

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Amy Toburen [atoburen@wisc.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 1:37 PM
To: Dennis Chaptman; John Lucas; Patrick Farrell; Eden Inoway-Ronnie; Dowling_John
Dowling_John; Casey Nagy; Chuck Hoornstra
Subject: Fwd: My Letter to State Representative Steve Nass of Wisconsin



RepNassEmail-A.pdf\TT00055.htm (244
f (71 KB) B)

fyi

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Paul V. Sheridan" <pvsheridan@comcast.net>
Date: July 7, 2006 11:47:58 AM CDT
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Professor Kevin Barrett [redacted] chancellor@news.wisc.edu,
jrpatau@vc.wisc.edu, dford@vc.wisc.edu, dbazzell@vc.wisc.edu, downs@polisci.wisc.edu,
gsandefur@ls.admin.wisc.edu, emraffer@facstaff.wisc.edu, whansen@facstaff.wisc.edu,
bsmattmi@wisc.edu, dcorcoran@madison.com, scullen@madison.com, bkreiser@aaup.org
Subject: My Letter to State Representative Steve Nass of Wisconsin

Dear Provost Farrell:

Attached is a pdf version of the hard-copy letter I signed and Fedex'd to State Representative Steve Nass of Wisconsin. As you can see from the included SPOD, his office received it at 10:08am today. I have a pdg/jpeg version which displays my signature if anyone needs that version as well (large, emailed to Professor Kevin Barrett earlier).

Paul Sheridan

22357 Columbia Street
Dearborn, MI 48124-3431
313-277-5095
pvs6@Cornell.edu

6 July 2006

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

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

Dear Representative Nass:

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

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

For your information, it was *this* form of patriotism that eventually led to historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

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

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

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

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

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

6 July 2006

Representative Stephen L. Nass
Page Two of Four

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 July 2006

Representative Stephen L. Nass
Page Three of Four

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6 July 2006

Representative Stephen L. Nass
Page Four of Four

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

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

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

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

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

Cordially,

Paul V. Sheridan

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

Attachments

**Courtesy Copy List
(As of July 6, 2006)**

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



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

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

07/07/2006

Dear Customer:

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

Delivery Information:

Status:	Delivered	Delivery location:	17 W MAIN ST
Signed for by:	J.RUDOW	Delivery date:	Jul 7, 2006 10:08
Service type:	Priority Envelope		

NO SIGNATURE IS AVAILABLE

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

Shipping Information:

Tracking number:	853542968761	Ship date:	Jul 6, 2006
Recipient:	REP STEVE NASS STATE CAPITOL MADISON OFFICE RM 12WEST 53708 US	Shipper:	PAUL SHERIDAN PAUL V SHERIDAN 22357 COLUMBIA ST 481243431 US

Thank you for choosing FedEx Express.

FedEx Worldwide Customer Service
1.800.GoFedEx 1.800.463.3339

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: FORTYFORT1@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 4:40 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: DE; Dr. Barrett

Dear Dr. Farrell:

Dr. Kevin Barrett, a professor at the University of Wisconsin has been attacked for saying that he believes that 9/11 was a covert operation. As difficult as it is for Americans to consider the idea that some part of their government could do such a thing, it appears necessary to examine the evidence.

It is extremely disturbing, but rational, to do this. There is an accumulating body of evidence that the government was involved. A group of university professors say that the official story scientifically could not have occurred. This group, "Scholars for 9/11 Truth" (<http://www.st911.org/>) includes engineers, physicists, mathematicians, and theology professors. Questioning the official 9/11 story is not "nutty."

Muslims have been painted in negative stereotypical ways as a consequence of the official story of 9/11. To discuss this with students is appropriate. Students study how Jews were stereotyped during WWII, and the Japanese were interred because of stereotypes.

Questioning of what happened on 9/11 requires courage, and intellectual honesty to examine the facts, and avoid mindlessly accepting the official story as a "sacred myth." To think critically, and question is what America is all about, and certainly what an education is intended to facilitate. It would not be responsible for Dr. Barrett to fail to do so.

Robert E. Griffin
Psychologist
100 River Street
Forty Fort, Pa. 18704
570-287-7570
http://users.adelphia.net/~neppa/neppa_officers.htm

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: maskedjellybean@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 1:25 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Mr. Farrell,

Kevin Barrett should not be fired from his teaching position. What he believes is really irrelevant, as long as he teaches all sides so that the students can form their own opinions. However, I can see that a line must be drawn. Teachers can't just teach whatever they want without presenting any evidence to support it. That being said: The truth of the matter is that there is, in fact, much evidence to support what he believes, and he is far from alone in those beliefs. It is important to examine these theories before dismissing them as complete nonsense. (www.fromthewilderness.com) Be skeptical of everything, but don't ignore anything. You might be interested in the poll on this page: <http://www.channel3000.com/education/9480690/detail.html> As you can see, the overwhelming majority agrees he should not be fired and 60% think he "raises some good questions".

Don't feel obligated to reply to this. I'm just letting my opinion be known.

Sincerely,
Ben

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 7:13 AM
To: Patrick Farrell
Cc: DONALD A DOWNS
Subject: Kevin Barrett responds to Governor Doyle



Pasted Graphic.tiff (22 KB) ATT00071.txt (541 B) ATT00074.txt (565 B)

Dear Governor Doyle,

Thank you for responding to my recent letter. I am sure most of your constituents get brief form-letter responses from your staff, so finding my letter the subject of a press conference and a major news story was quite an honor. (The letter is archived at <http://muica.com/governordoyle.htm>; scroll down for my mock-questionnaire for UW teachers.)

I think you're basically a good guy -- I used to play pick-up basketball with you at the Nat, and I know you're a ferocious but fair competitor -- so I would like to explain that my letter was intended in the spirit of friendly satire, not mean-spirited sarcasm. I studied absurdist literature at an impressionable age, and grew fond of this style of saying serious things in a humorous way.

