

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Wtcqd2000@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 11:17 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Provost Patrick Farrell, thank you

Dear Provost Patrick Farrell,

I want to thank you for not interfering with Kevin Barretts ability to offer a range of facts on the issue of 9/11. Having researched this issue myself, I have a great deal of respect for his work on this. And I believe that the intergrity of our democracy depends on preventing political figures from censoring and limiting the breadth of facts and ideas that educators can discuss.

I am a writer and columnist, and have included a column I've recently written on this issue, which questions the sanity of how our media is dealing with questions regarding such an important event as 9/11/2001.

Warmest regards,

Bill Douglas, Kansas City, Kansas

Exposing the 9/11 Conspiracy Wingnuts

by Bill Douglas, author of "The Amateur Parent - A Book on Life, Death, War & Peace, and Everything Else in the Universe"

I began researching the mainstream media coverage of the controversy regarding the attacks of 9/11/2001, when reading an article in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Newspaper, dated June 29th, 2006. It was titled, "Sept. 11 claim stirs UW probe -- Instructor says U.S. planned the attacks to provoke war." This led to my discovery of some wild conspiracy theorists that endanger our government and media establishments, with quite frankly insane assertions. I'll address this in full in the final paragraph.

Then by using a "google video 9/11" search, I recently viewed a FOX News interview on Hannity and Colmes with an Arab Studies teacher from the University of Wisconsin named Kevin Barrett. I had earlier seen an interview with another, a professor named James Fetzer, University of Minnesota Duluth. A few weeks earlier I had seen an interview on MSNBC Scarborough country interviewing a Mike Berger representing 911Truth.org.

Some of these guests referred to an organization called "Scholars for 9/11 Truth" with a website www.st911.org, which offered a physics research paper questioning the official explanation of the events of 9/11/2001. While visiting this site, I read that they pointed to the temperatures of the fires in the WTC buildings, and construction of the buildings, and the speed they fell, as evidence they claimed proved that what we saw on 9/11/2001 when the towers fell had to have been the result of a controlled demolition. Like the ones we've seen with Las Vegas hotels being brought down. Their claim was that the WTC buildings could not have been caused solely by the aircraft hitting the WTC buildings that day.

Then, I contacted the office of a Wisconsin State Legislator, Rep. Stephen Nass (R-Whitewater), and asked to speak to someone in the office who could speak on this issue. I asked if he was familiar with the Scholars for 9/11 Truth website, and he replied they had learned of it this week. I asked him if he and the Representative could comment on the charge that the fires on 9/11/2001

in the WTC buildings did not burn hot enough to bring down the buildings, and if he'd read the scholars organization's charge that thermate traces had been found on debris from the fallen towers (thermate indicating demolition type explosives were involved). The gentleman responded that no, they had not looked at this information, and this would not be something they would look at, further indicating that anyone who made such charges was blinded by their hatred of President Bush.

Which leads back to the interviews of guests on the three television news programs. The main theme of all three of the guests on these programs appeared to be concern of the physical evidence of 9/11/2001, mentioned above and particularly regarding the collapse of three of the World Trade Center buildings on that day.

The main themes of the interviewers on these programs appeared to be two-fold:
1) The guests were representing a fringe movement, and most Americans do not dispute the official 9/11 explanation of the 19 hijackers defeating US military and intelligence forces on 9/11/2001.
2) The guests and those they speak for, who question the official 9/11/2001 account, are of questionable sanity

This motivated me to do some research. First I looked at the fringe movement issue that the majority of Americans disagreed with the programs guests and accept the official explanation, and secondly, the sanity and expertise of people like their guests who question the official story of 9/11/2001.

First, regarding the fringe issue, asserting that the guests questioning the events of 9/11 reflected a small minority of American opinion. I looked at the only polls I could find on these questions, and the results were surprising.

A CNN viewers poll, which is not scientific, held Wednesday, November 10th, 2005, asked, "Do you believe there is a U.S. government cover-up surrounding 9/11?" 89% replied "Yes," they did believe there was a cover-up by the U.S. Government (9,441 votes), while only 12% felt there was no cover-up. In a national Zogby poll, of May 2006, found that 45% of the American public felt a new 9/11 investigation should be launched because "so many unanswered questions about 9/11 remain that Congress or an International Tribunal should re-investigate the attacks, including whether any US government officials consciously allowed or helped facilitate their success." An earlier Zogby poll of New York City residents, from August of 2004, found that Half (49.3%) of New Yorkers felt that U.S. government officials "knew in advance that attacks were planned on or around September 11, 2001, and that they consciously failed to act." While 66% of New Yorkers called for a new probe of Unanswered Questions by Congress or New York's Attorney General."

Now to the second issue the television media interviewers were most concerned with, which was the expertise and sanity of the people demanding a new 9/11 investigation, and some even suggesting possible U.S. government complicity in the attacks of 9/11/2001. Again, a simple google "video 9/11" search, provided a wealth of information. This too yielded some surprising results.

