perspective was based in their Catholic faith, not once, in eighteen years do I remember one of them demonizing the sincerely held beliefs of others - other churches, other philosophies, other countries, other peoples. We were taught to respect indigenous Americans, to read about socialism and communism, to learn about the systems of government in Belgium and India, and in African nations and in places such as Brazil and Ecuador and Costa Rica. I am eternally grateful to those good nuns (some have told me I was lucky to have such a benign group) for teaching me with grace and love that the world is a rich and complex and wondrous place to live. Of course, the Catholic Church in general has often been a malignant force on earth, causing immeasurable death, suffering and destruction through ancient church, up to the crusades, and even today in some places, teaching young gay men they are not sons of God. Evil will not die.

I ask that you disregard all those self-righteous complainers who want Dr. Barrett tarred and feathered. They are unworthy of your time. Please consider that thousands upon thousands of Americans are now aware of Dr. Barrett's situation, and that his dignity and his worth to your students and your institution must be protected from the "McCarthyites" now screaming in your ear. PEACE thomas m braun Tampa FL

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Wendy Thomson (Gwendolyn) [gept@mac.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 12:20 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett & Donald Downs

Dear Provost Farrell,

I am a graduate of Wellesley College, with a B.A. in Political Science. I am a "Wellesley Davis Scholar," that is among the roughly 125 students of that college who are not "traditionally-aged"; i.e., finishing our undergraduate degrees after having had some college earlier in life and raising children and/or worked for years in the interim.

I began at Harvard University back in 1974, but took an extended leave of absence, and after 26 years decided to finish up at Wellesley. I give you this background to let you know that I am not some wild-eyed, paranoid "conspiracy theorist" --a pejorative term in this culture.

I firmly believe the the events of 9/11 were planned and executed by persons within and outside of our government, collaborating for a variety of motives, some of which may have been idealistic -- intending to serve long-term national interests-- and some of which were self-serving. I concur with Professor David Ray Griffin that all the motives were underlaid by a perverted set of morals. If you look at recent Zogby polls you will see that a very high percentage of Americans do not believe that the 9/11 Commission did the job they were give to do, and that the truth of what really happened that day and why, has not yet been divulged to the public.

I believe that publicly known facts, plus the fact that crucial evidence was removed from the crime scene and destroyed (steel girders in NYC) plus the plethora of unanswered, highly relevant questions, *demand* a formal, *truly objective*, non-partisan, independent investigation into these matters.

I am saddened although not at all surprised to read about the events unfolding at University of Wisconsin concerning Professor Kevin Barrett's expression of his political views.

Since 9/11 there have been so many incidents of such attempts (many successful) to silence and punish Americans whose views question the "authority" of our government and the opinion makers and shapers of this nation in the media, the academy and think tanks. Fear of exercising one's civil rights, ostracism, and economic and political retribution are becoming disturbingly frequent features of our cultural landscape. This is not the America to which I was raised to pledge allegiance.

Surely a great institution of learning in a purportedly deeply democratic nation will not condone nor countenance the punitive type of shenanigans suggested by Professor Donald Downs. Will you allow U. of Wisconsin to become a compliant pawn in the resurgence of the Second McCarthy Era? I believe you will not. I and many others will applaud your courage and integrity as you stand up for the letter and spirit of our Bill of Rights and vigorously defend the rights of Professor Barrett to express and teach critical analysis in action, democratic debate in the public square, and democratic dissent in the service of defense of our most deeply held ideals.

Thank you advance for your courage and integrity.

Respectfully,

Gwendolyn E. Thomson

7 North Main St.
Williamsburg, MA 01096
(413)-268-9429

em: gthomson@alum.wellesley.edu

"Homeland Security" means creating a feeling of safety and home for every person everywhere.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Gustavo Espada [espada@fas.harvard.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 1:17 PM
To: dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; [REDACTED]
Subject: letter of support for Dr. Kevin Barrett

Dear Prof. Downs,

You are no doubt receiving many of these letters, as are others in a position of authority at the University of Wisconsin. I hope that even if you don't read them all, or read this one, that you get the message that a genie once out of a bottle is not easy to put back in, nor to reckon with.

Since many people believe, as you seem to, that it is irrational and even unpatriotic to question this administration let me first introduce myself. My name is Gustavo Espada, I am a graduate of Harvard College and the son of a retired U.S. Foreign Service Officer. I was raised both around Washington D.C. and in several countries in Latin America. One of those countries was Colombia, where when I was 9 years old, a car bomb was detonated outside the American Embassy where my father worked. I have thus firsthand experience with international terrorism as well as having received my bachelor's degree in Sociology from a relatively well-regarded institution. I have worked at that same institution for the last 7 years in an administrative support capacity involving financial and computer matters.

My reaction to the events of September 11 was much the same as everyone else's--I was in shock and extremely concerned for my fellow citizens' and my own well-being. I did not, however cease to think critically about the events of that day, as so many seem to have done, understandably as a result of the incessant propaganda to which we were all subjected from the administration and the cowed, compliant media. I struggled to reconcile the official accounts of bin Laden and 19 hijackers with reports in the mainstream media that stock trades leading up to the event indicated someone knew what was about to happen, and disappointed when the 9-11 commission dismissed those trades with nary an explanation, simply their assurance that they were found to be "innocuous". I was further troubled by a report by the BBC that at least four of the alleged hijackers were found to be living and working in Saudi Arabia, Morocco, and elsewhere--no mention by the commission on that report. I was further perplexed by the lack of evidence of a Boeing having crashed at the Pentagon--another imponderable, publicized by French author Thierry Meyssan. Finally, the eager and reckless response by the Bush administration not just to ram through the so-called patriot act but also to launch a series of ill-advised wars of conquest in the middle east cemented my resolve to find out for myself what was going on.

It has not been easy to do this difficult work with even my family and friends doubting me (though the majority of them have come around.) But I and others persevered, driven not only by our own moral compasses but by the growing body of research that instead of closing the case presented many more disturbing angles of inquiry. We have confirmed beyond doubt that world trade center building 7 was intentionally demolished using explosives. This happened at 5:20 on September 11, 2001. How is possible to set that up in a matter of hours, when such demolitions are normally planned over weeks if not months? Why does the government currently deny that this was done, claiming falsely that its own reports show it was a result of fires and structural damage? The reports cited in fact claim that their only hypothesis (fire and structural damage) "has only a low probability of occurrence". This

despite the owner, Larry Silverstein's admission on the PBS documentary America Rebuilds, that the fire department decided, on his suggestion, that the building should be "pulled". Why the confusion, and secrecy surrounding any attempts to determine with certitude how building 7 managed to collapse the way it did, visible in a number of videos to be a classic controlled demolition, with the center of the building initiating the collapse, pulling the outside inward so as to ensure a neat and orderly collapse?

Official claims that jet fuel fires weakened the twin towers' steel structures moreover have proven to be impossible. Not only did officials find it impossible to replicate that collapse in scale models of the towers, but computer simulations were also unable to replicate what was observed, based on that premise. Because the steel in the towers was certified to a standard that called for the steel to retain its structural integrity for 6 hours at 2000°F heat, and because the observed collapse points to a total failure of the virtually untouched 47 steel box columns comprising the core of the building, we must conclude that the government investigators were not forthcoming with the real cause of collapse. In fact, eyewitnesses claimed, on camera the day of 9/11, that multiple explosions in the basement and on floors far below the impact zone rocked the towers before they collapsed. Molten iron can be seen dripping out of the south tower in one video, and firefighters are on camera discovering pockets of red hot and molten steel up to six weeks after 9/11, despite the fact that the rubble piles had been doused with water in the interim. Since jet fuel burns in ideal temperatures at around 1800°F, and steel melts at around 3000°F, it is not absurd to conclude that the explosions reported by eyewitnesses were in fact explosive demolition charges, which would easily account for the presence of molten metal. The fact that Larry Silverstein, who owned building 7, purchased the lease on the twin towers about 6 weeks before 9/11 and ended up profiting handsomely should also give a patriotic American pause. Would this be the first instance of insurance fraud ever perpetrated in America? Hardly. Would it be the first time that such a massive case was planned in conjunction with a corrupt administration's plans for inducing America to support an attack on the geo-politically and economically valuable region of the world where Afghanistan and Iraq are found? Perhaps.

To call us conspiracy theorists, nutjobs, or whackos because we demand a higher standard than you do for evidence of terrorist acts against our people, because we demand a higher standard of proof for sending thousands of our children to kill and die in an illegal war, because we take seriously the pledge we recited as school children, and the oaths we've taken to defend the constitution and the nation from all enemies foreign and domestic-- is that patriotic, Professor Downs? Is that moral? Is that wise? Because you have questioned Dr. Kevin Barrett's judgement for raising these and myriad other issues of grave importance, you have brought the same attention onto yourself. We would urge you to stand up for what you claim to believe in. I understand you have been challenged to a debate, where you will argue in support of the premise that 19 hijackers with box-cutters managed not only to hijack four aircraft, but also to overwhelm America's air defenses, strike its military headquarters, and cause 3 steel frame skyscrapers to completely collapse because of fire for the first and only time in history. It sounds impossible, but with your sound judgement and professed support for your country, I'm sure you'll find a way to dispel all of our absurd conspiracy theories. I wish you the best of luck in preserving your reputation for sound judgement and patriotism in the process--you will need it.

Best regards,

Gustavo Espada
A.B. Sociology, 1996 (Harvard)
Foreign Service "brat", 1984-1992
Patriotic American with sound judgement, 1975-present

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Robert Brown [rbrown16@rochester.rr.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 1:35 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: David Barrett's position at UW

To: Patrick Farrell, Provost
University of Wisconsin

Dear Mr. Farrell:

Please support the right of Dr. David Barrett to speak his views openly in the university setting without the threat of losing his job now or in the future. Hold him to the same standards as any other instructor expressing other ideas. His opinions about 9/11 are irrelevant with respect to whether or not he should be allowed to express them, especially if he offers supporting arguments. Anyone who feels that his or anyone else's ideas are insupportable has the right to attempt to prove that. I have always understood that this kind of open dialectic of ideas is what university education is all about.

You may not be aware that the highly respected Dr. David Ray Griffin, professor emeritus of the philosophy of religion and theology at the Claremont School of Theology, spoke at The University of Wisconsin on April 28 of last year in an effort to address certain disturbing questions about 9/11 (as did Dr. Stephen Jones, professor of physics (BYU), at Utah State College on February 21 of this year). And there are many other respected professional people who have dared to pose such questions. Again, if these ideas are absurd, then rational examination and debate should show them to be.

I trust that you will be fair to Dr. Barrett and permit him to remain in his position at the University. Surely, he deserves no less.

Sincerely yours,
Robert Brown
Rochester, NY

Note: The text of Dr. Griffin's lecture at U of W can be read at <http://www.911review.com/articles/griffin/madison.html> . --
R.B.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: DONALD A DOWNS [dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 2:27 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Barrett

Patrick,

I suppose that we should talk about the issues surrounding Kevin Barrett. I am assuming that this is going to become a real hornet's nest, as their national movement is targeting Wisconsin, and me for the comment I made in the paper. FYI, I have written a letter to the editor of the State Journal clarifying my position on academic freedom in the case, which is pretty much what I have steadily maintained over the years. Others are demanding an apology, which I am not prepared to give.

