

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Kay [mollytwo@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 9:20 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: barrett

Having heard today that you have hired an extremist to teach in the University system, I find as a tax payer and parent that your conduct is reprehensible. I don't want to hear about the freedom of speech and that we are allowed to express our selves as an excuse. Mr. Barrett can express himself as much as he wants to, but as a tax payer I don't want to pay him. The constant demand at the University level for more funding , makes a person wonder if the money spent is done in a wise manner. I will also write to my legislatures and complain about this matter and your poor judgment.
Kay Stezenski, Shawano Wisconsin

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Ed Willems [willems@execpc.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:53 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Academic Freedom vs Mr Barrett's Personal Bias

Re: Your support of course curriculum that suggests the Twin Towers were destroyed by the U.S. Government to launch a war in the Middle East.

I have always believed that the University of Wisconsin's course curriculum contained a high level of accountability to support a quality learning system. As you should be aware, it is critical for higher learning institutions to create a learning platform that prepares youngsters, fresh out of high school, for the rigors of life they will face after graduation. Unfortunately, the University of Wisconsin will start to fail in this regard if your view of academic freedom means that course curriculum no longer has to depict true accurate data or be based on historical fact. The exchange of ideas you're trying to support must be somewhat plausible, as a result, I can't imagine any parent wanting to send their children to a learning environment that supports biased, inaccurate data.

Congratulations! If your goal was to embarrass the State of Wisconsin and discredit the University of Wisconsin's educational platform you have succeeded.

Ed Willems
3510 Foxwood Road
Racine, WI 53405

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: chris spaulding [spauldingchris@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:37 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: ** I SUPPORT Kevin Barrett **

Please let Mr. Barrett continue to explore this 911 question with the school.

and THANK YOU IF THAT'S THE CASE!!!!!!!

I love your town and college!

I absolutely agree with Mr. Barrett's 911 question and the fact that your school has such courses / resources available to a curious mind—I LOVE THAT!

This is an e-mail in support of KEEPING Mr. Barrett's class open!!!!

Students need to have these academic choices—even if these stuffy, close minded officials think otherwise.

—
Chris Spaulding
502-600-3585
<http://bellsouthpwp2.net/s/p/spauldingchris>
<http://www.myspace.com/spauldingchris>

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Mike Reiskis [mreiskis@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:26 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Mr. Farrell,

Tragically, the American system of education has evolved to a point where most of the decisions regarding the education of our children are made by those without the courage or the talent to move beyond the world of academia. You should be ashamed of yourself for rationalizing and defending the teaching of the nonsense espoused by Mr. Barrett. What's next, astronomy classes taught by members of the flat earth society?

In disgust,

Mike Reiskis
852 Kingston Lane
Bartlett, IL 60103

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Tim Marsden [swbytm@ticon.net]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:22 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Barrett You and barrett should be FIRED NOW!!!!!!!

I don't see how we the tax payers should pay to teach our kids False information. I will BE part of a protest to Paralyze the UW system until you and Barrett are gone.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Chris Allison [callison@sfnetworks.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:16 AM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Subject: FW: Barnett has to go

From: Chris Allison [mailto:callison@sfnetworks.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 5:09 AM

To: 'mark.green@mail.house.gov'

Subject: Barnett has to go

Congressman Green,

After watching Hannity and Colmes on Monday, I was stunned to see just how crazy this Mr. Barnett is. Having a few screws loose is not a crime, but spewing out these absolutely insane rantings to a group of captive students is just plain wrong. The fact that he collects our hard earned tax dollars to do it should be a crime. Please do whatever it takes to get this guy out of the classroom and on to a street corner where he belongs. Thanks for standing up to this lunatic and the persons who employ him,
Chris Allison

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Volz, Richard J [RV131017@ncr.com]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:12 AM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Subject: "Professor" Barrett

Provost Farrell.

As a University of Wisconsin-Madison graduate (BBA '85), I am completely embarrassed by the association of this "professor" with the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Thankfully, I am not a Wisconsin tax payer, funding this person's salary, "research" and development of his "course content". His views, admittedly supported by the 1st Amendment of the United States of America, are outrageous. I find your personal and the University's support of his "teaching" more than disappointing and further embarrassing. Two great institutions, the United States of America and the University of Wisconsin, are being tarnished by a personal agenda of a ill-intention "man". EVERYONE associated with our proud University are subject to ridicule.

I call for his immediate dismissal from the University and the elimination of the content he intends to teach related to his radical personal views of the tragic 9/11 events which victimized tens of thousands, our entire country and our way of life.

Sincerely,

Rick Volz

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Leo Burns [leo@leoburns.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:07 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Barrett

Mr. Farrell:

I'm sure that there's more to the story than meets the eye, but, you in particular and the University of Wisconsin in general are being made to look like fools. Find a way to get rid of Barrett.

Regards,



Leo Burns

Office: 508-477-3100 xt 14
Cell: 508-801-2484
Home: 508-420-3600
e-fax: 508-445-0525
e-mail: leo@leoburns.com
Web: www.leoburns.com

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Baron55te@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:05 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Shame on you!

Shame on you and shame on WU. Words escape me that you would allow Barrett to even be associated with the university. He doesn't even deserve the Mr. in front of his name, and I won't print what should be put with yours. How do you sleep at night...I hope not well.

Patricia Maxwell

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Janice Brumby [jansmail33@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:04 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Nutty Professor

WHAT IN THE WORLD IS WRONG WITH YOU PEOPLE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN?????

YOU HAVE THIS COMPLETE NUT CASE....PROFESSOR KEVIN BARRETT, WHO IS TEACHING HIS "CONSPIRACY THEORY", AS FACT!!! AT TAX PAYER EXPENSE!!!!

I WOULDN'T SEND MY KID TO YOUR PHONY BALONEY SCHOOL, IF YOU PAID ME!!

THIS BARRET GUY IS TOTALLY COO-COO! BLAMING OUR GOVT. FOR 9-11!!! WHAT AN IDIOT!! YOU HAVE TO BE AN IDIOT TO BELIEVE THIS...THEN, YOU ALLOW HIM TO TEACH THIS KOOKY PHONY THEORY TO OUR KIDS????????? DUMB, STUPID, IDIOTIC!!

I SAW THIS GUY ON HANNITY AND COLMES, AND HE IS IN NEED OF SERIOUS MEDICAL ATTENTION, TO ACTUALLY BELIEVE HIS DUMB BELL THEORY ABOUT 9-11!! WE KNOW MOST LEFT WING WHACKO LIBERALS HATE AMERICA, BUT TO ACTUALLY ALLOW HIM TO TEACH THIS DRIVEL, IS INCREDIBLE!!

THIS GUY SHOULD BE FIRED....IMMEDIATELY!!!

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: bruceandkaren [bruceandkaren@insightbb.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 7:03 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Academic Freedom

You have made a joke of academic freedom and are an embarrassment to the University of Wisconsin. I cannot in good faith continue to support the UW when you use our taxpayer dollars to support the teaching of blatant lies and inaccuracies. Any individual spouting untruths regarding 9/11 and promoting fundamentalist ideas in opposition to our way of life **MUST** be dismissed immediately.