My headline "Lecturer Threatens Governor's Job" was a humorous "man bites dog" inversion of the story from a few days earlier, when the **governor** had threatened a **lecturer's** job on the basis of political views espoused on a radio program. As conservative professor Donald Downs has written, this kind of threat represents a wholesale rollback of the prevailing norms of academic freedom. The "Lecturer Threatens Governor's Job" headline was also intended to underscore the point that public officials are hired and fired at will by the people, and that it is the ordinary person -- the \$8,000-a-semester lecturer in this case -- who should be hiring and firing the governor, not vice-versa. Effrontery? Unmitigated audacity? Sure. That's the fun of it. As I told Aaron Nathans the other day, there is no Arabic word for chutzpah, but I'm trying to invent one.

As for my questionnaire, that was intended to underscore the point that there is a very important debate in progress that touches on the issues raised in my questions. On one side of the debate are those who promote a mythical view of history designed to inculcate a kind of fundamentalist religious faith in American exceptionalism-- the idea that while other governments are corrupt, suffer coups d'etat and inside-job assassinations, have their democratic institutions undermined by plutocrats, use false-flag attacks to trigger wars of aggression, and so on, nothing like this could ever possibly happen here. On the other side are historians, journalists and intellectuals who are critically examining and debating the events listed in my questionnaire, and their implications for our society.

If you want the University of Wisconsin to function as a state church that inculcates fundamentalist religious faith in American exceptionalism, my questionnaire would be a good way to weed out potential heretics. If, on the other hand, you want the University to remain true to its tradition of "fearless sifting and winnowing" and its motto "the truth will set you free," people who raise questions about these issues, and debate them rationally on the basis of evidence, should be sought out and hired, not hunted down and fired.

While I have built up a loyal readership at MUJCA in part on the basis of my satirical writings, some readers have suggested that now that I am reaching a broader audience I should go easy on the

satire and speak more straightforwardly, in a manner more in keeping with the conventional tone of academia. Their advice is well taken, and I apologize if my previous letter gave rise to misunderstandings and confusion. In particular, you should know that my speech and writings as a satirist and activist are completely different, in tone, style, and content, from my speech in the classroom.

I would be happy to meet with you, in public or in private, to discuss my teaching record and philosophy and my plans and syllabus for the fall section of Islam 370. I also hope to participate in scholarly debates about the evidence for and against the adequacy of the *9/11 Commission Report* -- debates which I believe will sooner or later change your opinion, and received opinion in general, about this gravely important matter.

Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

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

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: syncha [syncha@centurytel.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 9:27 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Statements made Wednesday, June 28, by Kevin Barrett, Give that him a salary increase, Kevin Barrett for President

Dear Mr. Farrell:

I applaud Kevin Barrett's statements. We still live in a free country? Universities are a bastions of free thought. What's the problem?

The 9/11 event is fishy.

- Bush continued reading a book when the US was "under attack"
- The precise demolition of the World Trade Center falling in upon it's foundation
- Jet fuel burning temperature can't melt steel (my local machine shop uses oxygen and acetylene not jet fuel to cut metal), etc.
- Complete failure of Military in preventing the attacks (now they are raking in billions)

Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1961 Military Industrial Complex speech he states: *"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist."* <http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/indust.html>

How many billions have we spent thus far on the war as a revenge for 9/11?

Hum $1 + 1 = 2$.

9/11 + emotionally charged government story of event = Mideast war/profits (Bush, Chaney and their buddies lining their pocket\$)

Thank God Kevin Barrett has the guts to tell the truth. Give that man a raise!! Kevin Barrett for President...

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Craig T. Furlong [cfurlong1@socal.rr.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 5:40 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett



image001.gif (8 KB)

Dear Mr. Farrell,

Before the Provost Office makes any decision regarding Mr. Barratt, please be sure to investigate what his statements are based upon.

They are truthful statements, and questions, about 9/11, and America is now finally waking up to them.

I personally believe conclusively that the US Government is responsible for 9/11. It was an "inside job".

The evidence is abundant, overwhelming, and in-fact, damning.

These treasonous murderers need to be brought to justice for these atrocities, the biggest crime in our nation's history.

And BTW, they are not through yet by any stretch of the imagination. These evil men, who are the real "terrorists", are now pushed into a corner because the truth about 9/11 is coming out fully now, and they will not go quietly into the night. They said after 9/11 that the "terrorists" will do it again...it's not a question of "if" but of "when". The only problem is they are the terrorists. Don't take my word for it. Look at this most recent of the plethora of videos on the internet:

<http://www.911podcasts.com/files/video/whatsthetruth/WTTver3.wmv>

And then go to the Scholars for 9/11 Truth website. <http://st911.org/>

All the "dirt" on them is right there to be had. BTW, FYI Kevin Barrett is a member of of Scholars

It is time for America to take back our country from this wicked cabal before it is too late. Mr. Farrall, I firmly

believe they are getting ready to use nuclear weapons on American cities very, VERY soon (the word "imminent" comes to mind because they are in a corner; and don't think they won't do it; they did 9/11 without even batting an eye).

I pray to God we get by OK on this coming Tuesday, 7/11 (these crazies are also fixated on numbers, and this next date seems / sounds errily bad to me for some reason; call it a feeling; anyway, they've got to do something quick [because "the wheels are starting to come off"]).

My trust is in the Lord Jesus Christ, so I am not worried. But I care about our people. I am 56, white, married, IQ 137, I have family I care about, I am an accountant, and I am POSITIVE this secret cabal, acting through the US Government, is responsible for 9/11 and aren't through with doing their evil by any stretch of the imagination.

WAIT FOR THE LORD

BE STRONG AND LET YOUR HEART TAKE COURAGE

YES WAIT FOR THE LORD

Craig T. Furlong
Huntington Beach, California...*Surf City USA!*

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jim Senyszyn [jnsenyszyn@insightbb.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 5:50 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Kevin Barrett
Subject: Letter to Provost Patrick V. Farrell in Defence of University of Wisconsin Lecturer Kevin Barrett



The 571-Page Lie - Colonel Georg
Griffin.doc... Nelson statement...