Should we meet soon to discuss this issue? I will be gone from Thursday through Sunday, but will be back after that.

Don Downs

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Meria Heller [Meria@npgcable.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 3:01 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett & 9/11/01

Gentlemen:

I have personally interviewed and met Mr. Barrett on his views about 9/11/01. I have also interviewed many experts and authors on 9/11/01. This is still America the last time I looked, and cannot believe someone's employment would hang on their opinions/views of an attack that affected everyone in this country (and now Iraq and Afghanistan).

We are supposed to be the "land of the free". Being tried on opinions smacks of a fascist state, not a true democratic republic.

Living in a culture of fear since September 11th, we have lost all things we prided ourselves upon as Americans. Free speech and freedom of the Press to name a few. With an administration that wants to censor the press, control the internet, push forward the draconian Patriot Act laws, we are in trouble. When Universities which are supposed to form our best thinkers and future leaders start to repress freedom of thought and expression, our country may as well hang our flag upside-down.

Mr. Barrett is a very even tempered, fair minded individual. Anyone who looks into the blatant abnormalities of Sept 11, would indeed question the truth of the "official story" we were given. Our President was MIA for 102 minutes on September 11th. So was our entire military. We all not only have the right to question the official story, but we still have the right to freely discuss it. Dissent is part of being American.

I implore you to reverse your decision on Mr. Barrett on behalf of real "truth, justice and the American way".

Thank you,
Meria Heller
Producer/Host
"THE MERIA HELLER SHOW"

www.Meria.net Now in it's 7th year!

"Meria is the best weapon of mass instruction we have ; the inventor of internet radio reality"-
Greg Palast , Investigative Journalist

NOTICE: Due to Presidential Executive Orders, the National Security Agency may have read this email without warning, warrant, or notice. They may do this without any judicial or legislative oversight. You have no recourse nor protection save to call for the impeachment of the current President.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: BIKnight18@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 3:33 PM
To: dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: re: Dr. Kevin Barrett

Prof. Downs,

Regarding the Barrett controversy, I would invite you to do some research on why 42% of Americans, without any TV and print coverage, firmly believe that the U.S. government is lying and covering up what went on during 9/11. I have a biomedical engineering degree from Harvard, and I'm an air force brat. My father is a retired Air Force colonel and has a degree in aeronautical engineering. We knew on 9/11/01 that the government's explanation did not satisfy the evidence right before our own eyes, and have been working diligently ever since then. I hope you are aware of the fact that "The Long War" is an engineered conflict, and not a real "Global War On Terrorism". This engineered conflict is based on the events of 9/11. Frankly, the government's version of the story is a *ludicrous* conspiracy theory that doesn't stand up to any scientific scrutiny. World Trade Center 7's collapse alone should tell any objective observer that. I would point you and any other American to consider these following points:

I have been continually reminding people that the NIST report, the FEMA report, and the 9/11 commission report are the *alibi* of the government, not an independent review of the events on 9/11. The 9/11 commission report, with the executive director Zelikow (who is an author of the Bush doctrine of 2002), is the government's *alibi*, and the NIST and FEMA report are the government witnesses called in support of their alibi. Now if this was in court, the jury has the opportunity to scrutinize that alibi and the government's witnesses. Scholars for 9/11 Truth and the Journal of 9/11 Studies that the group just founded are the expert witnesses disputing the government's alibi, the government's account of how to explain the events on 9/11. And as evident in the last Zogby poll, an overwhelming majority of those who have been exposed to the research scrutinizing the government's story, (by those who know of WTC 7 and its collapse) side *against* the government's account and find the government's account not credible.

Another thing that I've been bringing up with people still on the fence is that it stands to reason that *some government* was involved in the 9/11 attacks. It was a big operation, and it was an operation that *did* show up on the intelligence radar screen of not only the U.S. (as evident by the August 6 PDB), but also the radar screen of multiple other government's intelligence organizations, who warned us. Part of the reason why so many of our fellow citizens believed that Iraq was connected to 9/11 even after the White House admitted there was no connection is because common sense told them that there had to be *some* state sponsorship or support, a state that has the reach to be *operating inside of the U.S.*, because most of the training for the supposed plotters took place inside the U.S. If it wasn't Iraq, it must have been another state. And the fact that the U.S. government has not offered any other explanation of state involvement, and has even protected or covered up other country's possible involvement (primarily Pakistani ISI and Israel's Mossad) should be *highly* suspicious to an objective observer.

Thanks,
Michael McKnight
Harvard '00 (biomedical engineering)
Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy (Duke)

I would also direct you to this article out Friday, the latest in a long line of former high ranking officials (including Bush's former chief economist in the Dept. of Labor, Dr. Morgan Reynolds, Col. Bob Bowman, former Reagan assistant Sec. of the Treasury Paul Craig Roberts, ex-CIA analyst and White House briefer for Reagan and George H.W. Bush Ray McGovern, Colin Powell's chief of staff Col. Larry Wilkerson, etc.) coming out against the government's conspiracy theory. Do not demean them for the forum that they have to go public in (here, it's Alex Jones, a radio personality). They are being stonewalled from mainstream media appearances. I have had personal correspondence with all of the individuals listed above.

[Former Reagan Cabinet Member and Colonel Says 9/11 "Dog That Doesn't Hunt"](#)
[Col. Ronald D. Ray asks why half a trillion defense budget couldn't protect Pentagon, astounded at "conspiracy theory" put out by government](#)
[Paul Joseph Watson & Alex Jones/Prison Planet.com | July 1 2006](#)

The former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense under the Reagan Administration and a highly decorated Vietnam

veteran and Colonel has gone on the record to voice his doubts about the official story of 9/11 - calling it "the dog that doesn't hunt."

Col. Ronald D. Ray joined Alex Jones for an hour long interview in which he gave his views on a wide array of subjects, including the war on terror, porous borders and the Bush administration.

Ray questioned the feasibility of having a budget of half a trillion dollars a year yet not even being able to defend the Pentagon.

"Half a trillion dollars a year and a bunch of guys over in a cave in Afghanistan were able to penetrate that half a trillion dollar network that's supposed to provide Americans with national security."

The Colonel detailed historical examples of the use of false flag operations carried out by the US government, in particular Israel's attempted sinking of the USS Liberty, which LBJ allowed to happen in an effort to blame Egypt and kickstart a war.

Ray espoused his complete distrust of the legitimacy of the official story behind 9/11.

"I'm astounded that the conspiracy theory advanced by the administration could in fact be true and the evidence does not seem to suggest that's accurate," he said.

Ray highlighted the existence of Project Bojinka and the fact that Bush administration officials claimed ignorance of a plot to attack the World Trade Center with planes despite limitless precursors to suggest otherwise.

Ray dismissed the validity of the assertion that the Bush administration is fighting a genuine war on terror.

"If the war on terror is real then the first thing that would have happened within a matter of weeks after 9/11 would have been we'd have closed the borders off."

"You have no national security if your borders are not secure."

Ray expressed his disgust at how the current batch of crooks had twisted the conservative movement and wrapped themselves in it like a wolf in sheep's clothing.

"This neo-conservative takeover of the government in the last six years is the destruction of the things that Barry Goldwater would have been running for in '64 and even the things that Ronald Reagan said he supported," said Ray.

"The conservative movement in this country has almost been neutered as a result of this administration."

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: lonabill@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 5:41 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Hi from Pennsylvania

In regard to Kevin Barrett, flight 93 was shot down by the "small white plane" that many here saw, Flight 77 did NOT hit the Pentagon as you can clearly see by looking at the photos, etcetera. I wonder if Kevin will tell the whole story whether you approve or not.

sincerely, Bill

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: ken zimmerman [kenzimmerman@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 6:23 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Patrick Farrell

Has the University looked into the content of Prof. Farrell's claims?

Can the University be certain of what happend on 911?

Is this claim that outlandish or is there a body of evidence to suggest otherwise?

Is this not a first amendment matter?

As a UW alumnus I have heard a variety of statements and claims by professors that are equally as controversial. Where were the investigations at that time?

This is not subversive or treasonous. It is the obligation of citizens and academia to challenge the official versions of events. Or do we not live in a free society?

Has our government ever been untruthful? Tonkin Bay comes to mind.

Be careful that the UW is not limiting views or dissent, however outlandish they may seem to be.

The University should be encouraging alternate viewpoints not sanctioning students, faculty or staff for beliefs outside the norm.

Hoping to still be proud of my alma mater,

Ken Zimmerman

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jeff Tanzer [dexterousdigits@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 6:26 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Hypocrisy

Dear Sir,

Your chastisement of Mr. Barrett concerning his beliefs, is quite troubling. What has happened in this country as a whole is something out of an Orwellian nightmare. Is it because his view exposes the belief system of which we have been victims of? History repeats itself. Absolute power corrupts absolutely. I think the academic world would be beneficial to our society if it would look at the hard evidence and expose the fraud that has been perpetrated upon this country and the world. As two Canadian gentlemen and their wives related to me, "We do not understand how the American people have been tricked, and are not getting the news that the rest of the world is getting" quote, unquote. I hope you will do a little research on what Mr. Barrett is saying, before you judge his right to express an opinion of which I know he has done considerable research on as well as giving his heart and soul to the matter.

Respectfully yours,
Jeff Tanzer, Salem Mass.

How low will we go? Check out Yahoo! Messenger's low PC-to-Phone call rates.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 6:40 PM
To: Amber Haque
Cc: Patrick Farrell; DONALD A DOWNS
Subject: Donald Downs Reconsiders, Supports Academic Freedom (for <http://mujca.com>)

Donald Downs Reconsiders, Supports Academic Freedom

Professor Donald Downs has apparently reconsidered earlier remarks proposing 9/11 truth as the possible equivalent of Holocaust denial, and saying that Kevin Barrett's views on 9/11 are "absurd" and evidence of poor judgment that should be taken into consideration when Barrett applies for renewal of his semester-to-semester position.

Professor Downs, after thinking the matter over, has produced an exemplary statement in support of academic freedom, and should be commended for it. He has stated in a private email that he is considering looking more carefully at the issues raised by 9/11 truth activists--though the motivation, at this point, would be to debate us. That's fine. Professor Downs is a reasonable man, as his letter below shows, who is capable of thinking things through and modifying his previous opinions, however strongly held. In this respect, we need more people like him. As the John Albanese film puts it, Everybody's Gotta Learn Sometime!