I will definitely make my views known to other alumni and can only hope that you will be removed from YOUR position.

Bruce Woodard
Rockford, IL

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Ira Sharkansky [msira@mscc.huji.ac.il]

Sent: Thursday, July 13, 2006 6:01 AM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu

Allow me to enter a protest concerning your hiring Kevin Barrett to teach anything at the university, including a class titled, "Islam: Religion and Culture."

I am well aware of the wide range of academic freedom, and the likelihood that teachers of the humanities will expound beyond the edge of their professional expertise. As a read Barrett's " Coexistence, Deep Dialogue and Deeper Truth," the man seems unhinged in the extreme. To assert that 9-11 was a Christian-Jewish conspiracy to begin a war against Islam adopts the anti-Semitism rampant in Muslim societies. To occlude that George Bush is waging a campaign against religion is sufficient justification for institutionalization, and not in a university department of language or religion.

My two older children have UW BAs along with Phi Beta Kappa; I earned my PhD there; and I used to take pride in having been a professor there. I shaped my sense of academic freedom on the basis of numerous conversations with David Fellman. I perceive that the best form of the concept has something to do with professional expertise, and not saying anything that comes to mind, or relying on undergraduate evaluations to decide what is acceptable.

In this context, I would urge potential students to think of some other university, on the assumption that they could find an American campus that pursues a form of academic freedom protected from wildness.

**Ira Sharkansky (Emeritus)
Department of Political Science
Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Home tel: 972-2-532-2725
Cell phone: 054-683-5325
Fax: 972-2-582-9144**

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Thomas Cooper [tcooper3@ix.netcom.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 9:06 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Mr. Farrell,

I read your justification for retaining Kevin Barrett as a lecturer at UWM. Your reasoning and logic was sound (in spite of the euphemisms you used to dilute Barrett's obvious pathology.) if you were dealing with a mentally stable person. Kevin Barrett is not fit to have under his influence the impressionable minds of the young men and women who attend your great university. Everything in your persuasive justification should never, ever apply to someone who bases his opinions on a pathological hate for a group of people or an administration; dogma from unreliable writings and articles; absolute lies, and apparent clinical paranoia as it relates to fictitious conspiracies. I see no difference between Barrett's perception of reality and Charlie Manson's. If Charlie Manson agreed not to delve into his evil past would you allow him to ramble on to students about his "unconventional" ideas during a career as a university lecturer at UWM? If you can not distinguish between "unconventional Ideas," "controversial Ideas," or a sound "variety of ideas," and mental instability, you may want to reevaluate your ability to make sound decisions about people's character.

I have a lot of experience and insider information on 911 in particular and terrorism in general. With what I know as true about 911 vis-a-vis the Bush Administration, I can state emphatically that Kevin Barrett is mentally unstable with respect to his extremely strange opinion. A conspiracy of the magnitude that Barrett describes would be impossible given the hundreds of various people that would have to be involved. Everybody knows that the Bush Administration has "leaks" throughout their administration. Ironically, Barrett is crediting the Bush Administration a great deal of sophisticated acumen when it comes to coverups. Everyone also knows they are absolutely not that smart.

Most people welcome a variety of ideas, unconventional ideas, and controversial ideas no matter how extreme they may be as long as they are based solidly in truth. Please spare me the philosophical diatribe about how do we know what the truth is. We both know what it is: accuracy of reality, and the quality or property of keeping close to fact and avoiding distortion and misrepresentation.

As I close, I ask you to do me one favor: Ask Kevin Barrett to show you any factual evidence that substantiates his opinion. You will see what I mean.

Regards,

T. Cooper

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Your Name [trigger8@voyager.net]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 8:04 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Mr. Farrell

I'm writing you to protest Kevin Barrett. So, if you follow your definition of "academic freedom," then Professor Grand Dragon of the KKK could fit in very well at UW Madison. Afterall the Grand Dragon and the KKK are hateful delusional bigots, TOO. Barrett actually believes that the US government is responsible for the horrifying events of "911" and that the gruesome beheadings of our soldiers around the world having their heads slowly sawed off were staged. I heard Barrett today on the Michael Medved radio show, so his opinions are fresh in my mind. In my opinion, Barrett is a hateful bigot; and here you are asking the hardworking taxpayers of Wisconsin in to pay for his dribble.

"Art Bell" couldn't even dream up this stuff.

Sincerely

Laurel Stephens
Carlsbad Calif

—
CoreComm Webmail.
<http://home.core.com>

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: JFRonayne@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 6:35 PM
To: jwiley@chancellor.wisc.edu
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: KEVIN BARRETT - NUT

Dear Dr. Wiley:

The University's decision to employee Kevin Barrett is a disgrace to the University of WI and the State of WI.

The decision is so bizarre that we truly think you should question the future of Patrick Farrell as Provost for the University.

Thank you,

**Jan & John
5001 W. Euclid Ave.
Milwaukee, WI 53219
Phone: 414-541-8834**

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: tcostanti [tcostanti@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 4:46 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Dr. Barrett

Provost Farrell,

Today on the radio I heard Dr. Barrett and Michael Medved discuss some of the Dr. Barrett's views. I was appalled that this individual is given the honor and responsibility, as a man of learning, to teach students at your university. His statements on the show represent a skewed world view: denying al-Qaeda's existence, stating the current administration staged the attacks of 9-11, calling the Bali bombings a false flag operation, stating the same for the beheadings in Iraq, accusing the CIA of the killing of Daniel Pearl, stating that American soldiers in Iraq are Christian terrorists, etc.

I read the article in your school paper describing your meeting with him and quoting you calling his opinions "unconventional" as well as that "These views are expected to take a small, but significant, roll in the class. To the extent that his views are discussed, Mr. Barrett has assured me that students will be free – and encouraged – to challenge his viewpoint." Having earned a Bachelor's degree, I attended years of classes and, after several negative experiences, found discretion the better part of valor when disagreeing with someone with total control over your grade. In addition, your statement does not take in to account that this is an introductory class and as such will likely see freshman as the main attendees. Freshmen are far more impressionable and have far less world experience than older students and Dr. Barrett's "unconventional" opinions, coming from an authority, will have weight regardless of their absurdity.

I fail to understand why such a highly regarded and respected institution with qualified lecturers queuing at your doors would subject the student body to this type of irresponsible and irrational pedagogue. My wife attended the University of Wisconsin in the 80's and the school she described would not endorse, and by employing him you are endorsing, the views of a fatuous, intellectually dishonest, apologist for extremist murders.

Best regards,
Tony Costanti

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: richard kincaid [rkincaid70@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 4:26 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Dear Mr Farrell,

Moments ago i finished listening to Michael Medved's radio talk show with his guest, Kevin Barrett. His biography included the fact that he would be teaching a class to students at the University of Wisconsin. His lies, manipulations, utter lack of evidence and facts and blatant anti-americanism, anti-christianism and anti-semitism insulted and angered me. The fact that he will be granted the opportunity, with your approval, to manipulate and fill with venom U of W students is an outrage. Please reconsider your position on allowing Mr Barrett to so negatively impact the image of your University.