5804 N. Haymeadow Court Apt. 1A

Peoria, IL 61615-3156

July 8, 2006

Patrick V. Farrell
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison

150 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, WI 53706

Dear Provost Farrell,

I am writing to commend a lecturer, Dr. Kevin Barrett, whom I understand you are reviewing. Dr. Barrett gave a very erudite and informative talk here in Peoria, IL on March 4, 2006. More recently Dr. Barrett hosted an enthusiastic, capacity crowd at the Wisconsin Historical Society in Madison on May 6, 2006 for University of Wisconsin alumnus Morgan Reynolds who served as George W. Bush's Labor Department Chief Economist in 2001-2002.

On April 18, 2005 last year at the Madison campus he also organized a talk by Dr. David Ray Griffin, emeritus professor of religion and philosophy at the Claremont School of theology who has published over 25 books and 150 articles. Griffin's talk was broadcast on C-SPAN2 nationwide. You can view the lecture online as a Google video by clicking on <http://tinyurl.com/zfaa4>. Also attached is Dr. David Ray Griffin's outline "The 9/11 Commission Report: A 571-Page Lie" of his book "The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions" which he presented at his Madison lecture.

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

A lecture by Brigham Young University physics professor, Dr. Steven E. Jones, "9/11 Revisited: Scientific and Ethical Questions" at Utah Valley State University on February 1, 2006 can be viewed as a Google video by clicking on <http://tinyurl.com/z4c7g> , and links to the video and a power point presentation can be found at the Scholars for 9/11 Truth website, <http://www.st911.org>. In the lecture Dr. Jones examines the physics and chemistry of the straight down, speedy, and symmetrical collapses of the World Trade Center Towers and adjacent Building 7 and the very hot molten and partially evaporated metal found at the sites. According to Jones burning jet fuel would not have been hot enough and he advances the hypothesis that the buildings were brought down by explosive devices set off in precise sequences such as in "controlled demolitions" of old buildings. He also says that pulverized concrete and smoke plume "squibs" clearly seen shooting out the sides of the buildings are further evidence for the theory that explosives were used. Expert witnesses also say they heard several explosions before and during the collapses. He notes that the World Trade Center buildings would be the first high-rise steel frame buildings in history to ever collapse from fire and impact damage as claimed in the official 9/11 story. Fire Engineering magazine called the investigation "a half baked farce" and demanded a stop to the "destruction of evidence". He also criticizes the Environmental Protection Agency for deleting warnings about highly toxic dust from its reports. He claims that the "smoking gun" bin Laden confession tape of December 13, 2001 is a fake and finds it strange that the FBI admitted that the hijackers left no paper trail. Jones asks who knew about the hijackers before 9/11 and who allowed them to fly hijacked planes for 1.5 hours without them being intercepted and forced to land. Jones calls for the release of all data held back and for a truly independent investigation by a Watergate-style special prosecutor.

You can download a pamphlet "911 The Fairy Tale From Hell" by clicking on <http://www.tyrannyalert.com/800.html> and then clicking on the image of the pamphlet. It outlines some major critics of the official 911 story and the major points of their arguments.

Retired U.S. Airforce Colonel George Nelson's call for legally required National Traffic Safety Board (NTSB) investigations and reports on the four crashes which have been lacking up to this time is also attached.

Jim Senyszyn

email: jnsenyszyn@insighthbb.com

home phone: (309) 689-9772

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thanks for listening.

<http://populist-party.dailykos.com/storyonly/2006/3/28/23447/7167>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and Pakistan (122-25).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: tjdean@temple.edu
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 5:56 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: regarding Kevin Barrett



Letter to Editor
7.8.06.wpd (...)

Dear Provost Farrell,

As a professor emeritus and ex-department chairman (Dept of Religion, Temple University) and UW alum (B.A., Philosophy, 1958) now back in Madison, I have been following the controversy over Professor Kevin Barrett's views about the events of 9/11 and the questions this has raised in some quarters about his fitness to teach a UW course on Islam this fall.

Given the political pressures and interference the UW has had to contend with over the past year, and with the memory still fresh of State Rep. Steve Nass' attempt last year to have the lecture invitation to Ward Churchill at UW-Whitewater rescinded, the present case assumes even greater significance for a university administration and a faculty known for its commitment to and defense of academic freedom.

From Professor Barrett's remarks quoted in the Capital Times editorial this Wednesday, July 5th, it would seem that he not only welcomes your inquiry into his course plans, but fully understands his responsibility as a classroom instructor to make sure "all defensible sides of important issues" are fairly presented and that students should have the corresponding academic freedom to "make up their own minds."

If so, I am confident that you and other university officials and faculty who are looking into this matter will come to what can be the only right and proper decision--to honor the university's commitment to both academic freedom and its contract with Professor Barrett to teach his course this fall.

Respectfully yours,
Thomas J. Dean, Ph.D.

P.S. I have attached my "Letter to the Editor" sent earlier to the Capital Times in response to today's headline, "Gov casts doubts on UW teacher." A sad day for our state and our university.

Tom Dean
710 Blue Ridge Pkwy
Madison WI 53705-1146
tel: (608) 236-2147
fax: (608) 236-0530
email: tjdean@temple.edu

tctvoice@madison.com

July 8, 2006

Dear Editor: Gov. Doyle's suggestion that UW professor Kevin Barrett may not be fit to teach a course on Islam is not only saddening, it is deeply shocking and scary. It has cost the Governor my vote come November. That matters greatly to me. It's why I am so saddened.

But my individual vote is not what is important. It's not what I find so shocking and frightening. What matters more to me, as a retired university professor, are two other things.

First, that Doyle, whose duties should include protecting the academic freedom of the professors of the state's university, has in effect allied himself with a legislator like Steve Nass, who, despite being a university graduate himself, has once again shown himself incapable of understanding this fundamental value underlying all higher education. That is shocking.

Second, that Doyle, unlike Nass, whose political motivations are obvious, would have us believe his concern is not with Barrett's political views about 9/11, only with his "fitness to teach." How naive does the governor think we are? Why does he think the controversy arose in the first place? The stench of McCarthyism was already in the air. Now the governor has added his name. That is what's scary.