(<http://www.911blogger.com/2006/05/video-everybodys-gotta-learn-sometime.html>)

To the Wisconsin State Journal,

I would like to clarify my comments in the State Journal (June 30) concerning the case of Kevin Barrett at the UW. Whatever one thinks of Barretts' ideas concerning what happened on September 11 (and I strongly disagree with them), two things must be understood. First, Barrett's views are protected under the canons of academic freedom if they are relevant to the subject matter of the class and are presented in a way that does not discriminate against students or prevent them from disagreeing. This means that he cannot be fired from his position for simply expressing them. Second, in considering any renewal of his contract, it would be wrong to base the decision on such things as public pressure and disagreement with the content of his views. The most relevant criteria for a lecturer include how well he knows his subject matter and the quality of student reviews. Whether Mr. Barrett satisfies these conditions is a matter of departmental judgment and assessment. Universities worth their salt must guard against dismissing people because of their ideas and conclusions alone.

Donald Downs
UW Madison

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: DONALD A DOWNS [dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 7:40 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett

Kevin, I have contacted the relevant person at Wisc Public Radio. I should mention that I have not changed my mind about your basic position, which I find quite implausible. But I do defend your right to say it, and will discuss the issue on the radio with you if they accept the invitation.

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

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Sunday, July 2, 2006 7:28 pm
Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>

> Don,
>
> I would be happy to do this. Since you know the WPR people better
> than
> I do, maybe you should contact them.
> >
> > The one problem with this approach is that it might not be a
> good idea
> > for me to be engaged in the substantive debate if I am going to
> > involved on the academic freedom side of the issue.
>
> I don't see the problem, unless you're coming around to my view of
> 9/11
> ;) which would detract from the power of your argument for
> academic
> freedom.
>
> Supporting academic freedom for those we strongly disagree with is
> the
> best possible demonstration of what it really means. I think we
> could
> have a polite, rational substantive debate on key 9/11 issues--a
> debate
> in which we strongly disagree with each other--that would
> underline the
> courage and integrity of your position as outlined in your new WSJ
> letter. Hearing such a defense of academic freedom from you would
> be
> educational in the best sense for WPR listeners. It would also
> frame
> your take on 9/11 as that of a reasonable man of integrity. We
> need
> solid critiques from reasonable people like you; if we got more of
> them, rather than insults and intimidation, the whole debate would
> be
> elevated, and the quest for truth would be served.
>
> Kevin
>
>
> >
> > Don
> >
> >

> > ----- Original Message -----

> > From: [REDACTED]
> > Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 11:43 pm
> > Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
> > To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>
> > Cc: Jim Fetzer <jfetzer@d.umn.edu>

> >> Don,

> >> Sorry, I forgot about the California trip.

> >> I do hope you'll consider getting involved with the aim of
> >> promoting reasoned discussion, sifting and winnowing, and so on.
> >> Whatever the
> >> truth of the most important event of the 21st century, the fact
> >> that
> >> upwards of 60% of the world's Muslims (89% in one al-Jazeera poll)
> >> say
> >> "inside job," 63% of Canadians and 49% of New Yorkers say "high
> >> treason," and 42% of Americans say "the official story is a
> >> coverup"
> >> suggests that our society has a problem on its hands--a problem
> >> that
> >> needs to be resolved through reasoned discussion, whatever the
> >> outcome
> >> of that discussion.

> >> Kevin

> >> On Jul 1, 2006, at 11:24 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:

> >>> Kevin, even if I were willing, you might recall that I said I was
> >>> going to California this coming Thursday (for a funeral
> >>> ceremony), and
> >>> won't be back until Monday. So I am not available for this
> >>> show any
> >>> way. Let me think some more about my role down the line. I
> >>> have to
> >>> think hard if this is the kind of thing I want to get involved
> >>> with in
> >>> this capacity. I have reasons on both sides of the ledger.

> >>> Don

> >>> ----- Original Message -----

> >>> From: [REDACTED]
> >>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 11:05 pm
> >>> Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
> >>> To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>

> >>>> Don,

> >>>> Thanks doing the right thing.

> >>>> Frankly I would love to debate 9/11 with you or with anyone who
> >>>> will come forward to defend the official account, and so, I am
> >>>> sure, would
> >>>> Jim Fetzer. We had hoped that you might be able to respond to
> >>>> Jim's
> >>>> proposed 45-minute succinct "how we know what we know"
> >>>> presentation at
> >>>> a still-to-be-arranged televised event next Sunday afternoon. You
> >>>> could
> >>>> just give a fifteen minute response, and then a panel could ask
> >>>> Jim

> >>>> questions. As a respected academic figure who is basically
> >>>> reasonable,
> >>>> pro-free-speech, and on the other side on the 9/11 issue, you
> >>>> would be
> >>>> a good person to fill this role. Having a solid person in the
> >>>> rebuttal
> >>>> role would help make this a genuinely educational event--which
> >>>> would be
> >>>> nice after all the hoopla.
> >>>>
> >>>> Kevin
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> On Jul 1, 2006, at 10:17 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>> Kevin,
> >>>>>
> >>>>> it was the right thing to do. I would have done it yesterday in
> >>>>> response to your first email, but things got emotional between
> >>>> us, and
> >>>>> I did not want to write anything until I had thought things
> >>>> through,
> >>>>> or let my thoughts settle. I assume that they will publish it
> >>>> when
> >>>>> they do the next set of letters about you. If not, I will
> >>>> contact them.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> At this point, I think that it is best that I not engage in any
> >>>> debate> about the broader issue of 9/11 with Mr. Fetzer or
> >>>> you. My
> >>>> role in
> >>>>> this affair should be with the academic freedom aspect of the
> >>>> matter,> at least for now. I assume that you agree.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Don
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> ----- Original Message -----
> >>>>> From: [REDACTED]
> >>>>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 9:38 pm
> >>>>> Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
> >>>>> To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> Don,
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Thank you. I basically agree with this letter word for word.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> I apologize for bristling. I know your heart is in the right
> >>>>>> place>>>> on
> >>>>>> free speech, but the "holocaust denier" thing really annoys me.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> Kevin
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> PS I am willing to wager that if you keep an open mind while
> >>>>>> carefully reading The War on Truth by Nafeez Ahmed and David
> >>>>>> Griffin's
> >>>>>> first>>>> two
> >>>>>> 9/11 books, especially the second one, all the while consulting
> >>>>>> Paul Thompson's Complete 9/11 Timeline when necessary, you may
> >>>>>> still>>>>>> think
> >>>>>> that many of my opinions on 9/11 are wrong, but you will no
> >>>>>> longer>>>> think them absurd. For what it's worth, Cheney
> >>>>>> biographer John
> >>>>>> Nichols
> >>>>>> recently told me in private some things he might not want
> >>>>>> me to

> >>>>> quote
> >>>>> him on, but I think it is fair to disclose to you that Paul
> >>>>> Thompson's Timeline had a powerful effect on his private
> >>>>> thinking about Cheney's
> >>>>> role in 9/11.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> On Jul 1, 2006, at 8:44 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Here is the letter:
> >>>>>
> >>>>> I would like to clarify my comments in the State Journal (June
> >>> 30)
> >>>>> concerning the case of Kevin Barrett at the UW. Whatever one
> >>>>> thinks of
> >>>>> Barretts' ideas concerning what happened on September 11
> >> (and I
> >>>>> strongly disagree with them), two things must be understood.
> >>> First,>>> Barrett's views are protected under the canons of
> >> academic>>> freedom if
> >>>>> they are relevant to the subject matter of the class and are
> >>>>> presented in a way that does not discriminate against
> >> students or
> >>>>> prevent them
> >>>>> from disagreeing. This means that he cannot be fired from his
> >>>>> position> for simply expressing them. Second, in
> considering any
> >>>>> renewal of his
> >>>>> contract, it would be wrong to base the decision on such
> >>> things as
> >>>>> public pressure and disagreement with the content of his
> >>> views. The
> >>>>> most relevant criteria for a lecturer include how well he
> >>> knows his
> >>>>> subject matter and the quality of student reviews. Whether Mr.
> >>>>> Barrett> satisfies these conditions is a matter of departmental
> >>>>> judgment and
> >>>>> assessment. Universities w
> >>>>> orth their salt must guard against dismissing people
> because of
> >>>>> their> ideas and conclusions alone.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Donald Downs
> >>>>> UW Madison
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> ----- Original Message -----
> >>>>> From: [REDACTED]
> >>>>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 8:40 am
> >>>>> Subject: Fwd: Kevin Barrett
> >>>>> To: Patrick Farrell <pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu>
> >>>>> Cc: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>> Sorry to contribute to the inundation, but John Cobb is
> >>>> considered>>>> by
> >>>>>>> many to be America's leading theologian, and I would hope his
> >>>>>>> perspective would help balance that of people like Mr. Downs.
> >>>>>>> Kevin
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Begin forwarded message:
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>> From: "John B. Cobb, Jr." <cobbj@cgu.edu>
> >>>>>>>>> Date: June 30, 2006 2:02:33 PM CDT
> >>>>>>>>> To: adpowell@wisc.edu
> >>>>>>>>> Cc: khidria@merr.com
> >>>>>>>>> Subject: Kevin Barrett
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>>> Languages and Cultures of Asia Dept.

> >>>>>>> Dear colleagues:

> >>>>>>> Kevin Barrett has written me that there is political

> >>>>>>> pressure

> >>>>>>> to exclude him from teaching because of his assignment

> of a

> >>> book

> >>>>>>> that

> >>>>>>> I participated with him in editing. Since I have

> > considerable

> >>>>>>> confidence that the University of Wisconsin does not yield

> >>>>>>> easily to

> >>>>>>> political pressure, I doubt that any comment on my part is

> >>>>>>> needed.

> >>>>>>> However, I would like to support Mr. Barrett.

> >>>>>>> Along with a Jewish professor in Arizona, Sandra

> >>>>>>> Lubarsky,

> >>>>>>> Barrett and I have gathered papers by religiously committed

> >>>>>>> people who

> >>>>>>> take a variety of positions on what really happened on

> 9/11. >>>>>>> Most do

> >>>>>>> not believe the official account or at least think that a

> >>>>>>> serious

> >>>>>>> investigation is needed. This is a widespread view in this

> >>>>>>> country,

> >>>>>>> and even more widespread abroad. Yet our press maintains

> >>> almost

> >>>>>>> complete silence. It is not politically correct to

> >>>> countenance a

> >>>>>>> "conspiracy theory."

> >>>>>>> I am a Christian theologian, and my task was to

> >> solicit >>>>>>> essays

> >>>>>>> from fellow Christians. We hope that this will begin to

> > break

> >>>>>>> through

> >>>>>>> the wall of silence on an issue of great importance to this

> >>>>>>> country

> >>>>>>> and to the world. So much of our foreign and domestic

> >>>> policy is

> >>>>>>> based

> >>>>>>> on the extremely questionable official account that it

> is my

> >>>>>>> belief

> >>>>>>> that the lack of attention to this matter by the Christian

> >>>>>>> community

> >>>>>>> in general is irresponsible. Incidentally, a major

> >>>>>>> breakthrough in

> >>>>>>> this regard has come through the publication by Westminster

> >>> John

> >>>>>>> Knox

> >>>>>>> press of David Griffin's book, Christian Faith and the Truth

> >>>>>>> Behind

> >>>>>>> 9/11.