One of the loudest advocates of the most damning charge that "members of the U.S. government actually orchestrated the events of 9/11 to fool the nation into unpopular wars", was not a tree-hugging Green Party activist, but rather a prominent Republican, in fact a Former Chief Economist under George Bush, and professor at Texas A&M, Morgan Reynolds.
<http://www.lewrockwell.com/reynolds/reynolds12.html>

Google research of the growing list of other 9/11 skeptics of the official story, some "convinced of U.S. government involvement," while others not going that far, but pointing out that "the official story is highly questionable and demands further investigation," yielded surprising results. Including a host of high level Republican administration officials, defense experts, intelligence experts, and respected scholars, as well as well known celebrities who are now adding the spotlight of their names to the issue of 9/11. Among them were:

Former Director of Advanced Space Programs Development for the U.S. Air Force, under President Reagan, and combat fighter pilot Col. Robert Bowman (Caltech Phd in aeronautics and nuclear engineering).
<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-6900065571556128674>

Former CIA Intelligence Advisor to Reagan and George HW Bush and founder of the Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity, Ray McGovern
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Researchers_questioning_the_official_account_of_9/11

Kevin Ryan, former department head at UL (Underwriter Laboratories) the company which certified the steel which went into the WTCs upon their construction, and inspected it after the WTC collapses in 2001. <http://www.911truth.org/article.php?story=20041112144051451>

Former assistant secretary of the U.S. Treasury Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Research Fellow at Stanford's Independent Institute, and former associate editor of the Wall Street Journal, Paul Craig Roberts
<http://www.wanttoknow.info/050908insidejob911#roberts>

Canadian National Defense Minister, the Honourable Paul Hellyer
<http://www.septembereleventh.org/kc/multimedia/movies/Hellyer.mov>

Minister for the Environment, and Member of Parliament (United Kingdom)
Michael Meacher <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8274552561914055825>

National Minister of Defense (Germany). Also, served as Minister of Technology Andreas Von Bulow <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=8274552561914055825>

Former Chief of Staff of the Russian armed forces, and chief of the department for General affairs in the Soviet Union 's ministry of Defense, General Leonid Ivashov
<http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=viewArticle&code=NIM20060123&articleId=1788>

Former MI6 British Counter Intelligence Officer, David Shayler
<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-5403286136814574974>

Distinguished McKnight University Professor of Philosophy at the University of Minnesota, former Marine Corps officer, author or editor of more than 20 books, and co-chair of Scholars For 9/11 Truth, James Fetzer
<http://www.911podcasts.com/display.php?vid=122>

Professor of Physics, Brigham Young University, and co-chair of Scholars For 9/11 Truth, Steven Jones <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=964034652002408586>

Emeritus Professor of Philosophy of Religion & Theology, Claremont Graduate University, and author or editor of some 30 books, including "The New Pearl Harbor" and "The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions"
David Ray Griffin
<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=6837001821567284154>

Professor of mathematics, University of Western Ontario, and founder of the Scientific Panel Investigating Nine-Eleven (SPINE), A.K Dewdney
http://www.serendipity.li/wot/operation_pearl.htm
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A._K._Dewdney

Aircraft crash investigation authority, USAF Col. (Ret) George Nelson
<http://www.physics911.net/georgenelson.htm>

Former chief Pentagon arms negotiator for the Middle East, USAF Col. (Ret) Don de Grand-Pre
<http://www.prisonplanet.com/022904degrand.html>

Actor Charlie Sheen (Platoon, Wall Street, etc.)

<http://prisonplanet.com/articles/june2006/280606juggernautoftruth.htm>

Actor, Ed Asner <http://www.911blimp.net/videos/EdAsner-UnityIsTheKey.mov>

Actor, Ed Begley, Jr <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-7140359934129245752>

So, now that we've examined the two main issues of concern for the television news interviewers, which was the "fringe" aspect of the questioners, and the "sanity/expertise" issue, it appears those arguments are very weak arguments, really with no merit at all. Obviously tens of millions of Americans, according to polls, want a new investigation into 9/11/2001 and have a strong suspicion of U.S. government involvement at some level. Obviously not all of the national defense, intelligence, aeronautics, physics and engineering experts questioning the official story of 9/11 are insane or unqualified to comment.

This begs the question, in the face of such obvious facts, why do our media personalities continue to attempt to throw out accusations that are patently untrue regarding those who question the official story? When a television news interviewer continues to ask questions and make assertions that he or she knows to be untrue, this would challenge the expertise and sanity, not of their guests, but of the television news interviewer.

The 9/11 truth movement appears to be growing rapidly, and involving people of substantial credentials and expertise. As television and some radio personalities continue to behave in what obviously is an insane behavior, what do we do? Can we get our national media any psychological help? If not, it would be wise to relieve them of their positions at least. I feel increasingly uneasy about millions of young minds being exposed night after night to comments and opinions by people who increasingly appear to be insane, yet in positions of authority.

Of course the concern here is larger. If there is any possibility or doubt about whether the events of 9/11/2001 were participated in by members of our own government, then our entire democracy and world peace would be strengthened by getting to the bottom of the true facts of this pinnacle event of our time.

It would be unhealthy to leave a cloud of doubt hanging over such assertions. There should be a full fledged national debate, experts from all sides should be interviewed on national media to get to the bottom of this once and for all. Our Congress should launch investigations into the physics questions that are causing so many to doubt the official story. No matter where anyone stands on this issue, this is obviously the only path to national healing and trust.

However, this debate on national media cannot occur if the interviewers hired by national media continue to behave in an insane irrational behavior, like "conspiracy theory wing-nuts." You see, too many of our media spokespersons on television and radio adhere to a wild conspiracy theory. Their theory is that anyone who looks into the facts of the events of one of the most important issues in history is alone, and insane, but yet somehow organized in some united conspiratorial effort. Of course, the facts fly in the face of this conspiracy theory, but these media personalities appear unable to grasp reality even when it is pointed out to them.

For media reading this article, time will tell whether you are an insane conspiracy theorist or not. If you too, are among the insane in our media, the public will likely eventually demand your resignation. As one who writes sometimes on parental issues, I believe it is unhealthy to have insane people in charge of the national information highways our children are taught to watch. We need sane media people who look at facts regarding issues, not ones who launch into insane screeds of paranoia to avoid reality.