Respectfully,

Richard W. Kincaid

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Lindabwillett@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 4:16 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Re Dr. Kevin Barrett

You really ought to be ashamed of yourself to continue to allow Dr. Barrett anywhere on the University of Wisconsin-Madison campus, let alone near any students. The man is clearly deranged and is not, therefore, fit to teach. His "views" lack any credibility and are totally absurd, yet you seem to think that it is perfectly acceptable for him to push these ridiculous-to-the-point-of-being-silly ideas on university students. How can you be so blind?

Would you be of the same mind if Dr. Barrett believed that black people generally have an inferior intellect and therefore ought not to be allowed to go to school with persons of other races, lest those persons of other races be tainted by association with black people – and wanted to teach an introductory history of Caucasians or, for that matter, an introductory history of black people? No, I think that you undoubtedly would find a way to keep Dr. Barrett out of the classroom. Yet because Dr. Barrett's insanity pertains to the United States and to Christians and Jews, you find his "ideas" acceptable to teach in a classroom. You know, of course, that neither the United States government nor any Christians or Jews will do anything other than complain about Dr. Barrett's comments – and about your own serious lack of judgment in allowing this fool to continue to teach at the University of Wisconsin. And by the way, he is not a professor, with tenure; rather, he is a lecturer only.

Or what if Dr. Barrett believed that aliens from outer space had planted radio devices in his brain in order to monitor his thoughts. And he further believed these same aliens had planted similar radio devices in the brains of President Bush, most of the members of Congress, all of the members of the Supreme Court of the United States, and many members of the FBI and CIA – and these aliens were controlling their thoughts. And finally, Dr. Barrett believed that he alone had the power to overcome these alien-controlled "robots"? Would you allow Dr. Barrett to teach a class on the government of the United States, or a class about political theory in the United States?

I have one final question: Do you believe that Dr. Barrett's association with the University of Wisconsin-Madison will enhance the University's reputation – or soil it? I am a parent of a 16-year-old girl who will go to college in a couple of years, and I can tell you that I would not under any circumstances send my child to your school. I cannot imagine that any thinking parent would send a child to the University of Wisconsin-Madison. If you allow deranged persons who reject real facts and accept fairy tales as truth (what else should his ideas be called but fairy tales, since they are not based in any way on any facts?) to teach important classes (or any classes, for that matter) – thereby teaching inaccuracies and calling these inaccuracies an "education" – then you are not fit to be Provost and your University is not a fit school for any young person to be able to receive a valid college education.

Linda B. W.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Catherine Love [lexcordis@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 4:04 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Barrett damages intellectual reputation of Madison

I have just heard this idiot on the radio. How illuminating to learn the CIA blew up WTC #7, and that this can be proved by reference to its Jewish owner. I am a Catholic and an alumni of the University of Chicago, for which I see I have fresh occasion to thank God.

Do You Yahoo!?

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

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Eric Billman [Eric.Billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 3:32 PM
To: Jim.Kubek@uwfoundation.wisc.edu; Betsy.Liotus@uwfoundation.wisc.edu; dean@bus.wisc.edu; Sandy Wilcox
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Fw: teaching the conspiracy theory on 9-11-01

I thought you would like to see his note in reply to mine. It is good to get the positive ones as well as the negative ones.

Eric G. Billman
 Senior Director of Development
 School of Business
 direct: 608-265-2609
 [REDACTED]

eric.billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu

— Forwarded by Eric Billman/UW-Foundation on 07/14/2006 03:30 PM —

"Dennis Kite" <dkite@mischerfinancial.com>

To "Eric Billman" <Eric.Billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu>

cc

07/14/2006 03:08 PM

Subject RE: teaching the conspiracy theory on 9-11-01

Eric,

Thank you for your very thoughtful and speedy reply. I hope my email was thought-provoking. I am not a natural born trouble-maker and I wrestled with myself for a couple of days as to whether or not I should even speak out. I decided I cannot live with myself if I fail to speak out. Some great American or Briton once said: What evil words people say is not important, what is important is that good men (and women) do not remain silent in response.

You are correct: I care very deeply about the University of Wisconsin and its reputation as well as what is happening there. I just have zero tolerance for so called "revisionist historians" and their pet causes. If responsible people have vetted this person and will monitor the situation, that is ok with me.

Hope you and your family are doing well and are in good health.

Best regards,

Dennis

—Original Message—

From: Eric Billman [mailto:Eric.Billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 11:22 AM
To: Dennis Kite
Cc: Jim.Kubek@uwfoundation.wisc.edu; Betsy.Liotus@uwfoundation.wisc.edu
Subject: Re: teaching the conspiracy theory on 9-11-01

Dennis,

Little did we know when we tried to get together a couple weeks ago that this story was about to hit the airways. Your letter to the Provost is thoughtful and I appreciate your sharing it with me. I will forward it to the President of

8/10/2006

the UW Foundation so that he will also be aware of your comments.

It has been interesting to see this story unfold here in Madison. One thing that I have learned is that there are two sides to every story and the press does not always give equal time to both. While not defending Mr. Barrett's opinion, I would like to take this opportunity to share with you a couple of items that may not have been in the accounts you read and heard.

You mention that the University should not allow him to teach his theory to students and as far as I can tell, he will not, other than as one of many theories. A thorough review of his syllabus, teaching plan, reading materials, and past student evaluations was conducted and at the end of this review the Provost, Dean, and Department Chair all sat down with Mr. Barrett. The review concluded that Mr. Barrett has a record of quality teaching, and there is no evidence that he has promoted his personal views in class.

Two weeks of the 15-week class will address contemporary political issues, with one week devoted to the war on terrorism. Students in the class will be free and encouraged to challenge any viewpoints presented. The idea is to create discussion and provide a place where critical thought can be learned and applied. Many of his students in their course reviews have commented that even when he might have, he has never pushed his own agenda in class and that is usually a good indicator that he will not this time.

Once this review was complete, the decision was made to allow him to teach. This is far from legitimizing his point of view.

These points may or may not make any difference to you, but I find them compelling and wanted to share them with you.

You are not alone in voicing embarrassment about this and we take your comments very seriously. It is an indication of the passion of your past support and your high regard for the University that you took the time to write. If you would like additional information, I am happy to send some of the local press coverage and editorials that overwhelmingly condemn this teacher, but support the University's decision to let him teach.

I look forward to getting together on my next trip and hope that we will have more pleasant things to discuss by then.