> >>>>>>> Although officially our book was co-edited by the

> >>> three

> >>>>>>> of

> >>>>>>> us, and we all solicited contributors, Barrett took major

> >>>>>>> responsibility for putting it together and working with the

> >>>>>>> publisher. I have not met him personally, but I can say

> >>>> that in

> >>>>>>> doing

> >>>>>>> this he was thoroughly responsible, leaning over

> backwards to

> >>>>>>> adjust

> >>>>>>> to the concerns of Jewish contributors, for example.

> >>>>>>> In my view, only those who believe that the American

> >>>>>>> government can do no wrong, or in particular that this

> >>>>>>> administration

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: DONALD A DOWNS [dadows@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 7:55 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Re: Donald Downs Reconsiders, Supports Academic Freedom (for <http://mujca.com>)

Kevin, you need to stress on your blog that based on everything I know, I am still strongly opposed to your position, and consider it beyond the pale of common sense. This point is different from the academic freedom issue per se, which I have clarified. But this does not mean that I endorse anything about your position, or consider it plausible in any way. Let's leave it at that.

D.

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

From: [REDACTED]
Date: Sunday, July 2, 2006 6:39 pm
Subject: Donald Downs Reconsiders, Supports Academic Freedom (for <http://mujca.com>)
To: Amber Haque <amberhq@bigpond.net.au>
Cc: Patrick Farrell <pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu>, DONALD A DOWNS <dadows@facstaff.wisc.edu>

> Donald Downs Reconsiders, Supports Academic Freedom
>
> Professor Donald Downs has apparently reconsidered earlier remarks
>
> proposing 9/11 truth as the possible equivalent of Holocaust
> denial,
> and saying that Kevin Barrett's views on 9/11 are "absurd" and
> evidence
> of poor judgment that should be taken into consideration when
> Barrett
> applies for renewal of his semester-to-semester position.
>
> Professor Downs, after thinking the matter over, has produced an
> exemplary statement in support of academic freedom, and should be
> commended for it. He has stated in a private email that he is
> considering looking more carefully at the issues raised by 9/11
> truth
> activists--though the motivation, at this point, would be to
> debate us.
> That's fine. Professor Downs is a reasonable man, as his letter
> below
> shows, who is capable of thinking things through and modifying his
>
> previous opinions, however strongly held. In this respect, we need
> more
> people like him. As the John Albanese film puts it, Everybody's
> Gotta
> Learn Sometime!
> (<http://www.911blogger.com/2006/05/video-everybodys-gotta-learn-sometime.html>)
>
> To the Wisconsin State Journal,
>
> I would like to clarify my comments in the State Journal (June 30)
> concerning the case of Kevin Barrett at the UW. Whatever one thinks of
> Barretts' ideas concerning what happened on September 11 (and I
> strongly disagree with them), two things must be understood. First,
> Barrett's views are protected under the canons of academic freedom if

> they are relevant to the subject matter of the class and are presented
> in a way that does not discriminate against students or prevent them
> from disagreeing. This means that he cannot be fired from his position
> for simply expressing them. Second, in considering any renewal of his
> contract, it would be wrong to base the decision on such things as
> public pressure and disagreement with the content of his views. The
> most relevant criteria for a lecturer include how well he knows his
> subject matter and the quality of student reviews. Whether Mr. Barrett
> satisfies these conditions is a matter of departmental judgment and
> assessment. Universities worth their salt must guard against
> dismissing
> people because of their
> ideas and conclusions alone.
>
> Donald Downs
> UW Madison
>
>
>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: linelites [linelites@bellsouth.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 8:37 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Mr. Farrell,

This man has the respect of many.

We are watching to see how he is treated.

9/11 truth is undergoing the process of scientific review. Scholars, (people we pay to occupy the halls of academia) are applying the data to a model and submitting their conclusions for peer review. This is how we know what we know....not through government commissions...that's the last place to look for truth. The conclusions support Mr. Barrett.

I would hope that even if he were wrong, you would support his efforts. Regardless, he has the weight of academia behind him. I hope you will support this process. I understand that is your job, correct?

Respectfully,
Jeremy Lynes

www.v911t.org and www.st911.org

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: MARCCREATE@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 8:54 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: re 911

911 is real and the truth is out there in books, movies and articles from all over the world. Anyone who doubts that 911 was an inside job is unpatriotic. Marc W. Boston

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Carol Herzenberg [carol@herzenberg.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 9:14 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Caroline L. Herzenberg
Subject: Fair treatment for members of the faculty including Kevin Barrett

Provost Patrick Farrell -

As you are well aware, it is important to maintain fairness and integrity in dealing with all faculty members. Please use the same standards for Kevin Barrett as are in use for other members of the faculty in connection with other issues, and do not allow the university to discriminate against him because he has spoken out on a controversial topic. Thank you.

Caroline Herzenberg
carol@herzenberg.net
1700 E. 56th Street #2707
Chicago, IL 60637-5092
773-955-7072

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Eric Meiers [outofindiana@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 9:09 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: ??????? what's this mean

<http://3c.911truth.org>

"...I was sittin outside the classroom waiting to go in, and I saw an airplane hit the tower....ya know the TV was obviously on and I used to fly myself and I said 'There's one terrible pilot'..."

At a Town Hall session in Orlando Florida on December 4th, 2001, George W.

Bush claimed he saw the first plane hit the North tower when in fact no known footage of the first plane was available until the next day!

Who is lie is this I heard the audio of this comment.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 9:36 PM
To: DONALD A DOWNS
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett

Don,

Wonderful, I look forward to the radio show.

"Quite implausible" I can live with. Three years ago I would have found my current position quite implausible too. And I am open to the possibility that I may be wrong in my educated guesses about what happened. I am convinced, however, that the official story is demonstrably very far from the truth, which makes this the most important issue of our time.

Kevin

On Jul 2, 2006, at 7:39 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:

> Kevin, I have contacted the relevant person at Wisc Public Radio. I
> should mention that I have not changed my mind about your basic
> position, which I find quite implausible. But I do defend your right
> to say it, and will discuss the issue on the radio with you if they
> accept the invitation.

>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: [REDACTED]
> Date: Sunday, July 2, 2006 7:26 pm
> Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
> To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>

>> Don,

>>
>> I would be happy to do this. Since you know the WPR people better
>> than I do, maybe you should contact them.

>>>
>>> The one problem with this approach is that it might not be a
>>> good idea
>>> for me to be engaged in the substantive debate if I am going to
>>> involved on the academic freedom side of the issue.

>>
>> I don't see the problem, unless you're coming around to my view of
>> 9/11 ;) which would detract from the power of your argument for
>> academic
>> freedom.

>>
>> Supporting academic freedom for those we strongly disagree with is
>> the best possible demonstration of what it really means. I think we
>> could
>> have a polite, rational substantive debate on key 9/11 issues--a
>> debate
>> in which we strongly disagree with each other--that would
>> underline the
>> courage and integrity of your position as outlined in your new WSJ
>> letter. Hearing such a defense of academic freedom from you would
>> be
>> educational in the best sense for WPR listeners. It would also
>> frame
>> your take on 9/11 as that of a reasonable man of integrity. We
>> need

>> solid critiques from reasonable people like you; if we got more of
>> them, rather than insults and intimidation, the whole debate would
>> be
>> elevated, and the quest for truth would be served.

>> Kevin

>>
>>
>>
>>> Don

>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>> From: [REDACTED]
>>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 11:43 pm
>>> Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
>>> To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>
>>> Cc: Jim Fetzer <jfetzer@d.umn.edu>

>>>> Don,

>>>> Sorry, I forgot about the California trip.

>>>> I do hope you'll consider getting involved with the aim of
>>>> promoting reasoned discussion, sifting and winnowing, and so on.
>>>> Whatever the
>>>> truth of the most important event of the 21st century, the fact
>>>> that
>>>> upwards of 60% of the world's Muslims (89% in one al-Jazeera poll)
>>>> say
>>>> "inside job," 63% of Canadians and 49% of New Yorkers say "high
>>>> treason," and 42% of Americans say "the official story is a
>>>> coverup"
>>>> suggests that our society has a problem on its hands--a problem
>>>> that
>>>> needs to be resolved through reasoned discussion, whatever the
>>>> outcome
>>>> of that discussion.

>>>> Kevin

>>>> On Jul 1, 2006, at 11:24 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:

>>>>> Kevin, even if I were willing, you might recall that I said I was
>>>>> going to California this coming Thursday (for a funeral
>>>>> ceremony), and
>>>>> won't be back until Monday. So I am not available for this
>> show any
>>>>> way. Let me think some more about my role down the line. I
>> have to
>>>>> think hard if this is the kind of thing I want to get involved
>>>>> with in
>>>>> this capacity. I have reasons on both sides of the ledger.

>>>>> Don

>>>>> ----- Original Message -----

>>>>> From: [REDACTED]
>>>>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 11:05 pm
>>>>> Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
>>>>> To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>

>>>>>> Don,

>>>>>> Thanks doing the right thing.

>>>>>
>>>>> Frankly I would love to debate 9/11 with you or with anyone who
>>>>> will come forward to defend the official account, and so, I am
>>>>> sure, would
>>>>> Jim Fetzer. We had hoped that you might be able to respond to
>>>>> Jim's
>>>>> proposed 45-minute succinct "how we know what we know"
>>>>> presentation at
>>>>> a still-to-be-arranged televised event next Sunday afternoon. You
>>>>> could
>>>>> just give a fifteen minute response, and then a panel could ask
>>>>> Jim
>>>>> questions. As a respected academic figure who is basically
>>>>> reasonable,
>>>>> pro-free-speech, and on the other side on the 9/11 issue, you
>>>>> would be
>>>>> a good person to fill this role. Having a solid person in the
>>>>> rebuttal
>>>>> role would help make this a genuinely educational event--which
>>>>> would be
>>>>> nice after all the hoopla.

>>>>>
>>>>> Kevin
>>>>>

>>>>>
>>>>> On Jul 1, 2006, at 10:17 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:
>>>>>

>>>>>> Kevin,
>>>>>>
>>>>>> it was the right thing to do. I would have done it yesterday in
>>>>>> response to your first email, but things got emotional between
>>>>>> us, and
>>>>>> I did not want to write anything until I had thought things
>>>>>> through,
>>>>>> or let my thoughts settle. I assume that they will publish it
>>>>>> when
>>>>>> they do the next set of letters about you. If not, I will
>>>>>> contact them.