Also, you may recall that when I contacted State Representative, Stephen Nass' office, his aid stated that they were aware of but not interested in and

would not look at the physics facts provided by the website Scholars for 9/11 Truth, www.st911.org. However, they did want to fire a university teacher for presenting facts, many of which were available on that site. To fire someone for presenting facts, facts that you dispute, yet have no idea what those facts are, and are unwilling to look at them to find out what they are . . . is also insane. Again, as someone who writes on parenting issues, as a concerned parent as well, America should also consider retiring our insane government officials who fire people for facts they aren't aware of and are unwilling to look at. These politicians apparently assert some wild conspiracy theory that millions of Americans are questioning the events of 9/11 because they are "Bush haters" according to the aid at Nass' office. This kind of delusional paranoia by our elected officials is of particular concern. Such wild eyed conspiratorialists should not be allowed in government.

Bill Douglas, author of "The Amateur Parent - A Book on Life, Death, War & Peace, and Everything Else in the Universe"

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Dean Nardelli [dtnardel@wisc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:15 PM
To: jdwiley@bascom.wisc.edu; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Chancellor Wiley and Provost Farrell,

I have been a UW student for 10 years, receiving a BS in 2000 and MS in 2003. I am currently a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Comparative Biomedical Sciences. I am also a teaching assistant in the Department of Zoology. I am writing to express my concern about the decision to allow Kevin Barrett to teach as fact his view that the events of September 11, 2001 were a creation of the U.S. government in order to justify combat against Islamic nations.

As a TA, I understand that the information I present has the potential to shape students' viewpoints. The biological sciences are not without their political controversies (stem cell research, evolution, etc.), but I believe the job of the instructor is to present facts in order to either learn the material outright or to make informed decisions on a given topic. For example, I teach the observed, rooted-in-fact mechanisms that support evolution without tipping off the students about my personal take on the topic. At the end of the day, I shouldn't have a say in whether my students believe in evolution, God, or both. I just want them to understand the scientific concepts that may lead to the formation of species.

However, Mr. Barrett's views seem to be drawn from a hatred and distrust of our current government and the media- opinions to which he is certainly entitled- rather than fact. He has made the rounds in conspiracy-theory panel circuits, and his views are well-known. He states that what is regarded by most as facts about 9/11 are actually manipulation of facts on the part of the media and the government, despite a mountain of documented evidence (such as the images we have all seen of the disasters and a proud confession by Osama bin Laden). In acknowledging that information can be manipulated and steered to achieve a particular goal, he must accept the notion that his interpretation of events themselves are subject to doubt and mistrust.

Mr. Barrett enters the lecture hall with a well-known and outspoken political viewpoint that permeates this particular lesson. While Mr. Barrett will likely present the conventional viewpoint of 9/11 as the price of being able to share his views, one must wonder if he will provide a fair and complete assessment of what really happened that day without using language that simultaneously dismisses the conventional view, directly or implicitly.

As a TA and future professor, I understand and appreciate the concept of academic freedom. As an American citizen, I understand and appreciate the concept of freedom of speech. But even a university must know that these concepts are not absolute. In everyday life, one cannot make threats or yell "fire" in a crowded theater without legal repercussion. One cannot engage in libel or slander. We have come to craft our language so as to become so benign that we do not lose lawsuits. The case of Mr. Barrett is one where a fringe conspiracy theory is given moral equivalence (as it pertains to what is allowable in a university setting) to what we all saw that day. Interestingly, Mr. Barrett will expose his likely view that the current administration is incompetent while claiming the same people orchestrated the most monumental cover-up in human history.

This combination of indoctrinating political views and basic contradiction is not ideal in an instructor,

8/10/2006

academic freedom or not. This is fine for the panel circuit and when he is outside of the University's territory, but to have the taxpayers and students pay for this disregard for the spirit of academic freedom is extremely troubling. Any personal views must be checked at the door. I know that any restriction of academic freedom has the potential to lead to greater restriction. But a well-reasoned, well-defined restriction will prevent an "anything goes" mentality for the lecturers of my generation. Now, the outspoken skeptic of the Holocaust will be able to win a lawsuit allowing him to teach a UW history class.

Having been a UW student since 1996, I have witnessed a good deal of political bias on the part of my instructors. This case, however, has compelled me to speak out on behalf of ensuring that instructors present facts rather than opinions- or, in this case, fiction. I believe this is the wrong way to ignite classroom debate and discussion.

I hope that the decision allowing Mr. Barrett to teach this particular lesson will be overturned. An institution cannot, with a straight face, claim that the truth can be found by "sifting and winnowing" when the outcome is implied or predetermined. After all, one shouldn't know what the result of "sifting and winnowing" will be. Freedom of speech is part of what makes this country great. Objectiveness is what makes instructors, and, by extension, their universities, great.

Thank you very much for your time.

Sincerely,

Dean T. Nardelli

BS '00, MS '03

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Rep.Nass [Rep.Nass@legis.state.wi.us]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:38 PM
To: Paul V. Sheridan; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Rep.Nass; Professor Kevin Barrett; 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; wlhansen@facstaff.wisc.edu; bsmattmi@wisc.edu; dcorcoran@madison.com; scullen@madison.com; bkreiser@aaup.org
Subject: RE: My Letter to State Representative Steve Nass of Wisconsin

I am the state legislator that has been calling for Kevin Barrett to be fired not solely on his speech, but primarily on the basis that he is using his position at UW-Madison to advance a personal agenda. Kevin Barrett has been unable to provide any scholarly basis for his conspiracy theory on 9/11 or even a minimal level of evidence that might circumstantially support his views.

There have always been limits on speech in the workplace. Mr. Barrett's rights won't be violated if he is fired for his academic dishonesty.