To be sure, Doyle, unlike Nass, says that it is the university's call, not his or any legislator's. But that is not enough to undo the damage he has done. That's why he will not get my vote this November.

Tom Dean
Madison

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Ron Rattner [ronrattner@earthlink.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 08, 2006 6:44 PM
Cc: Patrick V Farrell; Kevin Barrett; Walsh, David G.; mmcpike@tds.net; jbartell@quarles.com; mary.cuene@nwtc.edu; Elizabeth.burmaster@dpi.state.wi.us; danae@pearlsforteengirls.com; mbradley@ruderware.com; jesussalas25@yahoo.com; cmsemenas@hotmail.com; mjs@quarles.com; cpruit@abdata.com; ekeesler@new.rr.com; jvcrain@netnet.net; brent@johnsflaherty.com; board@uwsa.edu; prosey5@yahoo.com
Subject: "Common sense" confirms Dr. Kevin Barrett's fitness to teach at UW-Madison

Honorable Jim Doyle
Governor, State of Wisconsin

Re: "Common sense" confirms Dr. Kevin Barrett's fitness to teach at UW-Madison

Dear Governor Doyle:

As a McCarthy era UW-Madison graduate and retired lawyer, I am deeply troubled by UW-Madison's politically instigated academic "review" of Dr. Barrett, and by your widely publicized recent press statements criticizing him. When teachers are intimidated against seeking and speaking truth on a campus renowned for its liberal and progressive traditions, we are in trouble.

You reportedly questioned Dr. Barrett's fitness to teach, contending that "it isn't a question so much of academic freedoms" but of Dr. Barrett's "irrational" and "off the wall ideas" about what "we all saw [happen] on September 11". You told reporters that **"to say what we saw wasn't true just defies common sense."**

Never in the history of planet Earth has a well designed and constructed steel skyscraper been rapidly destroyed by fire, either before or since September 11, 2001. However, we are officially told that - contrary to the laws of physics - on 9/11 three such buildings were quickly destroyed by jet fuel fires, including WTC 7 which wasn't even hit by an airplane and had only a few small fires prior to its amazing 'free fall' collapse. But jet fuel doesn't burn hot enough to melt steel.

Never in the history of planet Earth has a large skyscraper collapsed on it's foundation at virtual 'freefall' velocity, except by controlled demolition using carefully pre-positioned explosives. But we are asked to believe that on 9/11 this happened sequentially to three such buildings, despite overwhelming contrary evidence, including compelling photographic evidence, credible eye witness testimony of multiple explosions, long lasting molten steel, and results of recent scientific tests on steel debris (salvaged before it was sent off to Asia) confirming that the steel was cut by thermate explosives.

Yet, official 9/11 explanations disregard history, don't discuss explosives, are contradicted by the laws of physics, and don't even mention WTC 7. So, I respectfully suggest that, rather than contradicting Dr. Barrett, "common sense" has impelled him - together with millions of other patriotic Americans - to question the Government, and to seek the whole truth. Thus, Dr. Barrett's outspoken challenge to the official 9/11 explanation is not "irrational" or "off the wall" but based upon the highest patriotic traditions of "common sense".

In 1776, Thomas Payne's widely read pamphlet **"Common Sense"**, denouncing British rule, was the rhetorical force which started the Revolutionary War and inspired Jefferson's drafting of the Declaration of Independence. Payne's anti-authoritarian words then, ring true today. Particularly apt

are these: "A long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defense of custom." Though Americans customarily trust their government, when official doctrine is clearly contradicted by the laws of physics and by "common sense", patriots like Dr. Barrett are morally impelled to challenge authoritarian leaders, and to tell truth to power.

Thus, "common sense" confirms Dr. Barrett's fitness to teach at UW-Madison. Moreover, the Bill of Rights and UW's long progressive tradition of honoring academic freedom in steadfast pursuit of truth, demand that he be free to seek and speak truth, without undue political or academic interference. Universities are for inquiries, not inquisitions. To remain a great academic institution, UW must operate in the tradition of La Follette, not McCarthy.

Respectfully,

Ron Rattner,
San Francisco

cc. Kevin Barrett, Board of Regents, Provost Patrick V. Farrell

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: anonymous.89ed1ab0e9@anonymousSpeech.com
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 7:32 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Counter-argument?

Can you provide a convincing physics-based counter-argument?

Paper:

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

Lecture:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=964034652002408586>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Kristi V. Thorson [kthorson@bascom.wisc.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 8:45 PM
To: Don Nelson; atoburen@wisc.edu; dchaptman@wisc.edu
Cc: Casey Nagy; DDL@bascom.wisc.edu; John Wiley; Gary Sandefur;
pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; choomstra@vc.wisc.edu; jdowling@vc.wisc.edu;
bsmattmi@wisc.edu; etinoway@wisc.edu; jplucas@wisc.edu; racelley@wisc.edu
Subject: Re: barrett at uw-milw

I agree it looks good. I imagine Don & I - and others - will be asked how we will monitor his class to make sure he does what he is telling us he is going to do. Any suggestions for a response?

Thanks all -
Kristi

Kristi V. Thorson
Assistant Director, State Relations
University of Wisconsin-Madison
608/262-4809
kthorson@bascom.wisc.edu
www.staterelations.wisc.edu
>>> Don Nelson 07/09/06 6:18 PM >>>
The release looks very good.

Don Nelson
Assistant Director, State Relations
Office of the Chancellor
University of Wisconsin - Madison
96 Bascom Hall
608-265-4105 office
608-217-5110 cell
dwnelson@bascom.wisc.edu
www.staterelations.wisc.edu
>>> Gary Sandefur 07/09/06 5:50 PM >>>
Dennis,

This is a great release. Pat and all of you should be proud of the approach that the University is taking.