>>>>>>
>>>>>>> At this point, I think that it is best that I not engage in any
>>>>>>> debate> about the broader issue of 9/11 with Mr. Fetzer or
>>>>>>> you. My
>>>>>>> role in
>>>>>>> this affair should be with the academic freedom aspect of the
>>>>>>> matter,> at least for now. I assume that you agree.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Don
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>>>>>> From: [REDACTED]
>>>>>>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 9:38 pm
>>>>>>> Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett
>>>>>>> To: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Don,
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Thank you. I basically agree with this letter word for word.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> I apologize for bristling. I know your heart is in the right
>>>>>>>>> place>>>>> on
>>>>>>>>> free speech, but the "holocaust denier" thing really annoys me.
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Kevin
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>> PS I am willing to wager that if you keep an open mind while

>>>>>> carefully reading The War on Truth by Nafeez Ahmed and David
>>>>>> Griffin's
>>> first>>>> two
>>>>>> 9/11 books, especially the second one, all the while consulting
>>>>>> Paul Thompson's Complete 9/11 Timeline when necessary, you may
>> still>>>>> think
>>>>>> that many of my opinions on 9/11 are wrong, but you will no
>>> longer>>>> think them absurd. For what it's worth, Cheney
>>> biographer John
>>>>>> Nichols
>>>>>> recently told me in private some things he might not want
>> me to
>>>>>> quote
>>>>>> him on, but I think it is fair to disclose to you that Paul
>>>>>> Thompson's Timeline had a powerful effect on his private
>>>>>> thinking about Cheney's
>>>>>> role in 9/11.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> On Jul 1, 2006, at 8:44 PM, DONALD A DOWNS wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Here is the letter:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I would like to clarify my comments in the State Journal (June
>>>>> 30)
>>>>>>> concerning the case of Kevin Barrett at the UW. Whatever one
>>>>>>> thinks of
>>>>>>> Barretts' ideas concerning what happened on September 11
>>>> (and I
>>>>>>> strongly disagree with them), two things must be understood.
>>>>> First,>>> Barrett's views are protected under the canons of
>>>> academic>>>> freedom if
>>>>>>> they are relevant to the subject matter of the class and are
>>>>>>> presented> in a way that does not discriminate against
>>>> students or
>>>>>>> prevent them
>>>>>>> from disagreeing. This means that he cannot be fired from his
>>>>>>> position> for simply expressing them. Second, in
>> considering any
>>>>>>> renewal of his
>>>>>>> contract, it would be wrong to base the decision on such
>>>>> things as
>>>>>>> public pressure and disagreement with the content of his
>>>>>>> views. The
>>>>>>> most relevant criteria for a lecturer include how well he
>>>>>>> knows his
>>>>>>> subject matter and the quality of student reviews. Whether Mr.
>>>>>>> Barrett> satisfies these conditions is a matter of departmental
>>>>>>> judgment and
>>>>>>> assessment. Universities w
>>>>>>> orth their salt must guard against dismissing people
>> because of
>>>>>>> their> ideas and conclusions alone.

>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Donald Downs
>>>>>>> UW Madison
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> ----- Original Message -----
>>>>>>> From: [REDACTED]
>>>>>>> Date: Saturday, July 1, 2006 8:48 am
>>>>>>> Subject: Fwd: Kevin Barrett
>>>>>>> To: Patrick Farrell <pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu>
>>>>>>> Cc: DONALD A DOWNS <dadowns@facstaff.wisc.edu>
>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> Sorry to contribute to the inundation, but John Cobb is
>>>>>>>> considered>>>> by
>>>>>>>> many to be America's leading theologian, and I would hope his

>>>>>>>> perspective would help balance that of people like Mr. Downs.
>>>>>>>> Kevin
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Begin forwarded message:
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> From: "John B. Cobb, Jr." <cobbj@cgu.edu>
>>>>>>>> Date: June 30, 2006 2:02:33 PM CDT
>>>>>>>> To: adpowell@wisc.edu
>>>>>>>> Cc: [REDACTED]
>>>>>>>> Subject: Kevin Barrett
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Languages and Cultures of Asia Dept.
>>>>>>>> Dear colleagues:
>>>>>>>> Kevin Barrett has written me that there is political
>>>>>>>> pressure
>>>>>>>> to exclude him from teaching because of his assignment
>> of a
>>>> book
>>>>>>>> that
>>>>>>>> I participated with him in editing. Since I have
>>> considerable
>>>>>>>> confidence that the University of Wisconsin does not yield
>>>>>>>> easily to
>>>>>>>> political pressure, I doubt that any comment on my part is
>>>>>>>> needed.
>>>>>>>> However, I would like to support Mr. Barrett.
>>>>>>>> Along with a Jewish professor in Arizona, Sandra
>>>>>>>> Lubarsky,
>>>>>>>> Barrett and I have gathered papers by religiously committed
>>>>>>>> people who
>>>>>>>> take a variety of positions on what really happened on
>> 9/11. >>>>>>>> Most do
>>>>>>>> not believe the official account or at least think that a
>>>>>>>> serious
>>>>>>>> investigation is needed. This is a widespread view in this
>>>>>>>> country,
>>>>>>>> and even more widespread abroad. Yet our press maintains
>>>> almost
>>>>>>>> complete silence. It is not politically correct to
>>>>> countenance a
>>>>>>>> "conspiracy theory."
>>>>>>>> I am a Christian theologian, and my task was to
>>>> solicit >>>>>>>> essays
>>>>>>>> from fellow Christians. We hope that this will begin to
>>> break
>>>>>>>> through
>>>>>>>> the wall of silence on an issue of great importance to this
>>>>>>>> country
>>>>>>>> and to the world. So much of our foreign and domestic
>>>>> policy is
>>>>>>>> based
>>>>>>>> on the extremely questionable official account that it
>> is my
>>>>>>>> belief
>>>>>>>> that the lack of attention to this matter by the Christian
>>>>>>>> community
>>>>>>>> in general is irresponsible. Incidentally, a major
>>>>>>>> breakthrough in
>>>>>>>> this regard has come through the publication by Westminster
>>>> John
>>>>>>>> Knox
>>>>>>>> press of David Griffin's book, Christian Faith and the Truth
>>>>>>>> Behind
>>>>>>>> 9/11.
>>>>>>>> Although officially our book was co-edited by the
>>>>> three
>>>>>>>> of

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: robert beverlin [mrrobb08@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2006 11:37 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: What's good for the GOOSE,!!!!



Centre for
Research the fine!

To MR Patrick Farrell

This is to voice my view on the resent issue of Donald Downs remarks concerning Kevin Barrett's appearance on Milwaukee radio.

First of all I have personally spent over 1400hrs looking at all the info, miss information on the subject of 911 and what Kevin is asking for is not only not absurd it is vital to getting this country back to something resembling what i have allways believed Amercia was all about

My research has revieled Many things that this country has been up to around the world historicly that we should be ashamed of but the killing of 3000+ of our own people is without a doubt crossing the line. I suguest you look into the 911 issue yourself .

start your research with this articule that is addmittly only therory but gives a good perspective on how easily it could be to fool allmost all americians about the "new BIG BAD GUY " we all need to fear in order to keep that defence department \$\$\$\$ coming

this may sound a little out there and there are many other possable motives of those responsible for 911 but at the very least it needs some major looking into.

Mr Downs should take Mr Barretts Offer to debate the subject or shut the hell up!!!

here is a few responsible places for truth <http://globalresearch.ca/>

<http://www.911truth.org/index.php?topic=resources&page=2>

Read attachment

Thankyou for your time and i hope fair concideration of this issue

Rob Beverlin

Centre for Research the final answer
Centre for Research on Globalisation (CRG) Centre for Research on
Globalisation
[home]

The mystery surrounding the death of John O'Neill:
The Propaganda Preparation for 9/11
by Chaim Kupferberg

Centre for Research on Globalisation (CRG), globalresearch.ca, 13 June
2002 (revised 19 September 2002)

Read more in Global Outlook September 11: Foreknowledge or Deception? Stop
the
Nuclear Threat, Issue no 2, Summer 2002. Now available ([click here to order](#))

In the immediate aftermath of the destruction of the World Trade Center, the
finger of guilt was directed toward the only plausible author for such a
sophisticated and ruthless act of terror - Osama bin Laden.
Throughout the late '90's, we were informed that bin Laden had declared war
on
America by reason of the American military presence on Saudi soil in the
wake of
the Persian Gulf war. We were told how bin Laden, ensconced in Afghanistan,
headed up a world-wide terror franchise whose sophistication and global
reach
dwarfed that of the Iranian-financed Hizballah or Islamic Jihad (previously,
the
most widely known of the terror organizations among the masses in the Middle
East). Bin Laden's organization, al-Qaida, was presented to us as something
entirely new in the annals of terrorism - a far-flung, sophisticated empire
of
terror, possessing - possibly - weapons of mass destruction, while having no
clear or viable state sponsor behind it (as the Afghani Taliban were merely
its
resident protectors). In short, by September 11, the United States now had
a
bona fide enemy - and, as they say in criminal justice parlance, a suspect
with
motive, means, and opportunity.
And while I was a bit taken at how quickly - and confidently - the fingers
were
pointing only hours after the 9/11 bombings, I was positively shaken by the
first red flag that popped up. His name was John O'Neill - or more
precisely, he
is the seam that shows. Dated September 12, in a Washington Post article by
Vernon Loeb, it was revealed that O'Neill, who died in his capacity as head
of
security for the World Trade Center, was also formerly the New York FBI
Counterterror chief responsible for the investigation into Osama bin Laden.
That
could perhaps be written off as one of those freak synchronicities. There
were
the other items - reported quite blandly, in that "there's nothing to see
here,
folks" tone - that gave me that sinking feeling. Apparently, O'Neill had a
falling-out with the Ambassador to Yemen over his investigative style and
was
banned from returning there. But then there was that other nugget that I had
trouble digesting - that O'Neill had resigned from a thirty-year career in
the

Centre for Research the final answer
FBI "under a cloud" over an incident in Tampa - and then left to take up the security position at the WTC (only two weeks before!).
The seam that shows...
For the bulk of his career, like most of his FBI colleagues, John O'Neill was largely unknown to the public at large - respected in his circle, to be sure, yet scarcely meriting much mention in the media - beyond being referenced now and then as an expert on counterterrorism. Yet in the few months leading up to September 11, O'Neill was now suddenly the subject of a series of seemingly unrelated controversies - the first, in July, involving his dispute with the State Department over the conduct of the bin Laden investigation in Yemen; and the second, in August, in which he was reported to be under an FBI probe for misplacing a briefcase of classified documents during an FBI convention in Tampa.
In the light of the aftermath of this second controversy - the documents were found, "untouched", a few hours later - one wonders why this seemingly minor news would merit such lengthy coverage in the Washington Post and New York Times. Keeping in mind the fact that these latter articles on O'Neill appeared a mere three weeks before he was to die in the rubble of the Twin Towers, one wonders if this wasn't a well-orchestrated smear campaign against O'Neill, with a bit of unintended "blowback" - as this now-discredited counterterror chief in charge of all bin Laden bombings would finally make the news as a fatal casualty of bin Laden's final bombing. Coincidence? Or was there something more here that would bear investigating?
My gut told me that, in the months preceding September 11, somebody was out to either discredit John O'Neill or, alternatively, to plant disinformation that could later be used to divert any investigator from a fruitful reconstruction of the forces behind 9/11. Or, quite possibly, was a mistake made - one pointing the way toward a plan whose scope goes well beyond the designs of Osama bin Laden? In other words, could we spot the telltale fingerprints of a propaganda campaign preceding 9/11?
Well, as they say, a hypothesis is only as good as its usefulness in ferreting out reality. My hypothesis: that the events of September 11 were planned by those who not only had the motive, means, and opportunity to carry out the plan, but also were best placed to manage the consequences stemming from it, as well as managing the flow of information. If this were an "inside job", the first thing to do was to look at who conveyed specific information on bin Laden before - and I stress, before - 9/11, for they were most likely involved wittingly or not with those who masterminded it.
Virtually the first "smoking gun" was presented the day after 9/11, when Vernon Loeb and Dan Eggen reported in the Post that Abdel Bari Atwan, editor of the Al-Quds al Arabi newspaper in London, "received information that he [bin