Best Regards,

Eric

Eric G. Billman
Senior Director of Development
School of Business
direct: 608-265-2609


eric.billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu

"Dennis Kite"
<dkite@mischlerfinancial.com>

07/14/2006 01:07 PM

To <pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu>
cc <bdurand@wisc.edu>, <dchaptman@wisc.edu>, <Eric.Billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu>, <comments@uc.wisc.edu>, <bjwolf@wisc.edu>

Subject teaching the conspiracy theory on 9-11-01

8/10/2006

I am a proud alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, Madison. I graduated with a degree in Banking and Finance in June, 1967. I have given modest financial donations to the UW down through the years, and cheered for its academic and athletic successes. I have defended the university on numerous occasions when others have criticized it for various reasons. I have always felt that the Wisconsin legislature was too stingy with the University, and should not try to starve it by over-zealous budget cutting. I have felt proud that the University was teaching valid and important subject matter to students in diverse subjects. Most important, I believed that the maintenance of high ethics and morals governed UW teachings.

I have never been so embarrassed (at any event since graduation) as when I heard the story come out about Kevin Barrett and the decision to permit him to teach at the UW. The theory that the CIA or the US government set up the 9-11 attack is allied with the most vicious anti-semitic theory emanating from the ignoramuses who lead several of the middle eastern countries who charged that "the Jews set up the attacks and told Jewish people to stay home from work that day". Scores of Jewish people were murdered in cold blood that day in New York which totally disproves that theory. I feel it is inappropriate for Barrett to teach a class at UW because it legitimizes and perpetuates these theories which have no substance. Will he teach the corollary theory next year that in fact the Jews set it all up, or is that part of this year's curriculum?

One thing I always valued at UW was the free air for lively discussions and debates which is the argument your administration is using to allow this to continue. Under those same lines, will the administration allow neo-Nazis to teach modern European history? Will it allow domestic terrorist bombers of clinics to teach medical courses dealing with abortions, or civics courses? Do you exchange professors with Saudi Madras (Wahabist) schools so you can have them come out and teach courses on diversity and tolerance? Freedom of speech is very different from the right to yell "fire!" in a crowded night club when no fire exists. The truth is what we are all searching for, but in the case of 9-11, it was 11 Saudis and 8 other Arabs who slammed those airplanes into the heart of America. Many in the Islamic world have not been able to accept that ever since.

My objection to this professor(?) teaching is not to stifle freedom of speech, but are you keen and sensitive to a possible breakdown in ethics and morals here? At the very least will you tolerate rampant anti-semitism to be fomented in a UW sanctioned classroom atmosphere? Perhaps you have covered all these issues and I am not aware of your review, but in the spirit of freedom of speech, these events are of concern and this whole affair does not leave a good taste in my mouth.

Dennis Kite
Corona del Mar, CA

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Marjorie Lundquist [marlundquist@usa.net]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 3:13 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: jdwiley@bascom.wisc.edu
Subject: The "Kevin Barrett affair" is still on the airwaves!

To: Patrick Farrell, Provost, UW-Madison
cc: John D. Wiley, Chancellor, UW-Madison
From: Marjorie Lundquist, Milwaukee

Subject: Update on the "Kevin Barrett affair"

Mr. Farrell, I've already e-mailed you about the conservative radio talk show hosts who are trying to whip up a mob to FORCE the University of Wisconsin-Madison to fire Kevin Barrett. And I've made some suggestions about what I think the University should do by way of response.

Mark Belling, both on his own WISN radio show in Milwaukee, and as a stand-in for Rush Limbaugh, has aired what I consider misinformation about the "Kevin Barrett affair". WISN radio also has a program (with co-hosts Dan and Nicole) called "Early Spin" that airs from 5:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m., and after that comes the "Jay Weber Show" from 8:30 a.m. to noon, or nearly noon. I've told you that Dan (Early Spin) is absolutely rabid on the subject of Kevin Barrett; he literally becomes almost incoherent with rage when he talks about how wrong it is for Kevin Barrett to be teaching a course at the University of Wisconsin.

Dan was ranting again this morning against Kevin Barrett (I just caught the end of the "Early Spin" program). But this topic kicked off the Jay Weber Show immediately following.

This e-mail message gives you a report on Jay Weber's on-air interview this morning of Assembly Representative Stephen Nass, who is trying to persuade fellow legislators to sign his resolution (now transformed into a letter he plans to send to the University) threatening to withhold funds from the University of Wisconsin if it doesn't fire Kevin Barrett. (I took notes while listening to this program.)

Jay Weber pointed out that withdrawing funds from the University would hurt the students, and asked Nass how he could justify doing something that would hurt UW students. Nass replied that "it's the top echelon at the university that isn't listening to the people" and indicated that he was trying to target this top echelon, not the students.

A little later in the interview Nass said, "I think many of them are hiding behind academic freedom." Surprisingly, he was NOT referring to anyone at the University of Wisconsin when he said this! Nass was answering a question about why so few Democrats (only one to date) in the Assembly had signed his resolution, and "them" referred to these Democrats!

Nass went on to say that the University of Wisconsin is telling the state legislators to "butt out" of university affairs because of the recent scandals at the University that have been uncovered; he implied that the University would prefer to deal with these quietly, out of the public eye, instead of being held publicly accountable.

There was passing mention of an offer from Kevin Barrett to debate Rep. Nass on the events of 9/11, but Nass wasn't interested.

That was pretty much it. Jay Weber, like the other conservative radio talk show hosts I've mentioned, is certain that Kevin Barrett is a nut, a "wacko"--whatever derogatory term you want to use to describe a person who is seriously out of touch with reality. He mentioned at the outset of his show this morning that he had discussed Kevin Barrett several times already in the past few weeks [I don't normally listen to the Jay Weber Show, so I didn't hear anything he said previously].

By the way, did you see the editorial that ran in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel yesterday (July 13)? It's at the bottom of page 16A and it is titled "Fiction and Fact at UW". When the publishers of a large newspaper hop on the bandwagon, it seems to me that it is time to get REALLY worried! Somebody there needs to respond to that editorial, and such a response would have more impact, I think, if it came from the Chancellor instead of the Provost.

Marjorie Lundquist

P.S. These radio talk show hosts all vehemently deny that there is any evidence to support skeptics of the official version of the events of September 11, 2001. Actually, there is a great deal of evidence, including a number of books. Here is a list of books that I have purchased and read:

The New Pearl Harbor

and

The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions

both by David Ray Griffith, often described as a "noted theologian", retired from California's Claremont College (if I recall correctly)

9/11 Revealed: The Unanswered Questions
Ian Henshall and Rowland Morgan
New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2005

Painful Questions: An Analysis of the September 11th Attack Eric Hufschmid [Copyright 2002, apparently self-published; this is a paperback book]

David Ray Griffith is a scholar who has published many books (mostly on theology); he is a professor emeritus now. His two books are probably the most "respectable" of all because he is undeniably a scholar of some stature (they are extensively footnoted), but each of the books I have listed has information that the other books lack. The Henshall and Morgan book also has extensive references provided. Eric Hufschmid's book has no footnotes or references, but does have a great many photographs, including photos of WTC buildings 5 and 6 burning (his is the only book I've seen that discusses what happened to WTC buildings 4, 5 and 6, for which there is NO evidence of controlled demolition, as there is for buildings 1, 2 and 7).