By the way, I support the right of any citizen to express their personal views on their own time and with their own resources. Mr. Barrett has no constitutional or statutory right to be put in a classroom to present his conspiracy theories.

Additionally, I have suggested that the legislature will look to make administrative budget cuts at UW-Madison as a result of the decision to continue the employment of Kevin Barrett. If any administrative budget cuts are adopted the legislature will mandate by statute that the UW can't regain this money by increasing tuition on students.

Steve Nass

State Representative
 31st Wisconsin Assembly District

(888) 529-0031 Toll-Free (Wisconsin Only)
 (608) 266-5715

From: Paul V. Sheridan [mailto:pvsheridan@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:33 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Rep.Nass; Professor Kevin Barrett; 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; wlhansen@facstaff.wisc.edu; bsmattmi@wisc.edu; dcorcoran@madison.com; scullen@madison.com; bkreiser@aaup.org
Subject: Re: My Letter to State Representative Steve Nass of Wisconsin

Dear Provost Farrell:

I sincerely believe you made the correct decision regarding academic freedom at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

However, I must admit that I am somewhat flabbergasted at the ease with which I anticipated the vitriolic from this Representative Nass. In the following article this Nass is reported to have reacted to your decision as follows:

8/10/2006

"Nass, a longtime critic of the UW System, said he would use the decision to push for cuts to the university's budget when lawmakers reconvene next year."

<http://www.madison.com/tct/news/index.php?ntid=90679&ntpid=1>

I believe you will see my anticipation of this Nass pusilanimity on page 4 of my letter to him of 7 July 2006.

Thank you for issuing an email return-receipt.

Paul Sheridan

P.S. This Nass is an abject hypocrite, and should be removed from office.

— Original Message —

From: Paul V. Sheridan

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Cc: Professor Kevin Barrett ; 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 ; wlhansen@facstaff.wisc.edu ; bsmattmi@wisc.edu ; dcorcoran@madison.com ; scullen@madison.com ; bkreiser@aaup.org

Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 12:47 PM

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

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: D Langley [dbl2000@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 9:58 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Controversial teacher

Dear Provost:

Can the following news article be accurate? If so, then you have far more serious problems than a controversial teacher.

The problems are that you have an idiot for an instructor and an idiot for a provost. Claiming that the government orchestrated the terror attacks is not just a "controversial" or "unpopular" claim. It is a blatant lie, an untruth, an monstrously stupid, insensitive, and revolting claim. It shows a fundamental lack of knowledge, logic, and respect for overwhelming evidence.

Because of the complete lack of any evidence for this outrageous idea, the teacher is unqualified to teach at any school. Refusing to let him teach is fundamental to protecting the academic integrity of your school, and NOT censorship of any sort.

You do not let instructors teach CREATIONISM at your school, and you have no business allowing this teacher to teach at Univ. of Wisconsin either. He is clearly unfit for the classroom. Dear God, get a grip on reality.

dbl

Wis. school lets radical instructor teach

By RYAN J. FOLEY
ASSOCIATED PRESS WRITER

MADISON, Wis. — An instructor at the University of Wisconsin who has said he believes U.S. officials orchestrated the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, will be allowed to teach a course on Islam, the school said Monday.

Some state politicians had called for the University of Wisconsin-Madison to fire part-time instructor Kevin Barrett after he spoke about his theories on a radio talk show last month.

"We cannot allow political pressure from critics of unpopular ideas to inhibit the free exchange of ideas," Provost Patrick Farrell said in a statement. "To the extent that his views are discussed, Mr. Barrett has assured me that students will be free - and encouraged - to challenge his viewpoint."

Barrett can present his view as one of many perspectives on Sept. 11 when he teaches "Islam: Religion and Culture" this fall, Farrell said.

8/10/2006

Farrell launched a review after Barrett said he believed the attacks were the result of a conspiracy designed to spark war in the Middle East.

Barrett said he was happy the school "did the right thing."

"This university is a pretty professional organization that is not going to buckle from political pressure from politicians," he said.

Politicians who had called for Barrett's dismissal blasted the decision.

"The governor would have come to a different conclusion about this," said Matt Canter, a spokesman for Gov. Jim Doyle.

State Rep. Steve Nass said he would push next year for cuts to the university's budget.

The university does not endorse Barrett's theories, Farrell said, noting they are widely believed in parts of the Muslim world.

Barrett earned a doctorate in African languages and literature and folklore from UW-Madison in 2004. He is to earn \$8,247 for teaching the course.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Lech Biegalski [bielec@cogeco.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 11:28 PM
To: Rep.Nass; pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: mtwohey@journalsentinel.com; [REDACTED] editor@onlinejournal.com;
 tom@informationclearinghouse.info
Subject: Re: Kevin Barrett

To: Representative Nass:

I don't know where you got the notion from that "there have always been limits on speech in the workplace." There should not be any.

Let me share with you one conclusion I have come to after serving as an initiating member and then a member of the National Council of the "Solidarity" movement in Poland in early 1980s. Were it not for speaking and acting in the workplace, (for example: famous strikes and then independent newsletters at the Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk), we would probably still have a communist regime in Poland, in Eastern Europe, and in the Soviet Union. At that time, President Reagan seemed to support fullheartedly the right of the Polish people to speak freely, and even take actions, like occupational strikes, at their workplaces. For evidence, please check the 1982 New Year's speech of President Ronald Reagan to the Polish people. Are you now suggesting that Americans are not as good as Polish and that they don't deserve the same rights? Your hypocrisy, Sir, is so transparent that even a child would be able to see through it.