Laden] planned very, very big attacks against American interests" only three weeks before 9/11. Moreover, the article reported that Atwan "was convinced that Islamic fundamentalists aligned with bin Laden were 'almost certainly' behind the attacks." Incidentally, Atwan had personally interviewed bin Laden in Afghanistan in 1996 - among the very few to do so. As reported by Michael Evans in the August 24, 1998 issue of The Times, Atwan "is trusted by bin Laden." Curious, perhaps, that Atwan seemed to be one of the major "point men" used in elaborating the Osama bin Laden "legend", as they say in intelligence parlance. In a U.S. News article dated August 31, 1998, Atwan informs us that bin Laden "is a humble man who lives simply, eating fried eggs, tasteless low-fat cheese, and bread gritty with sand. He hates America." No flash in the pan, this interviewer. Apparently, bin Laden kept Atwan's business card tucked away in his toga pocket. "Bin Laden phoned this newspaper, phoned me last Friday," Atwan revealed in an ABC News LateLine Transcript dated August 25, 1998. We'll come back to ABC News shortly. While solidly implicating bin Laden the day after 9/11, Atwan was also the media's "go-to" guy back in 1998 when he informed us, after President Clinton bombed tool sheds in Afghanistan, that bin Laden issued this threat against the United States: "The battle has not started yet. The response will be with action and not words." In the same article (which I took from Nando Times), ABC News is the source for an additional threat called in by Ayman al-Zawahiri, a senior bin Laden aide: "The war has just started. The Americans should wait for the answer." Only a few months before that, ABC had conducted its televised interview of bin Laden. By the summer of 1998, primed by Atwan, ABC NEWS, and a surprisingly small clique of well-worn sources, we had come to know bin Laden as America's latest "Saddam", "Qaddafi", "Noriega" - take your pick and set your bomb sites. By October 2000, when the U.S.S. Cole was bombed in Yemen, in case there was any doubt, Atwan offered Reuters his helpful analysis with regards to the source of blame: "I do not rule out that this was undertaken by Osama bin Laden. Yemeni groups don't have the experience to carry out this kind of operation." Atwan informed Reuters that bin Laden "was unlikely to claim direct responsibility for Thursday's attack for fear of U.S. reprisals." One can imagine, then, that Atwan gave his trusting phone mate cause for many a sleepless night. With friends like these... Leading up to 9/11, by the spring of 2001, an incriminating wedding videotape, apparently implicating bin Laden in the Yemen bombing, was circulating around

Centre for Research the final answer
the Middle East after being broadcast on the ubiquitous al-Jazeera
television
station (reconstituted from the BBC TV Arabic Service - more on them later).
In
the video, bin Laden, according to the Saudi-owned al-Hayat newspaper (more
on
them later, too), recited a poem celebrating the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole
(shades of deja vu here?) This from the ABCNEWS.com site dated March 1:
"Al-Hayat, which carried a photo of bin Laden and his son at the wedding,
said
its correspondent was the only journalist at the ceremony, also attended by
bin
Laden's mother, two brothers and sister who flew to Kandahar from Saudi
Arabia."

And yes, here, too, Atwan offers his thoughtful review of the bin Laden
video,
courtesy of PTI, datelined London June 22, 2001: "[Atwan] said the video was
proof that the fugitive Saudi millionaire [the Bruce Wayne of terrorists]
was
fit, well equipped and confident enough to send out a call to arms." Why
this
sudden need for proof? According to Atwan in the same article: "There have
been
rumours that [bin Laden] is ill and that he is being contained by the
Taliban in
Afghanistan. It is quite clear from the film that he is in good health to
the
point where he can fire a rifle, and is free to operate as he chooses." In
other
words, limber enough for his starring role in the months ahead.
So who is Abdel Bari Atwan and why is he anxious to tell us so much?
According
to the Winter 1999 issue of INEAS (Institute of Near Eastern and African
Studies), Abdel Bari Atwan, a Palestinian, was born in a refugee camp in the
Gaza Strip in 1950. Educated at the American University of Cairo, Atwan
moved to
Saudi Arabia and worked as a writer for the al-Madina newspaper. In 1978, he
moved to London, where he became a correspondent for the Saudi-owned Asharq
Al-Awsat newspaper. In 1988, after shuffling around between Saudi-owned
papers,
Atwan was offered a position as editor of al-Quds al-Arabi. By his account,
he
was offered a position as the executive editor of the Saudi-owned al-Hayat
(of
the bin Laden wedding video coup), yet turned it down to produce a more
independent newspaper as a challenge to the "empires" of the Saudi-dominated
dailies.
Al-Quds began production in April 1989. A little more than a year later,
Saddam
invaded Kuwait and al-Quds stood alone as the only Arab newspaper opposed to
the
Persian Gulf War - at least by Atwan's account. According to Atwan: "Without
the
Gulf war, we wouldn't have taken such political lines, which made us well
recognized and well respected." In November 1996, Bari-Atwan braved a
twelve-hour car ride through muddy roads, attired in shabby Afghani rags in
below-zero weather, and gave us the early scoop on bin Laden, conducting a
one-on-one interview in bin Laden's [bat]cave. From then on, the mainstream
media - CNN, ABC, BBC, Sky News - looked to Bari-Atwan and al-Quds as the
"independent" voice of the Arab street.
Incidentally, in a discussion concerning the matter of Saudi domination of
the

Centre for Research the final answer

Arabic media, taken from the Carryon.oneworld.org site, Atwan, as editor of his struggling independent, was facing off against Jihad Khazen, the editor of the Saudi-owned al-Hayat. As Atwan proudly related in support of his independence:

"One day I was called by the BBC-TV Arabic service [whose staff later reconstituted itself as al-Jazeera television]: 'There's a story on your front page today, saying such and such. Is it true?' I asked why he should doubt it and he replied: 'It's not published in al-Hayat [his job offer] or al-Sharq al-Awsat [his alma mater].'" Atwan boasts: "At least I can say we are 95 to 96 per cent independent" - leaving out the 4 to 5 per cent spent on bin Laden, I presume. Whether or not al-Quds truly is independent, this is the cover story the mainstream media buys into when they come trolling for their "independent" evidence.

So, to elaborate further on this (so far) fruitful hypothesis, it is my contention that al-Qaida and bin Laden are elaborate "legends" set up to promote a plausibly sophisticated and ferocious enemy to stand against American interests. I am not, however, implying that bin Laden himself is a total fabrication. Rather, it is my contention that confederates, believing themselves to act on behalf of bin Laden, are being set up in a "false flag operation" to perform operations as their controllers see fit. And who are these controllers?

If they're anything resembling the folks who brought you Hizbullah and Hamas, you wouldn't be sweating the suitcase nukes (made in America), the Ames strain anthrax (made in America), the MI5-like " sleeper agents" and coded "go" messages. Instead, you would be dodging primitive nail bombs and road mines

- and not needing Abdel Bari Atwan to feed you the lowdown on the blame. In view of the fact that bin Laden is of Saudi origin, that much of the "evidence" on the Arab side initially originated from Saudi-owned or Gulf Anglo-client state sources, and that Saudi Arabia is the major financial sponsor

of the Taliban brand of fundamentalism in Afghanistan (as a counter-point to Iran), I believe it is fair to say that Saudi Arabia might possibly be implicated. " Most likely, the Saudis performed their roles as subservient proxies. We'll get to the ultimate controllers soon enough (if you haven't already guessed where this is going). And now, to fill out the picture further,

it is necessary to name an equally essential partner as proxy - Pakistan, or, more specifically, Pakistan's version of the CIA - the ISI (Interservices Intelligence Directorate).

And this is where we begin to "close the circle" of our close-knit pre-9/11 propaganda clique. Returning again to the above-mentioned Dan Eggen and Vernon

Loeb Post article of September 12, we're offered - in a powerful little side-bar

- more critical evidence implicating bin Laden for the attacks the day before.

This time, the bombshell is offered by Palestinian journalist Jamal Ismail, Abu

Centre for Research the final answer
Dhabi Television's bureau chief in Islamabad. According to Ismail, a bin Laden aide called him "early Wednesday on a satellite telephone from a hide-out in Afghanistan," praising the attack yet denying any responsibility for it. As it turns out, Ismail was also among the select few to conduct his very own bin Laden interview, published by Newsweek in its April 1, 1999 issue. Here is how Newsweek described Ismail's good fortune: "Palestinian journalist Jamal Ismail's mobile phone rang just before prayers on December 18. 'Peace be upon you,' said the voice on the line. 'You may not recognize me, but I know you.'" And thus was Jamal Ismail invited on his own mud-soaked incursion to the bin Laden [bat]cave. Searching deeper, I found an interesting obscure article penned by respected Pakistani journalist Rahimullah Yusufzai in The News Jang, and dated May 3, 2000. It details the detention of two men of Kurdish origin, accused by the Taliban of spying for American and Israeli intelligence. As Yusufzai relates it, he spoke to the only journalists allowed by the Taliban to interview the detained men - Jamal Ismail and his cameraman. Apparently, Ismail had a special relationship with the Taliban, allowing him this rare privilege above other journalists. And, as we shall shortly see, so does Yusufzai. One wonders who debriefs them at the end of a workday. But more interestingly, by May 5, as reported by Kathy Gannon for the Associated Press, the story acquires - as they say - "new legs." Not only are the basic elements of the Yusufzai story mentioned, but the article leads off with the bombshell that one of the detained men revealed that he was recruited by the United States to find Osama bin Laden. It finishes with a little coda implicating bin Laden in the 1998 embassy bombings. Thus, in the space of two days, Yusufzai's Pakistani "spy" article sprouts a bin Laden addition when fertilized by the American Associated Press - and nicely provides a plausible explanation as to why a Kurd would be prowling around Afghanistan on behalf of the United States. Yusufzai, incidentally, moonlighted as an ABC News producer, charged with guiding ABC News correspondent John Miller through the Afghani marshes to the bin Laden [bat]cave - one of the very few American journalists to be accorded such an honour (and also, as it happens, a good friend of bin Laden arch-foe John O'Neill. But not chummy enough to direct O'Neill on to bin Laden's hideaway). Moreover, Ismail and Yusufzai are mentioned together in a CNN article posted January 4, 1999 - the former for his Newsweek interview, the latter for his own bin Laden dialogue for TIME Magazine the day later. Rahimullah Yusufzai, regarded by New York Times reporters John Burns and Steve Levine as "one man who has seen more of the Taliban than any other outsider," is also named by The Nation, in its article of January 27, 1997, as "one of the favourite journalists of [Pakistan's] ISI...one of the organizations funding and arming the Taliban." It's a small world after all. In the September 29, 2001 article of PressPlus,