I've provided this information because I think it may be time to tell the general public about the existence of the various books that report problems with the official version of the events of September 11, 2001--and the only way to do that is to list them! Kevin should be able to give you more references, I expect.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Ebdabbs@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 1:20 PM
To: mcbride@620wtmj.com
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; mtwohey@journalsentinel.com
Subject: Kevin Barrett 1996 conviction

Are the facts of this incident fully known? I don't think I would want my daughter to attend his lectures. The provost may be satisfied but I'm not. What are some of those "issues in his past" other than the idiotic 9/11 theory?

Ed Dabbs
Cudahy, WI

From the Journal Sentinel

Posted: July 13, 2006

Controversial UW lecturer was convicted in '96

The University of Wisconsin-Madison lecturer who has taught that the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks were an inside job was convicted in 1996 of disorderly conduct, but the university determined that should not prevent him from teaching.

Advertisement According to Dane County Circuit Court records, Kevin Barrett was charged after police responded to a call from a woman who said he had punched her in the face. Barrett, who pleaded guilty and was fined, said the charge was the result of him "resisting arrest."

UW-Madison Provost Patrick Farrell considered the conviction when he conducted a review of Barrett this month to determine whether he was fit to teach. "During our meetings, Mr. Barrett and I did discuss some issues in his past," Farrell said in an e-mail. "I determined that these issues were personal and unrelated to his responsibilities as an instructor."

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Dennis Kite [dkite@mischlerfinancial.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 1:07 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: bdurand@wisc.edu; dchaptman@wisc.edu; Eric.Billman@uwfoundation.wisc.edu; comments@uc.wisc.edu; bjwolff@wisc.edu
Subject: teaching the conspiracy theory on 9-11-01

I am a proud alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, Madison. I graduated with a degree in Banking and Finance in June, 1967. I have given modest financial donations to the UW down through the years, and cheered for its academic and athletic successes. I have defended the university on numerous occasions when others have criticized it for various reasons. I have always felt that the Wisconsin legislature was too stingy with the University, and should not try to starve it by over-zealous budget cutting. I have felt proud that the University was teaching valid and important subject matter to students in diverse subjects. Most important, I believed that the maintenance of high ethics and morals governed UW teachings.

I have never been so embarrassed (at any event since graduation) as when I heard the story come out about Kevin Barrett and the decision to permit him to teach at the UW. The theory that the CIA or the US government set up the 9-11 attack is allied with the most vicious anti-semitic theory emanating from the ignoramuses who lead several of the middle eastern countries who charged that "the Jews set up the attacks and told Jewish people to stay home from work that day". Scores of Jewish people were murdered in cold blood that day in New York which totally disproves that theory. I feel it is inappropriate for Barrett to teach a class at UW because it legitimize and perpetuate these theories which have no substance. Will he teach the corollary theory next year that in fact the Jews set it all up, or is that part of this year's curriculum?

One thing I always valued at UW was the free air for lively discussions and debates which is the argument your administration is using to allow this to continue. Under those same lines, will the administration allow neo-Nazis to teach modern European history? Will it allow domestic terrorist bombers of clinics to teach medical courses dealing with abortions, or civics courses? Do you exchange professors with Saudi Madras (Wahabist) schools so you can have them come out and teach courses on diversity and tolerance? Freedom of speech is very different from the right to yell "fire!" in a crowded night club when no fire exists. The truth is what we are all searching for, but in the case of 9-11, it was 11 Saudis and 8 other Arabs who slammed those airplanes into the heart of America. Many in the Islamic world have not been able to accept that ever since.

My objection to this professor(?) teaching is not to stifle freedom of speech, but are you keen and sensitive to a possible breakdown in ethics and morals here? At the very least will you tolerate rampant anti-semitism to be fomented in a UW sanctioned classroom atmosphere? Perhaps you have covered all these issues and I am not aware of your review, but in the spirit of freedom of speech, these events are of concern and this whole affair does not leave a good taste in my mouth.

Dennis Kite
Corona del Mar, CA

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Seldon B. Graham, Jr. [selgraham@austin.rr.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 10:37 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Expressing unconventional ideas is one thing, but accusing innocent Americans of murder without proof is quite another thing. False criminal accusations are not to be condoned in any institution of higher learning—not even the University of Wisconsin.

In **Dixit Land** I'll take my stand,
to live and die in **Dixit**.

In the good old USA, everyone is entitled to their own opinion. Most everyone is quick to express their opinion on almost anything and everything.

These opinions are collected in polls—actually popularity polls—on various subjects. These polls are often used by both government and business organizations to make decisions. At times, the decisions produced by polls can affect one's general welfare, economics, health, life style and other facets of life.

But, what if the opinions are wrong? A popular opinion is not always a correct opinion. A decision which relies on faulty opinions will be a wrong decision.

An opinion is only as good as the facts which support that opinion. The more relevant facts to support an opinion, the better the opinion.

What if there are no facts to support an opinion? In the legal profession, an opinion unsupported by any facts is called an "*ipse dixit*" opinion.

"*Ipse* is a Latin word meaning "he himself." "*Dixit*" is also a Latin word meaning "said it." In this context, "*dixit*" means having said it without having any or without providing any factual support for having said it.

To illustrate a "*dixit*," one example would be, "The earth is flat." Obviously, this *dixit* is an incorrect opinion not having any factual support other than one's subjective false perception.

As you might expect, an *ipse dixit* opinion expressed in a court of law is without any value. In the courts, the opinion of an expert witness—if an *ipse dixit* opinion—is without any weight as evidence and is worthless. Therefore, an expert witness can and should be cross-examined about the facts which support the expert's opinion.

Bernard Baruch, an economic adviser to US Presidents, said, "Every man has a right to be wrong in his opinions; but, no man has a right to be wrong in his facts." Baruch was pointing out that correct and relevant facts should be essential to every good and proper opinion.

But, we all know that this often does not happen. Individuals too often express a *dixit* opinion which they have heard from some other source. Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's Propaganda Minister, thrived on this human trait. Goebbels' warped viewpoint was that if you tell a lie often enough, people will believe it.

8/10/2006

Thus, we see that *dixit* can breed disaster and, therefore, should be avoided.

There are other reasons why *dixit* opinions should be avoided. They can be a deliberate sophism, an apparently correct but invalid statement. This is particularly reprehensible when a *dixit* opinion is used to deceive others. "He is a liar" comes to mind as an example. A "lie" requires the intent to deceive. The person stating, "He is a liar," without any evidence that the individual made a false statement with the intent to deceive, is himself or herself the liar.

A *dixit* often takes the form of a quibble, raising a frivolous or trivial objection. Lawyers have employed such *dixits* since ancient times. Emily Kadens, Ph.D., a medieval law scholar, notes that Roman law tolerated the cavil, the sophistry trick of raising frivolous and trivial objections, provided that it was not done maliciously.

One of the most famous examples of a cavil is: "If the glove doesn't fit [over hands already covered with non-slip, glide-resistant, high-friction vinyl gloves], the jury should acquit." That is certainly a *dixit* without any supporting evidence, probably one of the most successful *dixits* in history.