Cheers,

Gary

Dean, College of Letters and Science
University of Wisconsin-Madison
105 South Hall
1055 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706-1394
608-263-2303
Fax: 608-265-3564
>>> Dennis Chaptman <dchaptman@wisc.edu> 07/09/06 4:22 PM >>>
As promised, here is the draft release. I am off on Monday, making a college visit with my high school-aged daughter. Please let Amy know about any concerns or suggestions.

Thanks,
Dennis

Dennis

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

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Nancy in Birmingham [cather39@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 12:09 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Dr. Kevin Barrett is an asset to the University of Wisconsin

Dear Provost Farrell:

In reference to the situation with Dr. Kevin Barrett, co-founder of the Muslim Jewish Christian Alliance for 9/11 Truth, in his position as lecturer and instructor at the University of Wisconsin: Barrett is obviously knowledgeable in his field. It is apparent that he maintains current interest by his being a founder of MUJCA – an organization formed for several religions to work together toward understanding and truth regarding a problem they have in common..

The three religions represented in MUJCA are pitted world-wide against each other, based on the attack of September 11, 2001 and subsequent events arising from that. All three groups are victims of deceitful political machinations resulting in the loss of tens of thousands of lives.

The search for 9/11 truth continues and the number of doubters of the official story is ever-increasing. Before you would allow an excellent instructor to be lost to your state's university and to its students, would it not be wiser to investigate the official story for yourself and convince him that his view is unreasonable? Barrett has been called "irrational" and efforts are being made to have him fired – based only on disagreement with his view and his search for truth. So far, those who have commented on the situation have reverted to the feeble (though popular!) technique of attacking the person while evading the issue. According to what I have read, yours is the only voice of reason.

How can university students exercise critical thinking if they are exposed to only one view? In the interest of representative democracy and free speech, it is of utmost importance that they be exposed to multiple views. If all we need do is adhere to a "party line," are we not succumbing to the very policy we condemned in our recently departed cold war enemy?

I repeat to you what I wrote to Rep. Nass: Supporting freedom of speech for those with whom one disagrees is a most excellent characteristic of patriotism.

Sincerely,

Nancy Bracewell, M.Ed.
Birmingham, Alabama

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: jeff111@pacbell.net
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 5:59 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Please respect Kevin Barrett's freedom of opinion

Dear Provost Farrell:

Please respect Kevin Barrett's freedom of opinion. Also, please use the same standards for Dr. Barrett and this issue, as for other instructors and other issues.

Please respect freedom of speech in this country. Please do not fire Dr. Barrett because of political pressure.

Thank you,

Jeffrey Schwartz

San Francisco

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: David J Gaines [djgaines1@juno.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 6:20 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Having read a number of Kevin Barrett's highly intelligent essays, I support his qualifications for teaching. Those who call for his firing appear to be quite uninformed on the subject of 9/11.

David J. Gaines

Desert Hot Springs, CA

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Michael Marino [mm@svn.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 7:10 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Dr. Kevin Barrett

July 9, 2006

Dear Mr. Farrell:

I'm writing to ask that you refuse Mr. Nass' request to fire Dr. Barrett. The important and controversial issues that Dr. Barrett has spoken of publically are shared by many other men, including Dr. Steven Jones of the Physics Department at Brigham Young University. 9/11 is a very troublesome issue, but firing Dr. Barrett for talking openly in a peaceful way is not conducive to the goals of higher education, or the standards of UW. The many members of the Scholars for 9/11 Truth all stand behind Dr. Kevin Barrett, and I hope you will too. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Marino
California

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: aw2247 [aw2247@armorware.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 5:06 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: re: Professor Barrett

Dear Provost Farrell,

42% of American People, according to a recent Zogby poll, believe there's been a coverup of 9/11. Dr. Barrett's views are outspoken for 9/11 Truth, based on his research of the evidence (much of it being ignored by the three major official studies of 9/11--FEMA, NIST, and the 9/11 Commission). Muslims everywhere have been scapegoated as being responsible for that attacks; much evidence suggests otherwise. Please support this courageous professor; academic freedom is the essence of democracy. Barrett is courageous and responsible to the truth. The truth has to be the mission of any institution of learning.

Thanks for your consideration.

AW

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Richard Lowe [richardclowe@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 8:10 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dr. Farrell,

I wish that more of my university professors demonstrated the courage, passion, and commitment to principle that Dr. Kevin Barrett has recently shown.

The decision you make is going to reverberate through this country; indeed, you are setting a precedent. I hope you do the right thing: Take a stand for Dr. Barrett and others like him when you're lucky enough to have them on your team.

Sincerely,

Richard Lowe
New Orleans, La.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Doug Johnson [paxman@mhtc.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 8:14 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Freedom of speech/opinion

Dear sir

In regards to statements and opinions made by Kevin Barrett, I implore you to not only allow him to continue to teach, but to also encourage his questioning the official version of the events of 9-11-01. This is an american issue, many of the most outspoken critics of the official version are conservative. This is not some liberal rant. Many of the victims families of 911 want these same questions answered. In the last 5 years if watched our country erode away under the Bush administration and the silence of the Democrats. Someone has to stand up to these criminals and ask for accountability. Not just for 911 incompitance and possible complicity, but for lies leading to war, energy policies designed by the corporations, outing a CIA officer, and on and on. We the people need to take a stand and Kevin is doing just that. Without freedom of speech we as a country are through. Please do the right thing and decide in Mr Barretts favor.

Regards Doug Johnson
10691 Mayflower rd
Blue Mounds WI 53517

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: David Chen [dave@chen.name]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 8:18 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: dave@chen.name
Subject: Dr. Kevin Barrett's views on 9/11

Dear Provost Patrick Farrell,

I am writing to defend Dr. Kevin Barrett's academic freedom, with regard to his views on 9/11.

In my opinion, instead of dismissal or censure, a more appropriate response would be to hold a debate on the issue of 9/11. If his views are absurd, as Rep. Nass has stated recently, it would be best if it was demonstrated in a public debate. Such public discourse demonstrates a greater commitment to academic freedom, as well as discouraging an environment of fear.