Centre for Research the final answer
Yusufszai's ABC colleague, John Miller, mused about running into his buddy
John
O'Neill in Yemen while reporting on the U.S.S. Cole bombing the year before.
"He
said, 'So this is the Elaine's of Yemen.' "
"There is a terrible irony to all this," Miller said. I'll say: Miller, one
of
the very few Americans who can give a first-hand account of bin Laden, bumps
into his friend, bin Laden's chief investigator, while both are
investigating a
bombing in Yemen that will later be tagged onto bin Laden - and only a year
before O'Neill dies at the hands of... allegedly ...bin Laden.
Now, following the logic of my hypothesis, if the bin Laden threat was,
pre-9/11, a close-knit propaganda campaign, one would expect to find the
same
names showing up repeatedly in combination with one another. This, too,
applies
to the American commentators. Let us return to the August 1998 American
bombings
of bin Laden's tool sheds as an example. The night of the bombing,
Rahimullah
Yusufszai received a call from bin Laden aide Ayman al-Zawahiri, in a report
from the Associated Press. Later, Yusufszai obtained for ABC News exclusive
photos of the damage to bin Laden's camp. Further commentary describing the
layout of the bin Laden camp was furnished to the Washington Post by former
CIA
analyst and terrorism expert Kenneth Katzman, as well as Harvey Kushner of
Long
Island University. Only little more than a week before that, Katzman and
Kushner
were offering their assessment of bin Laden's culpability for the embassy
bombings in Africa in a Washington Post article penned by Vernon Loeb and
Walter
Pincus. They were joined in this effort by Vincent Cannistraro, the ABC news
analyst who also escorted John Miller to his bin Laden interview, as well as
provided running commentary in the days immediately following 9/11.
Cannistraro,
a former CIA counterterrorism chief, provided covert aid to the Afghani
mujaheddin in the late '80's, as well as supervised CIA operations with the
contras. He was also one of the point men in the notoriously circumspect
investigation at Lockerbie. In the above-noted Loeb and Pincus article - in
which bin Laden is quoted from the ABC News Miller and Yusufszai interview -
Cannistraro weighs in with his assessment of the embassy bombings: "I
believe
Osama bin Laden is the sponsor of this operation, and I think all of the
indications are pointing that way."
Soon after the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole in Yemen, a Vernon Loeb Post
article,
dated October 13, 2000, proceeded to implicate bin Laden through the
detailed
information provided by Kushner, Katzman, and Cannistraro. Earlier, in a
Vernon
Loeb Post article dated July 3, 2000, Yusufszai, Kushner, and Cannistraro
unveiled bin Laden aides Ayman al-Zawahiri and Muhammed Atef as the men to
watch
as bin Laden's likely successors, with a helpful tidbit on the Zawahiri
biography thrown in by the Saudi-owned al-Sharq al-Awsat.
None of the above, of course, is offered as the "smoking gun" pointing the
way
to a propaganda conspiracy, nor are my chosen examples meant to be
exhaustive in
evidencing this point. According to Felicity Barringer, in a New York Times
article dated September 24, 2001: "A good deal of the public information on

Centre for Research the final answer

bin

Laden comes from the journalists who went to Afghanistan to interview him, including [Peter] Bergen, ... Peter Arnett, John Miller, Rahimullah

Yusufzai,

and Jamal Ismail." The article further makes reference to Vernon Loeb, Al Quds

al-Arabi (Atwan), Judith Miller, Al Jazeera, and Brian Jenkins (formerly of Kroll Associates - the security firm that obtained the WTC position for John O'Neill by way of Jerry Hauer). Clearly, I have also not heretofore made mention of the other experts who have worked assiduously toward building our knowledge base on bin Laden - Steven Emerson, Daniel Pipes, Yossef Bodansky, and

various British and EU elites. However, the above examples do show how the information flow on bin Laden could be plausibly managed by the skilfully placed

revelations of a relatively insular clique of "experts" called upon repeatedly

by the mainstream media.

Here is how it would work: A relatively few well-connected correspondents provide the "scoops" that get the coverage in the relatively few mainstream news

sources - the four TV networks, TIME, Newsweek, CNN - where the parameters of

debate are set and the "official reality" is consecrated for the bottom feeders

in the news chain. In other countries, this is what is known as propaganda - or,

put less politely, psychological warfare.

But before I leave this topic, I would like to provide an example of "news management" that is revealing for what is omitted - that is, the "smoking gun"

of Pakistani ISI involvement in the events of 9/11. On October 9, 2001, the Times of India dropped this little bombshell: "Top sources confirmed here on

Tuesday that [ISI Chief Mahmud Ahmad] lost his job because of the "evidence" India produced to show his links to one of the suicide bombers that wrecked the

World Trade Centre. The US authorities sought his removal after confirming the

fact that \$100,000 were wired to WTC hijacker Mohammed Atta from Pakistan by Ahmad Umar Sheikh at the instance of Gen. Mahmud."

What makes this particular piece so devastating is that only days before, much

of the mainstream American media was touting the news of a "key link" in the chain of evidence linking bin Laden to the events of September 11 - namely,

a \$100,000 wire transfer to the hijackers from a shadowy operative linked to bin

Laden. Yet once this operative was "outed" as being linked instead to the Pakistani ISI Chief, any propaganda gains initially made through this

evidence would now crumble. One possible reason might stem from this Karachi News

item, released only two days before September 11:

"[Pakistani] ISI Chief Lt-Gen Mahmood's week-long presence in Washington has triggered speculation about the agenda of his mysterious meetings at the Pentagon and National Security Council. Officially, State Department sources say

he is on a routine visit in return to [sic] CIA Director George Tenet's earlier

visit to Islamabad...what added interest to his visit is the history of such visits. Last time Ziauddin Butt, Mahmood's predecessor, was here during Nawaz

Centre for Research the final answer

Sharif's government the domestic politics turned topsy-turvy within days.

That

this is not the first visit by Mahmood in the last three months shows the urgency of the ongoing parleys..."

In other words, this was a propaganda piece that went disastrously wrong.

After

October 9, bin Laden's alleged paymaster could now be linked to a U.S.

"ally"

who spent the days before 9/11 in deep consultation at the Pentagon. The US authorities immediately went into damage control mode by insisting on the quiet

retirement of the "outed" ISI chief. Thus removed from the public eye, the ISI

Chief's role in all this could be effectively ignored, and an American media black-out could be safely assumed.

Such a scenario certainly fits in snugly with my hypothesis, which I will now

proceed to elaborate completely. The events of September 11 were

masterminded by

those who were in the best position to manage the consequences - namely,

those

most able to manage the flow of information, those most able to coordinate all

the elements necessary for the perpetration of a successful operation

(subverting airport security, guiding the planes to their specific targets), and

most significantly, those who stood to reasonably benefit in the aftermath.

Conspiracies, by their very nature, are not crimes of passion. They may

involve

rational, albeit cold-blooded, attempts to achieve a desired end by

employing

the most effective means available. It is for this reason that "mainstream"

terror groups like Hamas and Hizbullah largely avoid attacking American

interests where such attacks would serve no practical interest. For all

their

talk of Jihad, these terror groups tend to plan their specific attacks with

an

eye to the consequences that could reasonably be expected to follow. Thus,

knowing the moral and political constraints of Israeli deterrent strategies,

they calibrate their attacks to elicit consequences that are most tolerable

for

them - and hence, manageable. Yet surely, in the light of the cult of

suicidal

martyrdom, such considerations no longer hold sway. Perhaps. But then, in

the

case of such a far-flung anti-Zionist movement as al-Qaida, one would expect

at

least a little more exertion against Israeli interests than has heretofore

prevailed - unless, of course, the "point" of al-Qaida was to provide a

plausible dire threat to American interests where none had then existed. In

any

case, as nobody has noticed this particular anomaly, there was no need for

any

needless exertion of resources in order to bolster a credibility that needed

no

bolstering in this one particular sector.

Motive, means, and opportunity. While I presented the Saudis and Pakistani

intelligence as clear-cut proxies, the only motive these elements would have

to

benefit from a crime of this nature is an assurance that no punishment would

be

forthcoming but rather, they would be on the right side of power and wealth

among those in a position to determine the booty.

Centre for Research the final answer

Another anomaly: on the very day that the ISI Chief was in deep consultation at the Pentagon, Ahmed Shah Massoud, the head of the Afghani Northern Alliance - a cultishly popular figure within that group, and a mortal foe of Pakistan's ISI - was assassinated by two terrorists posing as cameramen. Keeping in mind the fact that, throughout the '90's, American leaders such as Clinton, and American companies such as Unocal, were largely throwing their support over to the Taliban in opposition to the Northern Alliance (or United Front), it seems rather convenient that, in the aftermath of 9/11, the way was now cleared for the Northern Alliance to be co-opted as an instrument for setting up a more pliant Afghani government (now headed, incidentally, by a former consultant to Unocal).

So who are the ultimate controllers? To begin with, the circumstantial evidence seems to point to an operative clique primarily based out of New York City and the State of Florida. I stress the word "operative", as this clique appears to consist of subservient agents involved in laying the preparations. Once again, John O'Neill serves as an effective Rosetta Stone in interpreting the raw outlines of this operative clique (which is by no means a "rogue" clique). The FBI and CIA elements involved in counterterrorism have a checkered past. For one, Oliver North in the 1980's served as Counterterrorism Chief while he used his office as a cover to deal with such narco-terrorists as Monzar al-Kassar (who figures in the crash at Lockerbie - also investigated by Cannistraro). In the late '90's, O'Neill was transferred from the federal office of Counterterrorism to the New York Counterterrorism Office of the FBI - and it was the New York branch which was then designated as the primary investigator of all overseas investigations involving bin Laden. Moreover, this branch was also involved in the somewhat suspect investigation of TWA 800 - investigated by O'Neill and reported upon by ABC's John Miller, who was formerly the Deputy Police Commissioner of Public Relations for the NYPD before he joined up with ABC. As regards New York, there is another element involved in germ warfare operations. Actually, a multi-million dollar bunker - serving as a command and control center in the event of a biological attack - was set up at 7 World Trade Center at the direction of Rudolph Giuliani, who also oversaw the mass spraying of malathion over the boroughs of New York City when the West Nile virus hit town a few summers previously. The man Giuliani placed in charge of that operation, Jerry Hauer, also happened to be the man who found John O'Neill the position at the world Trade Center, as well as being the one who - by his own admission - identified O'Neill's body.