A *dixit* opinion can be disguised as a factually supported opinion by the clever use—of all things!—of more *dixits*. Adding irrelevant reasons for an opinion does not make the opinion factually supported. Citing inapplicable facts hides the truth that an opinion is without supporting facts. An example: "He made a false statement; therefore, he is a liar." Making a false statement without any intent to deceive is not a lie. Two or more *dixits* do not make a proper opinion.

A *dixit* opinion is supposedly authoritative dogma which is not to be disputed or doubted even though the reasons for the opinion are not given. Dogma is particularly inappropriate for opinion polls. This should be a clue as to why polls should always receive the disadvantage of doubt. As Warren Buffett has said, "A public opinion poll is no substitute for thought."

Bertrand Russell said, "The fact that an opinion has been widely held is no evidence whatever that it is not utterly absurd; indeed, in view of the silliness of the majority of mankind, a wide-spread belief is more likely to be foolish than sensible." Consensus does not make it correct.

Facts first, then opinion. Never seek facts merely to try to justify a *dixit* opinion. Do the fact-finding homework first. Find out the pertinent facts. Be sure the facts are correct. Then, and only then, form an opinion from the facts. Do not be a person whose attitude is, "Don't bother me with the facts because my mind is made up."

Bernard Baruch made a profound statement about the adequacy of facts, "If you get all the facts, your judgment can be right; if you don't get all the facts, it can't be right." Thomas Fuller put his thoughts on correctness of facts into the venacular: "Get the facts or the facts will get you. And when you get 'em, get 'em right, or they will get you wrong."

An illustration of a well-founded opinion might go something like this: My opinion is that your child was not bitten by my dog because I do not own a dog; I have never owned a dog; I do not take care of another person's dog; I have no interest in or relationship with a dog; and, I have a doctor's report stating that I am highly allergic to dogs. Well-founded opinions like this are hard to find.

We live in a land of *dixit* opinions. In order to exist successfully and prosper in this atmosphere of too many *dixit* opinions, start challenging the opinions you see and hear. Question the reasons for the opinion. Does the writer or speaker have a vested personal interest in the opinion? What are the facts in support of the opinion? Can the facts withstand scrutiny? By doing this, one's own opinions will

improve by applying the same analysis to them.

Caveat dixits. But, that's just my opinion. I hope that I provided enough facts to support it.

Seldon B. Graham, Jr.

4713 Palisade Drive
Austin, Texas 78731

(512) 452-4000

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Larry Kahan [lkahan@wisc.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 10:23 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Feedback

Dear Provost Farrell,

As a UW faculty member for some 33 years, I thought I might drop you a note regarding recent events. I congratulate you on the way you handled the Barrett matter. I thought your comments were absolutely correct - this is a matter of educational competence that should be decided on the basis of training and ability to teach as well as past teaching performance, not on the basis of personal beliefs. To me, this affair was reminiscent of McCarthyism, and I was glad to see the University stand up to legislative demagogery.

In the interest of full disclosure, I have to add that I was disappointed by your actions in the Barrows case. When the appropriate governance committee carefully investigates a case and comes to a conclusion (and a unanimous conclusion at that), I think it ill advised to for the university administration to go contrary to that conclusion. In my eyes, the damage to the credibility of our governance system far outweighs any benefit to the University from the handling of the particular case.

Sincerely,
Larry Kahan
Professor
Biomolecular Chemistry

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Geoff Davidian [Geoff@MilwaukeePress.Net]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 10:13 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: peter.phillips@sonoma.edu; khidria@merr.com
Subject: Dr. Kevin Barrett

Attached please find a letter regarding Dr. Kevin Barrett

Milwaukee Press

4101 N. Prospect Ave.
Tel: (414) 964-2123

Shorewood, Wisconsin 53211
Fax: (414) 431-8389

July 14, 2006

Patrick V. Farrell
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison
150 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, WI 53706

Re: Dr. Kevin Barrett

Dear Provost Farrell:

Thank you for recognizing that Dr. Kevin Barrett is fit to teach.

Outlandish as his topic may seem to many, I heard Dr. Barrett speak at UWM on Sunday and discovered he has a message worth hearing. I congratulate you and the university for having a scholar with the dedication and strength to withstand the onslaught of misplaced patriotism that intended to end his career.

We should value a breadth of expression to ensure that democracy stays on track.

Very truly yours,

Geoff Davidian, editor & publisher

Cc: Dr. Kevin Barrett
Dr. Peter Phillips

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Tom Wynn [twynn@mtnhome.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 8:57 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Academic Integrity

Mr. Farrell,

My name is Tom Wynn
I hope your time will allow you to read and acknowledge this letter.

I am currently attending Arkansas State University Mountain Home. I am an honor student with a 4.0 grade average. I have two classes remaining before I graduate. Because college has been such a wonderful experience, I intend to further my education at a larger University.

Critical thinking is a very important part of education, particularly at the college level. However, if a teacher offers his or her personal views to receptive students about sensitive subjects such as the tragic events on 9/11 and the war on terror, the teacher has a responsibility to provide real evidence to support such theories unless it is clearly stated that the theory is based on assumptions or that it is just a hypothetical situation to invoke critical thinking.

Concerning Mr. Barrett

This is not a question of academic freedom; this is question of quality of education. It is overwhelmingly evident Mr. Barrett has an axe to grind. I studied his writings, statements, and interviews and they clearly establish a biased opinion against the United States Government. How he presents his thoughts in class could hardly be balanced given his well publicized track record. I can't for the life of me understand how a well established University can accept this reality and brush it off as an academic freedom issue. If you really don't endorse his theories, I guess you could invite someone who claims they can debunk his theory. Have them present evidence to the class that Mr. Barrett will evidently teach. You might start with the folks at Popular Mechanics who have done exactly that.
<http://www.popularmechanics.com/science/defense/1230517.html> This would provide evidence that you really do wish to provide the quality of education that you claim.

Because of Barrett, I will NOT consider the UW-Madison to further my education. Furthermore, I will encourage all of my friends and colleagues to attend other Universities with better qualified teachers. I am willing to change my opinion if students are presented with balanced material which Barrett can not possibly present by himself due to the fact that he has made his thoughts very clear in every public forum he could muster. I suppose he will write a book in the best interest of the students. Maybe he will donate the proceeds to the alleged victims of the Terrorist United States Government. Sounds Crazy? Hmmm

Thank you for reading my letter. I hope you will consider my views as you have considered Mr. Barrett's.