You are building your case on the alleged lack of right to speak freely in the workplace. If this is the best explanation that you can give to support your position in Kevin Berrett's case, and if you have to use totalitarian (as opposed to democratic) solution (cutting the UW-Wisconsin's administrative budget to make it comply with your dictatorial request), then it clearly means that people like Kevin Berrett are right about the alienation of the U.S. government from the nation and from the CONstitution, and the need to force freedom and democracy back where they belong. This can only be interpreted as acting in the best social and national interest of the American people. This would also mean that Berrett is a patriot and should be given an appropriate credit for his courage.

By the way, here also is your evidence that you are seeking: your answer proves that Berrett is right - people like you ARE assuming dictatorial powers in a democratic country and it is totally unacceptable. In addition, the current administration has a PROVEN record of lying the Americans and to the international community. Therefore, the trust in any official explanation, including the one on 9/11, is justifiably gone. Plus, there is plenty of evidence to support the opposite views and opinions. It is a duty of the American people to expose this evidence and to seek justice. I submit that this also is your duty.

Mr. Ness, you are a victim of your own propoganda. You see, a meaningful democracy can only function if people have access to a wide range of facts and opinions. Only then, people can make informed choices and decisions. In democracy, people also have the right to share and debate their opinions in order to reach consensus. I understand why in Nazi Germany or in Stalin's Soviet Union these rights were suppressed. I don't understand why you are taking the same stand in America.

One more point: If Berrett is right, the Bush administration and their supporters should be tried and punished for national treason, crimes against peace, crimes against humanity, mass murder, etc. See, we understand why you are trying to silence Kevin Berrett and others who think like him. However, it does not mean the we agree with you. And you know what? We don't have to. We are "the people", you "represent" us, not the other way around. It is you who may be fired.

I strongly encourage you to seek more information on 9/11 and other related issues. Plenty of it (including some pretty strong evidence) is available in bookstores and on internet. Ignorance in this case will not be admitted as an excuse.

8/10/2006

Thank you for the publicity, much needed and much appreciated.

Lech Biegalski

— Original Message —

From: Rep.Nass
To: Lech Biegalski
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 9:44 PM
Subject: RE: Kevin Barrett

I am the state legislator that has been calling for Kevin Barrett to be fired not solely on his speech, but primarily on the basis that he is using his position at UW-Madison to advance a personal agenda. Kevin Barrett has been unable to provide any scholarly basis for his conspiracy theory on 9/11 or even a minimal level of evidence that might circumstantially support his views.

There have always been limits on speech in the workplace. Mr. Barrett's rights won't be violated if he is fired for his academic dishonesty.

By the way, I support the right of any citizen to express their personal views on their own time and with their own resources. Mr. Barrett has no constitutional or statutory right to be put in a classroom to present his conspiracy theories.

Additionally, I have suggested that the legislature will look to make administrative budget cuts at UW-Madison as a result of the decision to continue the employment of Kevin Barrett. If any administrative budget cuts are adopted the legislature will mandate by statute that the UW can't regain this money by increasing tuition on students.

Steve Nass
State Representative
31st Wisconsin Assembly District

(888) 529-0031 Toll-Free (Wisconsin Only)
(608) 266-5715

From: Lech Biegalski [mailto:bielec@cogeco.ca]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 1:17 AM
To: Rep.Nass
Subject: Kevin Barrett

To: Representative Nass:

You said: "The fact that Mr. Barrett uses his position at UW-Madison to add credibility to his outlandish claims is an unacceptable embarrassment to the people of Wisconsin and the UW System."

How about this: "The fact that Mr. Bush used his position as a President of the United States of America to add credibility to his outlandish lies about the WMDs in Iraq was an unacceptable embarrassment to the people of the U.S. and the entire world."

L. Biegalski

8/10/2006

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.1.394 / Virus Database: 268.9.10/384 - Release Date: 7/10/2006

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Mike [malesi1@rochester.rr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 10:43 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Standards?

Dear Mr. Farrell,

There is an old saying that says "going from point A to point B is never a straight line". I cannot imagine that the founders of the University Of Wisconsin would have ever imagined a professor such as Kevin Barrett would hold a position at this institution.

As someone who voted for President Bush twice, I believe the current administration has failed in most aspects of their duties, and discourse is every citizens right. However, the statements made by Mr. Barrett which he clearly believes, are that of a mentally ill man. I urge you to remove him from your staff and prevent this man from poisoning the young minds he has been intrusted to influence.

Thank you for your time,

Michael J. Alesi

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Emily Fischer [esfischer@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 10:36 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: thanks

Provost Farrell,

Thank you for clearing Kevin Barrett to teach the Islam class in the fall. As a recent graduate (last year) with a Political Science degree, the one thing that I most appreciate when I look back at my time in the classroom was the widely open forum for unconventional views. It would have been a very sad day had Barrett not been allowed to teach based on his theories. Thank you for doing the right thing, regardless of the heated opposition.

Emily Fischer
B.A. 2005

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Mark In Tulsa Oklahoma [mister_mark@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 10:36 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; chancellor@news.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett Should be DISMISSED

Are you kidding me? I can't believe that the University of Wisconsin would actually want to associate itself with the absurd claims and 9/11 conspiracy theories currently being spewed by Kevin Barrett.

Mr. Farrell, you were quoted as saying that "Mr. Barrett has assured me that students will be free - and encouraged - to challenge his viewpoint." Sir, if you really believe this, then I submit that you and the Chancellor should have no problem making Mr. Barrett's semester-by-semester employment contingent on anonymous student feedback forms.

I suspect that since neither you, nor the Chancellor, have ever been present for any of this man's classes (and therefore have no tangible proof of the content of his courses), then I think student feedback - ANONYMOUS student feedback - should be the key element for determining whether or not this man deserves to keep his job.

You both have a lot of explaining to do, and I think your research should begin with input from Kevin Barrett's former STUDENTS - not him.