Moreover, there has been a widespread campaign on to link the threat of al-Qaida with that of a mass biological attack. At least the day after September 11, the link - as the Anthrax mailings had yet to arise - was not so apparent. Yet

Centre for Research the final answer

on
PBS' Frontline, the New York Times' Judith Miller (no apparent relation to John Miller, as far as I'm aware), accompanied by the New York Times' James Risen, was interviewed as an expert on al-Qaida. Several weeks later, Judith Miller would once more make the headlines as the apparent recipient of an anthrax mailing which turned out to be a false alarm - yet was all the same conveniently timed with the well-publicized launching of her book on...germ warfare. As was later discovered, the anthrax mailings petered out once the news leaked that a DNA test revealed the material to be of the Ames strain of anthrax, an agent synthesized out of a CIA laboratory in Fort Detrick, Maryland. Nevertheless, this was sufficient to fast-track Bioport's exclusive license for the anthrax vaccine toward FDA approval. Formerly, Bioport's experimental anthrax vaccine was being forcibly administered - under threat of court-martial - to hundreds of thousands of American servicemen (in conformity with Bioport's exclusive and lucrative contract with the Department of Defense). Incidentally, Judith Miller, along with Jerry Hauer, was among 17 "key" participants in a biowarfare exercise known as "Dark Winter" - a think tank-funded scenario that aimed to study the nationwide effects of a hypothetical smallpox outbreak. One of the sponsors of that exercise was the Anser Institute of Homeland Security, an organization established before September 11, 2001. Interestingly enough, the curious phrase "homeland security" was starting to creep up with increasing frequency in the vocabularies of certain political cliques (Dick Cheney, the Hart-Rudman Commission, et al.) in the year or two leading up to 9/11. The point of the above-noted information is to draw attention to an apparent propaganda campaign to prepare the public for a catastrophic biological attack. As with the Twin Towers, the blame for any coming attack may be duly and plausibly assigned by those who carefully laid the groundwork in preparing us for this eventuality. As for Florida, the connection with this state is obvious, for not only was the first anthrax mailing directed to the Florida offices of the National Enquirer, but many of the accused hijackers were also reported to receive their pilot training from flight schools in Venice and Tampa. Notably, it was a Florida bank account to which hijacker Mohamed Atta allegedly deposited his 9/11 pay cheque. Moreover, Florida, by way of the MacDill Air Force Base, is also Central Command for the war in Afghanistan. In addition to its function as Central Command for the war on terrorism, MacDill is -outside of Langley - also a major base of the CIA. Thus, in the CIA's own backyard, we find the infrastructure and financial support that went into the planning for the events of 9/11. And, as we so often find with events surrounding 9/11, another synchronicity - for

Centre for Research the final answer

coincidentally
enough, the woman who reportedly happened to find an apartment for one of
the
alleged hijackers was the wife of the senior editor of the National
Enquirer.
Moreover, her husband, Michael Irish, also happened to make use of an
airfield
that reportedly served as flight training for some of the hijackers. I
emphasize
the word "reportedly," as the possibility always exists that this "reported
fact" may be nothing more than disinformation, strategically placed to
divert
attention from a possibly more subtle truth. In intelligence operations,
foreign assets are often placed with resident "controllers" whose job it is
to
supervise the asset as well as provide accommodations as the need arises.
Who
are Michael and Gloria Irish? Or, perhaps more revealingly, what kind of
social
circles do they run with? This is certainly an avenue worth exploring - by
reason of its many synchronicities if for nothing else. Again, the seam that
shows.
As a little side-note, Tampa experienced its own mass spraying of malathion,
a
mutagenic pesticide, when it encountered a med fly outbreak the year before
New
York's West Nile outbreak. In the end, the flies were contained through a
sterile med fly program administered out of MacDill Air Force base.
So, to sum up, it appears that the events of September 11 were planned years
in
advance, with the groundwork being carefully laid by a propaganda campaign
orchestrated to convince the public that the United States has a plausibly
sophisticated nemesis with the motive, means, and opportunity to perpetrate
a
devastating act of terror against Americans. Toward that end, Saudi Arabia
and
Pakistan have been used as the primary proxy agents to run a "false flag"
operation, setting up and financing the infrastructure of al-Qaida in
Afghanistan. Through madrassas based in Pakistan, Saudi and Yemenite
militants
were instructed in the Saudi brand of Wahabbi Islam, and subsequently
"graduated" to the camps that were set up in Afghanistan - again, under
Saudi
and Pakistani sponsorship. Stateside, the operative agents were mostly based
out
of New York City and Florida. In the aftermath of 9/11, elements in the
American
government are now widely disseminating information in vast quantities,
overwhelming the populace and lending credibility to the government's
version of
events. Thus, post-9/11, the actions of this formerly insular propaganda
clique
are no longer perceptible. Information is now being doled out in generous
portions to credulous reporters who are outside the loop, yet perform their
unwitting service as "bottom feeders" in the downward flow of information.
In all cases, the actions of these proxy agents and operative planners are
sufficiently distanced and compartmentalized from the true masterminds to
create
a condition of "plausible deniability". In short, the proxies have also been
set
up as possible patsies with evidence that has been carefully laid to
incriminate
them should cracks in the "official story" become too discernible. Moreover,

Centre for Research the final answer

the
groundwork has already been carefully laid to cast aspersions on another
convenient patsy - the Jews, by way of the State of Israel and its
supporters.
Already, for those prone to perceive Jewish conspiracies, the reliable vein
of
anti-Semitism - combined with anti-Zionism - has been mined to distract the
masses and to create a modern version of the ritual blood libel, thereby
further
"muddying the waters" should the true masterminds be threatened with
exposure.
In other words, the present difficulties in the Middle East work perfectly
to
set up the State of Israel as a plausible alternative suspect with motive,
means, and opportunity. Toward that end, a low-level "buzz" has been
circulating
over the Internet (and especially in Europe) of an Israeli spy ring that was
rounded up in the days after September 11. Whether or not these reports are
credible is not the point. Most likely, there was a spy ring operating, and
various Israelis were unwittingly set up as patsies, to be exposed should
the
need arise. Thus, while evidence may be marshaled to taint the Saudis,
Pakistanis, or Israelis, the real guilt must inevitably lie with those in
the
best position to manage the flow of information as well as reliably benefit
from
the new order created, primarily, the political and corporate elites of the
United States, the United Kingdom, and the European Union - also, as it
happens,
the very parties orchestrating the global war on terrorism. In this respect,
the
Saudis, Pakistanis, or Israelis have far less to gain (other than the
benefits
of going along with the designs of the rich and mighty).
I could go on and further highlight the obvious geostrategic gains of those
who
are clearly managing the flow of information - the proverbial pipelines,
oil,
wealth, and so forth. But I think those purported benefits are a bit of a
"red
herring" - more of a side benefit than the main motivating factor. Americans
and
their allies would have easily supported a thrust into Afghanistan for a
provocation far less costly and bloody than this (such as Kuwait in the
early
'90's). It is no small act to intentionally take down such an overarching
symbol of financial stability as the Twin Towers, and chance killing
thousands
in the process. Such a conspiracy, if in fact perpetrated from within, would
by
its nature necessitate a huge structural, cultural, and demographic change.
The
very brazenness of the act, the naked aggression, would necessitate a
tenacious
determination to achieve the ends for which these actions were perpetrated.
There is no going back now. An infrastructure is being laid out - one that
will,
finally, provide a dissident-proof totalitarian oligarchy composed of
like-minded elites served by an under-class kept under constant
surveillance.
The edifice of this regime is being constructed, brick by brick, with the
mortar
of the Office of Homeland Security (to centralize and coordinate an

Centre for Research the final answer

effective police state), the Freedom Corps (to indoctrinate the most idealist - and therefore activist - elements of the populace toward service to the state), and the Patriot Act (to provide the legal basis for subverting long-held rights under the screen of national security). If all of this sounds strangely familiar, if it is redolent of Huxley and Orwell, that is perhaps because Huxley and Orwell were both intimately involved with the elites of their time - in fact, were fully subsumed among them - in ways that made their future projections abundantly prescient, and, in their minds, inevitable. With further refinements in mind control technologies - yes, they do exist - as well as the monopolization of the food supply by way of sterile seed "terminator technology" - the approval for which was granted in the months following 9/11 - the masses may be perpetually culled and exploited by those who hold the keys to this fully managed society. If this notion of reality strikes you as somewhat dissonant, at odds with your own personal experience, it may be perhaps that we have not quite arrived there yet, and that you have personally not felt the corrosive lash of political corruption and governmental malfeasance. In all likelihood, you have not read the mountain of evidence detailing political and elite deviant behaviour in this country. You may even be dismissive of "conspiracy theories", yet wholly unaware of the well-documented attempts by the CIA and FBI to subvert, surveil, and propagandize the populace through programs such as Project Mockingbird (media infiltration) and MK-Ultra (mind control through chemical, hypnotic, or electro-magnetic means). These programs are effected primarily through "think tanks" that are set up across the United States for the purpose of disseminating information and propaganda under the rubric of "expertise". Moreover, various foundations, such as the Rockefeller or Ford Foundations, are often used as funnels to finance and feed the arteries of these propaganda networks. In the 1970's, a good deal of this structural corruption was officially exposed - in a "limited hang-out" - by way of the Church Commission, as well as the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Thereafter, much of the most damaging revelations were played down or ignored by the mainstream media, and the waters were then muddied by a stream of outlandish conspiracy theories - aliens, Elvis, etc. - that merely served to discredit the information that was most credible. "Muddying the waters", incidentally, is a tried and true staple of the intelligence craft. It is really just a matter of familiarizing yourself with all the documented anomalies that do not accord with the received, mainstream reality put forth to you by the mainstream media. As a practical guide to begin, you might want to confine your search to strictly "mainstream" sources, as I have sought to do

Centre for Research the final answer

in attempting to construct my case on 9/11. My evidence is by no means exhaustive. In fact, it is merely the proverbial tip of the iceberg. Yet proceeding in this direction, under my hypothesis, has been most fruitful in analyzing the various anomalies that pop up now and then. Any simple keyword search of the following terms may be helpful in pointing toward a more substantive understanding of the elites who ultimately guide your fortunes: "Iran-Contra" , "Mena", "BCCI", "Project Paperclip", "Michael Aquino", "Paul Bonacci", "Operation Northwoods", "MK-Ultra". Much of the information on these topics is credible and well-documented. More disturbingly, it highlights behavior committed by the very same elites who are now interpreting the events of 9/11 for you. Read for yourself, and decide, at the end of the day, how much credibility you will continue to accord to those who claim to be the proper trustees of your fate and well-being.

Chaim Kupferberg is a freelance researcher and writer. Copyright © Chaim Kupferberg 2002. Permission is granted to post this text on non-commercial community internet sites, provided the source and the URL are indicated, the essay remains intact and the copyright note is displayed.

The URL of this article is:

<http://globalresearch.ca/articles/KUP206A.html> Read more in Global Outlook
September 11: Foreknowledge or Deception? Stop the
Nuclear Threat, Issue no 2, Summer 2002. Now available (click here to order)
[home]