— Sound Minds Must Prevail —

P.S. Do you have an academic integrity policy? If so, I would be interested in reading it. Could

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Dan Maguire [maguired@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 8:36 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: re Professor Barrett

Professor Daniel C. Maguire
Marquette University
(Home Office) 2823 N. Summit Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53211
maguired@juno.com
www.religiousconsultation.org

Provost Patrick Farrell
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dear Dr. Farrell,
Congratulations on your defense of academic freedom in the classroom and in extra-mural utterances in accord with AAUP standards. The integrity of a university depends on fidelity to John Henry Newman's definition of a university as a place "where many minds compete freely together." As to the substance of Professor Barrett's stance on the prelude to 9/11, many questions remain unanswered. Indeed, the investigation has hardly begun, especially in this country. Recently published investigative studies point to considerable foreknowledge by the CIA re some of the operatives of the 9/11 plot. It is no time for a research university to call for closure of debate. It is also no time to cave into posturing politicians. So, again, as a fellow academic, I congratulate and thank you for your defense of the true nature of the academe.

Daniel C. Maguire
Professor

you tell me where I might find it? I am interested in the guidelines for faculty.

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Timothy Paustian [paustian@wisc.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 7:54 AM
To: PATRICK V FARRELL
Subject: Thank you

Provost Farrell,

I just read your statement on Kevin Barrett and I wanted to thank you for your courage. It takes courage to take a stand on such unpopular issues and it is nice to know I work at a institution where principals mean something. This is real leadership and you should be proud. I know I am.

Cheers,

Tim

Timothy Paustian
"Life is not a zero sum game. Everybody can win"

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Ebdabbs@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 4:05 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: chancellor@news.wisc.edu; dwalsh@foleylaw.com; mary.cuene@mwtc.edu; dbarker@ffrf.org
Subject: Kevin Barrett. Qualified to teach?

Still qualified to teach Islam in at UW-Madison?

From the Journal Sentinel

Posted: July 13, 2006

Controversial UW lecturer was convicted in '96

The University of Wisconsin-Madison lecturer who has taught that the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks were an inside job was convicted in 1996 of disorderly conduct, but the university determined that should not prevent him from teaching.

Advertisement According to Dane County Circuit Court records, Kevin Barrett was charged after police responded to a call from a woman who said he had punched her in the face. Barrett, who pleaded guilty and was fined, said the charge was the result of him "resisting arrest."

UW-Madison Provost Patrick Farrell considered the conviction when he conducted a review of Barrett this month to determine whether he was fit to teach. "During our meetings, Mr. Barrett and I did discuss some issues in his past," Farrell said in an e-mail. "I determined that these issues were personal and unrelated to his responsibilities as an instructor."

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Judie Ferraris [judith.ferraris@verizon.net]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 12:22 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Thank you

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Dan Maguire [maguired@juno.com]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 8:36 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: re Professor Barrett

Professor Daniel C. Maguire
Marquette University
(Home Office) 2823 N. Summit Avenue
Milwaukee WI 53211
maguired@juno.com

www.religiousconsultation.org
Provost Patrick Farrell
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Dear Dr. Farrell,
Congratulations on your defense of academic freedom in the classroom and in extra-mural utterances in accord with AAUP standards. The integrity of a university depends on fidelity to John Henry Newman's definition of a university as a place "where many minds compete freely together." As to the substance of Professor Barrett's stance on the prelude to 9/11, many questions remain unanswered. Indeed, the investigation has hardly begun, especially in this country. Recently published investigative studies point to considerable foreknowledge by the CIA re some of the operatives of the 9/11 plot. It is no time for a research university to call for closure of debate. It is also no time to cave into posturing politicians. So, again, as a fellow academic, I congratulate and thank you for your defense of the true nature of the academe.

Daniel C. Maguire
Professor

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Esty Dinur [edinur@wisc.edu]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 10:51 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Fwd: [apa] [Fwd: Kevin Barrett: Holocaust "agnostic"]

Hello again,

The email below was just received in my mailbox. Too late for your decision process but important that you know.

Also, on the day that your decision was made, I remembered another thing--an example of Barrett's lack of intellectual integrity and teaching prowess: he did an Access Hour on WORT, a copy of which may be requested from the station. He called it "The Challenge of Islam," the title of a course he had given at Edgewood. He had four female students with him in the studio and they spent the majority of the hour talking, elatedly, about how feminist and female-supportive Islam is.

Having read the Quran cover-to-cover (and some of it numerous times), I called and requested to ask a question. I was told that I couldn't get on the air to do so. I left my question with the receptionist who assured me it would be delivered to Barrett. In my question, I noted that the Quran:

- allows men to marry four women and have additional "women slaves"
- says that the women are from the devil and should not wear makeup so they do not incite desire in the hearts of men
- prescribes exactly how many times men should beat their wives and with what size stick for various infractions

Of course, women may not marry more than one man and have no right to hit a man for his infidelities or disrespect.

I asked him to explain these in light of what had been discussed. He did not reply, nor mentioned that he had received a question. This, BTW, happened some time before his anti-Semitic remarks on my show and at that time I had had no interactions with him.

Again, this information is meant to ask that someone supervise the man and his class very closely. I am not requesting that you reconsider your decision--I'd hate for him to become a free-speech martyr.

Thanks.

Date: Thu, 13 Jul 2006 21:27:24 -0500
From: Allen Ruff <alruff@tds.net>
Subject: [apa] [Fwd: Kevin Barrett: Holocaust "agnostic"]
Sender: owner-apa@lists.wort-fm.org
To: undisclosed-recipients: ;

The piece below, forwarded to me a by a friend, allie and wonderful internet sleuth, should be sufficient in casting off any doubt as to Kevin Barrett's anti-Semitism. His words speak for themselves. As noted by the person who sent me this document, you have to read it carefully to distinguish who's saying what. But it's well worth the effort.

-Allen

Apropos the Kevin Barrett dust-up -- maybe you are already aware of this
-- if not, you should find it interesting:

<http://www.oilempire.us/holocaust-denial.html#mujca>

I think what happened here is that Barrett (writing from khidria@merr.com, his MUJCA-net address) showed his true colors to Robinowitz because he thought that he, being a fellow 9/11 truther, would be sympathetic (or at least discreet) with it. Instead, Robinowitz turned around and posted it at the page of his website where he denounces anti-Semites and Holocaust deniers in the 9/11 truth movement.

The e-mail is a little confusing because of the forwarded messages nested in it, and also because Robinowitz seems to have annotated it with his own comments. But, you can still tell what parts Barrett authored.

--

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG Free Edition.

Version: 7.1.394 / Virus Database: 268.10.0/388 - Release Date:

7/13/2006

Esty Dinur
Marketing and Communications Manager
Co-Chair for Artistic Selection, Madison World Music Festival
Wisconsin Union Theater
800 Langdon St.
Madison, WI 53706-1459

608-262-3907 (voice)
608-265-5084 (fax)
edinur@wisc.edu
www.union.wisc.edu/theater

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: GRAHAM K WILSON [gkwilson@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 4:08 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Fwd: Re:



Re: (2.68 KB)

I'd be very grateful if your staff could send him a copy of your statement; he was for many years a distinguished member of our department and been a donor to our Foundation accounts.

Graham

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: GRAHAM K WILSON [gkwilson@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 4:06 PM
To: Ira Sharkansky
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu
Subject: Re:

Dear Ira;

We are very proud of your association with this department and I in particular recall your time here and kindnesses to me very fondly. I am therefore sorry that this appointment has caused you such distress.