Sincerely,
Mark R. Heaton

Yahoo! Music Unlimited - Access over 1 million songs. [Try it free.](#)

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: kaypal_@excite.com
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 10:22 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: 15 minutes of infamy

Importance: High

Boy oh boy, you sure did UW proud this time. Way to go. Maybe you can get OBL next semester!! Your pal, Paul

Join Excite! - <http://www.excite.com>
The most personalized portal on the Web!

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Sean Kelly [tenyrsgone20002000@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 10:21 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Critical Thinking Skills

Critical thinking skills does not mean that you keep your mind so OPEN that all of your brains spill out! How dare you use tax payer funds to support a nutjob who actually thinks that the World Trade Center Towers were destroyed by Americans. Kevin Barrett should be in jail for sedition! **DROP THIS JERK** and focus on REAL education.

We all saw those towers hit by jumbo jets LIVE on television as it happened. How dare you insult Americans who all lived through that day, and the real Americans who fight for you every day overseas and here at home, by wasting the taxpayers money on this CRAP!

SHAME ON YOU!

DROP KEVIN BARRETT NOW!

Do you Yahoo!?
Next-gen email? Have it all with the all-new Yahoo! Mail Beta.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Ron Rattner [ronrattner@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 9:10 PM
To: Patrick V Farrell
Cc: Kevin Barrett; mmcpike@tds.net; jbartell@quarles.com; mary.cuene@mwtc.edu; Elizabeth.burmaster@dpi.state.wi.us; danae@pearlsforteengirls.com; mbradley@ruderware.com; jesussalas25@yahoo.com; cmsemenas@hotmail.com; mjs@quarles.com; cpruitt@abdata.com; ekeesler@new.rr.com; jvcrain@netnet.net; dwalsh@foleylaw.com; brent@johnsflaherty.com; board@uwusa.edu; prosey5@yahoo.com
Subject: Academic freedom has triumphed over political intimidation at UW-Madison.

To: Dr. Patrick V. Farrell, Provost
University of Wisconsin - Madison

Dear Dr. Farrell:

UW-Madison remains a great citadel and exemplar of academic freedom because of your principled resolution of the political controversy over Dr. Kevin Barrett's engagement as a UW lecturer. You and the Board of Regents have courageously renewed and reinvigorated the University's highest principles and purposes, and have established an important precedent in its perennial quest for truth.

This is a proud chapter in the annals of a great academic institution. The wisdom of your decision will be vindicated by history, and it will be remembered long after today's demagogically instigated political storms have subsided and are forgotten.

Respectfully,

Ron Rattner, retired attorney
San Francisco

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Raymond Bauer [raymie@inreach.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 9:00 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Congratulations! The University has made the national news!

Provost Farrell:

Congratulations! The university and you have made the O'Reilly Factor, Brit Hume, and Tucker Carlson's show! Wow! This including the governor, and members of your legislature plus the people of Wisconsin and (those of us in California). In my long life I have heard a lot of weird statements (as a psychologist), but Kevin Barrett takes the award for weirdness!! I believe in academic freedom, but it is quiet evident that you and your university president have forgotten many of the tenets of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments. Under the paragraph "Academic Freedom", Section C, it says.....but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence they should at all times be accurate, should exercise restraint, should how respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution.

There are many other sections I could quote to you, but you need to read the Statement yourself and think about how much damage you and the president will inflict on the university as a whole in order to protect a loose cannon. I would respectfully request that you look over and over again at the video of the second plane aiming and hitting the 2nd tower and tell me that President Bush ordered this slaughter! Also look over and over again at the people jumping to their deaths rather than burn to death, a horrible death, and tell me by any means you choose that Kevin Barrett has a right to teach his perverted and sick concepts of what really happened. If you believe his garbage, then God help the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

Respectfully,

Dr. Raymond Bauer
Retired Professor

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Larry.D Waller [Larry.D.Waller@mwarep.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:36 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Mr Farrell

In my previous letter, I meant to remind you that study after study has shown that OVER 90% of university professors are liberal and vote for Democrats. It is hard enough for a student with conservative views who disagrees with any professor to 'challenge his viewpoint'. Do you really think a student will step to to challenge MR. BARRETT?. Take off the rose colored glasses, Mr. Farrell.

Larry Waller

This communication and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and delete this communication from your system.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Paul V. Sheridan [pvsheridan@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:33 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Steve Nass; Professor Kevin Barrett; 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; wihansen@facstaff.wisc.edu; bsmattmi@wisc.edu; dcorcoran@madison.com; scullen@madison.com; bkreiser@aaup.org
Subject: Re: My Letter to State Representative Steve Nass of Wisconsin

Dear Provost Farrell:

I sincerely believe you made the correct decision regarding academic freedom at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

However, I must admit that I am somewhat flabbergasted at the ease with which I anticipated the vitriolic from this Representative Nass. In the following article this Nass is reported to have reacted to your decision as follows:

"Nass, a longtime critic of the UW System, said he would use the decision to push for cuts to the university's budget when lawmakers reconvene next year."

<http://www.madison.com/tct/news/index.php?ntid=90679&ntpid=1>

I believe you will see my anticipation of this Nass pusilanimity on page 4 of my letter to him of 7 July 2006.

Thank you for issuing an email return-receipt.

Paul Sheridan

P.S. This Nass is an abject hypocrite, and should be removed from office.