Contrary to what Representative Nass has stated in the media, Barrett's views are far from "fringe". The list of people who question the official story on 9/11 includes prominent members of government, including Former German Defense Minister Andreas Von Buelow (<http://www.lawyersagainsthewar.org/articles/buelow.html>), British MP Michael Meacher (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,1036571,00.html>). In a recent Zogby poll (<http://www.zogby.com/features/features.dbm?ID=231>), 42% of poll respondents believe that the US government is covering up 9/11, and that there should be a new investigation.

There is also a group of scholars who have formed an organization Scholars for 9/11 Truth (<http://www.st911.org>). The list of members includes physicist Steven Jones (<http://www.physics.byu.edu/research/energy/htm7.html>), theologian David Ray Griffin (<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/1566565529/002-4023427-1557628?v=glance&n=283155>), Mechanical Engineering professor Judy Wood (<http://www.teamliberty.net/id252.html>), and numerous others. In addition, many family members of the 9/11 victims (such as Bill Doyle and Ellen Mariani) have expressed doubt regarding the 9/11 story.

I ask you to help preserve academic freedom, regardless of one's views on 9/11.

Thank you,

David Chen
dave@chen.name
917-517-2767

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Russ [like7new@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 8:37 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Academic Integrity

Dear Dr. Farrel,
Professor Kevin Barret deserves to be treated with respect for his views. According to a recent Zogby poll, 70 million United States citizens disbelieve the official story of the events of September 11, 2001. I have been active in the September 11 truth movement since September 12, 2001. I challenge you to examine the material available from Dr Stephen Jones at Scholars for 911 Truth, www.st911.org.

The truth of 911 is rapidly reaching critical mass. Like the assassination of President Kennedy, the majority of United States citizens will not believe the official story. Unlike the assassination of President Kennedy, the effects of September 11, 2001 have affected every US citizen on a direct, deeply personal level. A public reaction is building.

Hitler's 1933 Reichstag fire was an event similar to 911. I hope that your academic integrity is above the level of Hitler's supporters. You can expect support and friendship from the millions of us in the 911 truth movement if you chose to do the right thing.

Thank you,
Russ Hallberg
Portland, Oregon

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: STEVE DONDANVILLE [steve2446@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 9:07 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Dr. Kevin Barret

Dear Mr. Farrell,

I am writing to encourage you to support the continued employment of Dr. Kevin Barret. I have heard Mr. Barret speak many times and have always been impressed with his high level of integrity. Never have I heard him characterize his personal endeavors regarding the issues of 9/11 as anything other than an attempt to educate. He faithfully listens to the questions of others and responds in a thought provoking, honest manner, always sticking to demonstrable facts, never demanding acquiescence.

Clearly, when over 40% of the US population feels that we need to have another, independent investigation of the events of 9/11, it is reasonable to bring this issue of for discussion in a college course. Surely we can trust our college students to have the critical thinking skills needed to make informed decisions about the information at hand. It is interesting to me to note that the people who are raising questions are people who have a political agenda, not people who have worked with or been under the tutelage of Dr. Barret. Unless and until there are student/faculty complaints about his methods/materials, then this should be a non-issue.

The University's diversity statement extols the importance of nurturing diversity. Please act in the spirit of your stated goal and allow Dr. Barret to continue his teaching career at the University of Wisconsin.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Dondanville

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: dhailer@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 9:19 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Patrick Farrell,

Please support Kevin Barrett. Regardless of how you feel about the 9/11 Truth Movement, universities should never shy away from controversial ideas. In fact the University should sponsor a public debate about the controversy.

Thank you,
David Hailer
Shoreview, MN

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: cb_brooklyn@nycmail.com
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 10:29 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Regarding Kevin Barrett

Dear Dr Farrell:

I ask you to use the same standards for Dr Barrett and his 9/11 opinions as you would for other instructors with other issues.

Rep Nass' comment calling Barrett's opinions "absurd" was completely uncalled for, as proven by this national Zogby poll about 9/11: <http://www.zogby.com/features/features.dbm?ID=231>

According to the poll, 45% of Americans want a new 9/11 investigation, including possible involvement of government officials in the attacks.

As you have a PhD in mechanical engineering, you should understand Mechanical Engineering Professor Judy Wood's (Clemson University) scientific findings of the collapse of the World Trade Center: <http://janedoe0911.tripod.com/BilliardBalls.html>

Professor Wood explains her paper in this two-hour interview:
http://mp3.rbnlive.com/Fetzer/0606/20060629_Thu_Fetzer1.mp3
http://mp3.rbnlive.com/Fetzer/0606/20060629_Thu_Fetzer2.mp3

Dr Wood does not consider alternate opinions of 9/11 absurd.

Neither does former Chief Economist of the Dept of Labor (in GWB's first term) Dr Morgan Reynolds, nor does former Director of the Star Wars program and retired USAF Lt Col Dr Robert Bowman, both of whom have publicly said that 9/11 was an inside job.

Even Elsevier, a top book publisher, is releasing this volume:
<http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0762313056>

Again, I urge you to judge Dr Barrett and his comments the same as all other instructors.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
CB
Brooklyn NY
USA

--

Play 100s of games for FREE! <http://games.mail.com/>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Khalil York [khalilyork@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2006 11:03 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Freedom of political and religious views

Mr Farrell,

I am writing in regards to the controversy dealing with Kevin Barrett. I find it amazing that a mans religious and political beliefs would be held against him in this great country of ours founded on the rights of FREEDOM of these issues! I hope you make the right decision and allow this man his due right to earn a living regardless of his religious or political views. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely
Khalil York

Do you Yahoo!?
Everyone is raving about the [all-new Yahoo! Mail Beta](#).

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Dave Cutler [ds_cutler@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 2:09 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Please Don't Fire Prof. Kevin Barret

Prof. Kevin Barret has every right to state his opinions on 911. How dare people try to stop free speech!! These idiots should be fired for trying to take away our right of free speech.

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

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 9:50 AM
To: Ron Rattner
Cc: Patrick Farrell; [REDACTED] mtwohey@journalsentinel.com
Subject: response to Megan's Journal-Sentinel article

Yes, thanks Megan (and Ron),

I'll try to remember to comb my hair next time ;) And I'm sorry I missed the chance to take your follow-up questions, Megan. Good article overall.