— Original Message —

From: Paul V. Sheridan
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: Professor Kevin Barrett; 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; wihansen@facstaff.wisc.edu; bsmattmi@wisc.edu; dcorcoran@madison.com; scullen@madison.com; bkreiser@aaup.org
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2006 12:47 PM
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

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Larry.D Waller [Larry.D.Waller@mwarep.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 8:31 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Professor Kevin Barrett

I found your statements regarding Kevin Barrett very interesting, and extremely 'textbook'. It mirrors most all responses by administrations time and again after 'off the wall' or 'over the line' comments or accusations made by out-of-touch university professors.

You state "These views are expected to take a small, but significant, role in the class". This is outrageous. An instructor has basically accused our President and his administration of murdering 3,000 people, of all races and, religions, and you think these views will be simply forgotten or 'taken lightly' by his students? Then you go on to say that "students will be free - and encourage - challenged his viewpoint". Mr Farrell, get out of the office once in a while, and read something besides the Campus newspaper and the New York Times, and you will see and hear of testimonies from dozens and dozens of students who decided to 'challenge their professors viewpoints' on sensitive issues. EVERYONE, including Mr. Barrett's students, know that to do so, can and will, as evidenced time and again, effect their current grade. A professor who feels strongly enough about a subject like this, as Barret does, would not hesitate to let his strong feelings effect his grading with someone who disagrees with him just as strongly, And I profess NO ONE who is so emotionally involved, as he is, could NOT let him effect his grading. If you believe this man could, given a chance right now, judge President Bush and his policies in a fair and unbiased way, then you, Mr. Farrell, are in the wrong position. Point taken.

You go on to state "I fully expect that the vast majority of his teaching will involve aspects of Islamic culture and religion wholly unrelated to his controversial view of the events of 9/11. Mr. Farrell, the events of 9/11 DEFINE much of the culture and religion of Islam. Get tapes of his lectures, Mr. Farrell. I would wager he does NOT mention that Muslim children are taught at an early age that the Jews and the West are evil and Islam must take over the world. He will NOT mention that their women are repressed in many ways. He will NOT mention that Islam law in many countries states that if you do not pray 5 times daily, you will be prosecuted.

Mr. Farrell, Mr. Barrett has proven time and again that he is not a 'moderate' Muslim. This man is an embarrassment, a disgrace, and a danger to our country by letting him spew forth bias religious views to our students.

But, of course, in your position, you must be politically correct. I hope Wisconsin alumni rise up loudly and aggressively over this matter.

Larry Waller
2415 SW 206th Place
Aloha, Or. 97006

This communication and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by e-mail or telephone and delete this communication from your system.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: cpmiller [cpmiller@surewest.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 6:42 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: gimme a job

I think the world is flat.....may I teach geography at UW...?

cpmiller

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Graham Wilson [gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 6:40 PM
To: RJinCAL2@aol.com
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: RE: From: RJ Johnson

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I should make clear to you that this course is not a Political Science course and that I therefore have no responsibility for it. I will forward your comments to the Provost.

Graham Wilson
Chair, Political Science
UW-Madison

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

From: RJinCAL2@aol.com [mailto:RJinCAL2@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:16 PM
To: gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu
Subject: From: RJ Johnson

Oh great, now al-Jazeera is happy your school is teaching a course that rewrites the history of the attack on September 11. The University of Wisconsin looks more pathetic than ever. Didn't any of you see the planes hit the buildings? No one heard the tape where bin Laden takes credit for the attack?

**RJ Johnson
Documentary Producer
PBS, Bravo, Showtime, etc.**

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: ROBERT POGLITSCH [rjpogs1@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 6:37 PM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Please forward this to the notorious "professor" barrett. maybe it will be enlightening and will teach him something. he is an unhinged moonbat. your liberal university disgusts me and many others. it's a shame that taxpayers money goes to waste at your "institute of higher learning."

<http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/defense/1227842.html>

Do you Yahoo!?

Get on board. You're invited to try the new Yahoo! Mail Beta.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Graham Wilson [gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 6:29 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: FW: From: RJ Johnson

I could just ignore this or I could send him a pres release if you provide one. No idea why he wrote to me!!!

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

From: RJinCAL2@aol.com [mailto:RJinCAL2@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:16 PM
To: gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu
Subject: From: RJ Johnson

Oh great, now al-Jazeera is happy your school is teaching a course that rewrites the history of the attack on September 11. The University of Wisconsin looks more pathetic than ever. Didn't any of you see the planes hit the buildings? No one heard the tape where bin Laden takes credit for the attack?

**RJ Johnson
Documentary Producer
PBS, Bravo, Showtime, etc.**

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Lynn [friscorider@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 6:14 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: barrett

Sir,

I wonder if you would succumb to pressure if the class was, "Mental capacities of African Americans versus White Americans" or how about "Queer, the obsession of the left"

Dishonest crap again from you idiots in academia.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: KNB [Katieb129@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:57 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: unhappy

Dear Mr. Farrell,

Hi, my name is Katie and I'm 16. As an honors student at my high school I have been looking into colleges for some time now and in the past have actually looked into the University of Wisconsin as a possible choice for me to attend when I graduate.

I would like to let you know that I will not be considering your school anymore due to the fact that you are going to allow Mr. Kevin Barrett teach the class entitled "Islam: Religion and Culture". I couldn't believe what I was seeing on the television when I heard Mr. Barrett tell of his outrageous 9-11 conspiracy theory and of his plan to teach this in a class at your school. I believe that this is a slap in the face to those who have suffered losses due to the events that happened on September 11. How could anybody possibly believe that our country would do that to its own people? It makes me very unhappy when I see a blatant disregard of all those souls lost on that terrible day.

I'm sorry if I have wasted your time but I believe these words have to be said.

Katie Barber

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: bkorach [bkorach@cfl.r.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:48 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Barrett and Logic

Dear Sir:

When I attended Indiana University, any and all courses were subject to a provable rigueur with regard to course content. By your reply to the outcry, if Barret was teaching that 25% of the world's population are ETs, you would say that's ok. The difference here is Barrett offers no provable facts to support his position. His and your logic is equivalent to saying the holocaust was a hoax. Teaching without responsibility is no different that hollering "fire" in a theatre. Are all students required to take and pass a "Critical thinking and Evaluation." type course? Your rosy view that all university students are capable of such is fallacious.

Your evaluation and report illustrates that there is no responsibility for concrete provable substance to course work or required reading at U of W. A syllabus, unsubstantiated required reading, and course work does not insure a proper course in math, science, literature, business,music, etc., so why does it in this case? You and those that conducted the review are simply WRONG by any critical measure.

I suppose you feel the bombing at your university thirty some years ago was ok too.

Disgusted,

Bennett Korach
University of Indiana '71

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: andybush@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:47 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Barrett

You are a fool. Barrett's appearances on television and radio should send a shiver up your spine. It makes a joke of your University and especially you. It is one thing to "challenge" young minds. Putting a lunatic in charge of a serious course is idiotic.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: LORI ROBERTS [laroberts1@wisc.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:45 PM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Subject: thank you!

Provost Farrell,

Thank you profusely for your sound decision and acute articulation regarding Lecturer Barrett's class. I'm a 42 year old ungrad living my lifelong dream of studying Sociology at UW-Madison and will graduate next year. My son also attends UW-Madison. As you can tell, I hold this institution very close to my heart. UW-Madison is world class for a multitude of reasons; couragous leaders like yourself ensure that Wisconsin will remain as such. So, I'm off to check the Fall timetable to see if any of Lecturer Baret's sessions have open seats. :) Thanks again!

**Sincerely,
Lori Roberts**

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jason Berg [solsund@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:13 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Thank you.

Thank you, my good Sir, for being sane in an insane time.

I do not go to the University of Wisconsin-Madison, nor do I even live in Wisconsin, however the decision that was made by your office about Kevin Barrett being allowed to teach has raised the standing of your college in my eyes a great deal.

I've seen too many people be afraid of the idea of questioning authority and too many teachers getting suspended or fired after trying to teach controversial things. In an age so far removed from the times of yesteryear we no longer need to be dealing with teachers in the same way that Copernicus and Socrates were dealt with for having differing views.

Teachers of college classes should be creating discussions and bringing up controversial issues, as long as they are not presenting them as the facts.

I lifts my heavy heart to see that there are others in this world that do not bow to political pressure without giving it a fair review first.

Thank you again for your fair decision,

Jason Berg

Express yourself instantly with MSN Messenger! Download today - it's FREE!
<http://messenger.msn.click-url.com/go/onm00200471ave/direct/01/>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Scott Dowd [skdowd@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 9:06 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Question

Greetings

Just watched your professor Barrett on Hannity and Colmes

Do you and the University truly support this guy?

He's facilitating discussion and thought for the students?

You would actually allow someone making around \$8000 on a part time basis to bring this much attention to the school

And represent him self that poorly publicly?

Embarrassing

Regards

Scott Dowd

763-428-8332

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Preston Condra [PCondra@watchman.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 3:48 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: A question about Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison policy.....

Dr. Farrell,

In your statement regarding the situation with Barrett you said:

"We cannot allow political pressure from critics of unpopular ideas to inhibit the free exchange of ideas. That classroom interaction is central to this university's mission and to the expansion of knowledge. Silencing that exchange now would only open the door to more onerous and sweeping restrictions. It is in cases like this - difficult cases involving unconventional ideas - that we define our principles and determine our future. Instead of restricting politically unpopular speech, we will take our cue from the bronze plaque in front of Bascom Hall that calls for the 'continual and fearless sifting and winnowing' of ideas."

I assume from this then that the University of Wisconsin-Madison will allow things like this to be taught in the classroom:

- Creationism
- open criticism and rejection of evolution
- teaching of the biblical Christian worldview
- pro-life teaching and anti-abortion teaching
- teaching abstinence
- teaching that homosexuality is immoral
- pro-military teaching

According to your statements you have to allow such teaching in the classroom. My guess, however, is that the University of Wisconsin-Madison is as politically correct as any state institution and does not allow such ideas to be taught in its classrooms. In fact, I'm sure the university -and probably you- would quickly fire any professor for teaching such things. If I am wrong, I am glad to be wrong, but judging by your statements I would say I am correct. Interestingly, it is acceptable on your campus for your faculty to accuse the President of the heinous things he is being accused of by Barrett, yet your university will outlaw things like I have listed above from its classrooms while claiming to be a place of "the free exchange of ideas." If I am correct, which I think I am, then your statements and practices are contradictory and thus hypocritical.

Preston Condra

Fort Worth, TX

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Brian Johnson [brianjjo@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2006 5:25 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Dr. Farrell,

I'm sure that you're going to get a lot of this today, so I'll be brief. After reading this and reviewing the tape, you can't be serious about letting Kevin Barrett teach at the University of Wisconsin.

<http://althouse.blogspot.com/2006/07/uw-911-denialist-appears-on-hannity.html>

I don't know how else to say this. I'm ashamed and I'm outraged that my school would let a lunatic like this teach a class. I don't understand it, and I don't think there's any way you could explain it to me because it makes no sense whatsoever. There's a difference between someone who has an unpopular opinion and somebody who's deranged.

Please review everything that this man has said publicly and then decide whether you're protecting freedom of speech or simply the freedom to say anything that pops into your head. He has the right to say what he wants. He's an American. He has no *right* to teach at Wisconsin. That's a privilege that I assumed was reserved for the best we could get.

Best regards,

Brian Johnson
Wisconsin '87