One issue that arose in the headline and reverberated throughout the article needs to be addressed.

Headline: "**his 9/11 teachings**" makes it sound like I am teaching my personal view of 9/11 in class as if it were the truth, the way a physics teacher would teach the law of gravity. This is false. If you look at my syllabus, which you can find on Jessica McBride's website, you'll see that readings that strongly support the official view of 9/11 and the war on terror greatly outweigh those that question it. The book *No God But God* strongly supports the official view -- indeed the book's whole argument is built around it. Readings by Lewis and Esposito also strongly support the official view. And Huntington supports it implicitly. The articles by Ahmed and Masud question the official view of the war on terror, but neither explicitly argues that 9/11 was an inside job (though the evidence they discuss could lead to that conclusion). In short, I am assigning roughly 400 pages of reading that support the official view, versus two essays adding up to perhaps 80 pages that question it--and those two essays make no claim about what really happened on 9/11/01. The two essays that critique the official view of 9/11 occur during only one week of the fifteen weeks. I will, of course, do my utmost to be fair to all points of view that can be considered defensible within the context of the discipline, including the dominant American interpretations of 9/11 and the so-called war on terror. (That is how it is referred to on al-Jazeera and in Arabic news in general -- the **so-called** war on terror.) I am including the perspectives of Ahmed and Masud because they represent the view of the great majority of the world's Muslims, and the course is designed in part to help students "get inside" the Muslim worldview/worldviews in various ways.

This would be a laudable goal even from a "know your enemy" perspective. One of the things that made me question the official account of 9/11 was watching a debate between "conspiracy theorist" Thierry Meyssan and a Pentagon spokesperson on al-Jazeera in October, 2003. The Pentagon guy was completely clueless about the mind-set of the audience he was addressing. He thought that using ridicule and insults to attack "crazy conspiracy theorists" would work on al-Jazeera's audience. He apparently didn't realize that the vast majority of the audience took that as an insult and reacted with hostility! At the beginning of the show, the on-line poll was running 75% say the US government did 9/11, 25% say it was al-Qaida. By the end of the show it was 89%-11%.

If my Islam 370 students finish my course completely clueless about the way Muslims see the world, I will have failed. In the long run, if Americans continue to ignore the worldviews of others, America will fail.

Kevin Barrett

8/10/2006

On Jul 10, 2006, at 1:19 AM, Ron Rattner wrote:

Dear Megan Twohey,

Thanks again for your excellent journalism and continuing coverage of this important academic freedom issue.

Sincerely,

Ron Rattner, San Francisco

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: KeeperRichEarth [KeeperRichEarth@netwurx.net]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 7:44 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Mr Barrett regarding intellectual freedom
Importance: High

July 10, 2006
N7886 County Hwy X
Watertown, WI 53094
920-262-0602

UW Provost Partick Farrell
608-262-1304

Dear Provost Farrell:

Hope your day is going well.

I have a concern to share with you regarding the situation of Mr. Barrett, his relationship to the UW, and his comments regarding 9-11 Truth.

Earlier today my call was transferred after I learned that you were in a meeting. Please commend everyone I spoke with as all were friendly and professional. My conversation with Mr. Brian Mattmiller was especially fruitful and pleasant.

Here is my "nutshell" summary. UW has a long tradition of intellectual freedom. That's why I graduated from the system. That's why my daughter is now a sophomore at UW, and that is why I hope my junior in high school may attend UW next year. Recently we were visiting campus and came across the sign, "If not now when, If not you, who." It was extremely appropriate to this moment.

Intellectual freedom requires both the courage of and support from administration. Certainly, no one should be promoting their personal opinion as gospel. However Mr. Barrett's statements regarding 911 are not as outlandish as most typical politicians would lead the public to believe. It is unfortunate that most elected officials do not better understand their duty to question formal government as part of their responsibility to represent the rights of citizens. A majority of New York city and state residents do not accept the official government version as accurate. Zogby polls also indicate a high percentage of uncertainty in the general public. That is astounding given their limited knowledge and information from embedded media. Here are two Zogby articles: <http://www.911truth.org/images/911TruthZogbyPollFinalReport>
<http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=855>

It is the moral responsibility of educators, and as citizens, it is our constitutional duty to democracy, to discuss all ideas. I would be incredibly disappointed if the UW did not remain true to its tradition of intellectual freedom. I understand you took a breath, and a step back to consider this issue. I know you depend upon legislators, (who continually under fund

8/10/2006

education), for much of your budget. But those things will work themselves out when the worm turns. In the meantime I dearly hope your decision will uphold Mr. Barrett's right to present all sides of an issue; especially those less popular with those in power.

Thank you for the time.

best wishes,

Bill Reichertz

Ps. I have read the UW press release sent by Mr. Mattmiller. Bless you both for the clarity and insight with which you undertook the review and for the decision you took. My opinion of our flagship educational institution has increased.

Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.
Martin Luther King Jr.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jill Pitterle [dpitterle@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 11:57 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Please remove Kevin Barrett

Dear Patrick Farrell,

My daughter will be attending UW Madison this fall. We are excited about the opportunity for her at this wonderful university.

Kevin Barrett should not be affiliated in any way with the great University of Wisconsin - Madison. His ideas are protected in a public forum, but they have no basis in the study of Islam. Kevin Barrett has ideas that only appeal to a very narrow fringe of the US population. He is welcome to lecture to his followers. He has embarrassed the University and revealed that he really has overrode any of his prior credentials. Kevin Barrett is no longer credible and needs to be removed from the University of Wisconsin - Madison.

There are many very qualified instructors in the Study of Islam. Please initiate the talent search immediately.

Thank you.

Daniel Pitterle
15430 Oak Lane
Brookfield WI 53005
dpitterle@sbcglobal.net

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: seth friedman [friedman_seth@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 11:49 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: not about "unpopular ideas"

Dear Mr. Farrell,

The entire issue surrounding the appointment of Kevin Barrett as an instructor at your school has absolutely nothing to do with freedom of expression, or your standing up to pressure to shut down unpopular ideas. It has everything to do with stupidity, poor scholarship, and a total lack of any ability on his part to understand history, society, culture and religion. To allow this man a platform to spew his stupidity goes along way to highlighting to "level" of academic rigor that your school has sunk too.

Sincerely,

Seth Friedman
White Plains, NY

Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Make PC-to-Phone Calls to the US (and 30+ countries) for 2¢/min or less.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Thomas Rippe [rippe@usc.edu]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 10:16 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: I support the UW decision on Kevin Barrett

Dear Provost Farrell,

I am a UW alum ('95, BA History and Philosophy) and I wanted to take a moment to show my support for UW's decision not to bow to public or political pressure over Kevin Barrett. I don't agree with what Mr. Barrett has to say, but I support his right say it. Today, as always, I am proud to be a Badger.

Sincerely,

Thomas Rippe
Master's Candidate in Journalism
University of Southern California
3939 Veselich Ave. #125
Los Angeles, CA 90039
323-445-9465

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: John and Annmarie Fonzo [j.j.fonzo@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 9:59 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Hi!

Saw your Kevin Barrett on FOX this nite. Where did you ever find that guy? Who in the Provost Office does he have in his pocket? He not only is a sicko, but he could'nt even debate Hillary Clinton! If I was the president of WU I'd be looking for some body's butt to hang, first starting in the PROVOST OFFICE with the one who approved Barrett's agenda. Eat cheese!

JOHN AND ANNMARIE

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: matthewhine@comcast.net
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 9:45 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Medical director providing evidence - Barrett

July 10, 2006

Dear Dr. Farrell,

I am a former medical director for the United States Postal Service who began researching the events surrounding September 11, 2001 as a result of my professional interest in the anthrax attacks that killed several Postal workers.

I am one of the approximately 45% of Americans (per Zogby poll) that believes the government's official account of those events is false.

I am writing you because of the controversy regarding Kevin Barrett. Mr. Barrett has taken a position that is unpopular among a minority of very vocal opponents. I understand he wishes to engage students in a critical examination of the events of 9/11/01. I urge you to support academic freedom.

I understand you are a mechanical engineer, and you may also have some knowledge of structural engineering. As such, you will find a video on the topic of the controlled demolitions of the world trade center buildings (twin towers and building 7) very interesting.

I am sending you a copy of a DVD on this issue by snail mail. In the meantime, you may view the video at <http://www.911TrueStory.com>

Feel free to contract me if you would like further information.

Yours truly,

Matthew Hine, M.D., M.P.H., F.A.C.P.M.

706 Mississippi Ave.

Chattanooga, TN 37405

(423) 294-3094

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jane Allen [jallen@iwi.net]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 9:17 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dr. Farrell:

I just watched Dr. Barrett on Fox News tonight and I must say that he is without doubt an absolute lunatic. His science is wrong and his conspiracy theories are absolute fantasy.

Your university should immediately review its hiring practices if this is an example of the staff which you have assembled. Everybody is entitled to their own personal views however you have put this Dr. Barrett in a teaching position.

Regards,

Byron Allen
Houston, Texas

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: marian marek [marek48809@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 9:09 PM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Subject: Kevin Barrett is not an educator

Dear Patrick Farrell,

I would like to challenge you and your decision to continue to employ Kevin Barrett as an instructor. His statements concerning the attack on 9/11 and his derogatory remarks about the planes that hit the World Trade Center Buildings. He not only has a different point of view, **HE HAS The TYPICAL LIBERAL BRAIN that fits right into The University of Wisconsin Staff!** His statements are an **INSULT** to all the innocent people that died on that fateful day! **SHAME ON YOU and SHAME ON YOUR LOW STANDARDS OF ACADEMIC QUALITY!!!!**

Marian Marek

Yahoo! Messenger with Voice. Make PC-to-Phone Calls to the US (and 30+ countries) for 2¢/min or less.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Richard Rhodes [r7292@rcn.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 8:59 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Richard Rhodes

Academic freedom and open discussion is great. Except when you allow a very loud mouth nut to teach students. If Kevin Barrett wants to lecture people on his absurd views he should be doing it off campus. There are people running around who claim Hitler never killed any jews. Are you going to let them teach. He is teaching kids who are very naive about the world. You think these kids are all adults. Far from it. And if his views on 9/11 are so crazy how do you know he is teaching the truth about Islam. These are his views also. If you believe in academic freedom you should also have someone giving these students a different view on 9/11 than his. I believe you would agree to let someone come in to teach who claims that the government created hurricane Katrina.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Douglas Hudson [dah10408@msn.com]

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 8:53 PM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Subject: Barrett

Why would you allow that creep Barrett to even be on campus? I usually contribute to the University, but NO MORE! D.A.Hudson

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Betty Ferris [bjferris@cheqnet.net]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 8:37 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Academic Freedom

Dear Patrick Farrell

I am writing to thank you for the way you handled the Kevin Barrett situation and for having the wisdom and courage to uphold the great tradition of academic freedom which has characterized the University of Wisconsin for over 100 years.

Although you are obviously well acquainted with the famous bronze 'sifting and winnowing' plaque placed on Bascom Hall as a gift from the Class of 1910 in honor of the UW Board of Regents' affirmation of academic freedom in the 1894 trial of Professor Richard Ely, you may not have had an opportunity to read Theodore Herfurth's 1948 account of the events or see Richard Ely's letter attributing authorship of the legendary statement to Charles Adams.

Both can be found on the Wisconsin Electronic Reader website which was created by UW-Madison Libraries and the Wisconsin Historical Society as part of Wisconsin's 1998 Sesquicentennial celebration. Below is a link to both documents for your convenience.

<http://www.library.wisc.edu/etext/WIReader/Contents/Sifting.html>

Thanks again for 'walking the talk'.
Keep up the good work!

Encouragingly,

Betty Ferris
310 E. 3rd St
Washburn, Wisconsin 54891