As you recognize, this is not a course taught in the Political Science department and I think it highly unlikely that we would have hired someone with as strange a view of the world as Mr. Barrett has proclaimed. It is also not obvious to me that anything in his academic training qualifies him to teach a course on the US government in general or its role in the events of 9-11 in particular. That topic would seem to me better reserved for people in this department or History. However, I am told that Barrett will be spending only one week on this topic for which I suppose we should be thankful.

I am copying the provost, Pat Farrell, and I hope he will send you a copy of the statement he issued on the controversy.

Graham

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

From: Ira Sharkansky <msira@mscc.huji.ac.il>
Date: Thursday, July 13, 2006 6:01 am
Subject:
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu, gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu

> Allow me to enter a protest concerning your hiring Kevin Barrett to
> teach anything at the university, including a class titled, "Islam:
> Religion and Culture."

>

> I am well aware of the wide range of academic freedom, and the
> likelihood that teachers of the humanities will expound beyond the
> edge of their professional expertise. As I read Barrett's "
> Coexistence, Deep Dialogue and Deeper Truth," the man seems
> unhinged in the extreme. To assert that 9-11 was a Christian-
> Jewish conspiracy to begin a war against Islam adopts the anti-
> Semitism rampant in Muslim societies. To conclude that George Bush
> is waging a campaign against religion is sufficient justification
> for institutionalization, and not in a university department of
> language or religion.

>

> My two older children have UW BAs along with Phi Beta Kappa; I
> earned my PhD there; and I used to take pride in having been a
> professor there. I shaped my sense of academic freedom on the basis
> of numerous conversations with David Fellman. I perceive that the
> best form of the concept has something to do with professional
> expertise, and not saying anything that comes to mind, or relying
> on undergraduate evaluations to decide what is acceptable.

>

> In this context, I would urge potential students to think of some
> other university, on the assumption that they could find an
> American campus that pursues a form of academic freedom protected
> from wildness.

>

>

> Ira Sharkansky (Emeritus)
> Department of Political Science
> Hebrew University of Jerusalem
> Home tel: 972-2-532-2725
> Cell phone: 054-683-5325
> Fax: 972-2-582-9144
>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: GRAHAM K WILSON [gkwilson@facstaff.wisc.edu]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 4:06 PM
To: Ira Sharkansky
Cc: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu
Subject: Re:

Dear Ira;

We are very proud of your association with this department and I in particular recall your time here and kindnesses to me very fondly. I am therefore sorry that this appointment has caused you such distress.

As you recognize, this is not a course taught in the Political Science department and I think it highly unlikely that we would have hired someone with as strange a view of the world as Mr. Barrett has proclaimed. It is also not obvious to me that anything in his academic training qualifies him to teach a course on the US government in general or its role in the events of 9-11 in particular. That topic would seem to me better reserved for people in this department or History. However, I am told that Barrett will be spending only one week on this topic for which I suppose we should be thankful.

I am copying the provost, Pat Farrell, and I hope he will send you a copy of the statement he issued on the controversy.

Graham

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

From: Ira Sharkansky <msira@mscc.huji.ac.il>
Date: Thursday, July 13, 2006 6:01 am
Subject:
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu, gwilson@polisci.wisc.edu

> Allow me to enter a protest concerning your hiring Kevin Barrett to
> teach anything at the university, including a class titled, "Islam:
> Religion and Culture."

>

> I am well aware of the wide range of academic freedom, and the
> likelihood that teachers of the humanities will expound beyond the
> edge of their professional expertise. As I read Barrett's "
> Coexistence, Deep Dialogue and Deeper Truth," the man seems
> unhinged in the extreme. To assert that 9-11 was a Christian-
> Jewish conspiracy to begin a war against Islam adopts the anti-
> Semitism rampant in Muslim societies. To conclude that George Bush
> is waging a campaign against religion is sufficient justification
> for institutionalization, and not in a university department of
> language or religion.

>

> My two older children have UW BAs along with Phi Beta Kappa; I
> earned my PhD there; and I used to take pride in having been a
> professor there. I shaped my sense of academic freedom on the basis
> of numerous conversations with David Fellman. I perceive that the
> best form of the concept has something to do with professional
> expertise, and not saying anything that comes to mind, or relying
> on undergraduate evaluations to decide what is acceptable.

>

> In this context, I would urge potential students to think of some
> other university, on the assumption that they could find an
> American campus that pursues a form of academic freedom protected
> from wildness.

>

>

> Ira Sharkansky (Emeritus)
> Department of Political Science
> Hebrew University of Jerusalem
> Home tel: 972-2-532-2725
> Cell phone: 054-683-5325
> Fax: 972-2-582-9144
>

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Thomas Cooper [tcooper3@ix.netcom.com]

Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 2:51 PM

To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu

Subject: Kevin Barrett

Mr. Farrell,

Did you know that Kevin Barrett said on a national syndicated talk show that "Dick Cheney should and will be hanged for treason before the year is up"? He said this as a representative of your university.

You have to understand that if the students know that a disturbed person like Barrett is working for the university, they will wonder how many other disturbed professors are there to handle their education.

Regards,

T. Cooper

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 7:33 AM
To: Frank Lasee
Cc: rep.pocan@legis.state.wi.us; Patrick Farrell
Subject: concerning "any and all proof"

Dear Frank Lasee,

In case you got the wrong impression, I thought I should point out that what I sent you was just a basic introduction to the subject, not "any and all proof." An exhaustive bibliography of all the worthwhile research, argumentation, papers, books, etc. on the subject would be far too lengthy to do you any good. What I sent you was enough to give you a sense of whether or not there are sane scholarly voices out there marshaling actual evidence. (The word "proof" does not apply, since we are not yet in a court of law.)

Please also check out <http://st911.org>, where more than 60 professors with academic affiliations, and hundreds of other academics, have put their reputations on the line by speaking out on this issue, doing research, and so on. If you are concerned about an \$8k lecturer teaching a class with 5% or less 9/11 content, of which 80% of the readings support the official story while 20% critique it, what about the 60 other professors drawing full salaries at non-Wisconsin institutions and devoting most of their time to research aimed at proving the official story is a lie?

It would be tragic if the University of Wisconsin suffered because of me, while more than 50 non-Wisconsin universities continue to support 9/11 truth activist professors, often paying them six-figure salaries, not 8k a year! Not one st911 member has even been reprimanded, nor have any (besides me) had their jobs threatened. Why exactly am I so important? "Not one penny for Barrett" – and millions for the other st911 members? It seems to me that it is Nass who is wasting the taxpayers' dollars here.

If there is a good reason to harass the University of Wisconsin about me, and ignore all those other universities employing st911.org members, I would like to know what it is. If it has to do with the fact that I am a Muslim, there may be a religious-discrimination lawsuit looming on the horizon.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

Dear Marc Pocan,

Thank you for your forthright statement about Steve Nass. I have met some crazy, obsessive people in my three years of 9/11 truth activism—as well as some unusually sane ones—but I have yet to meet a "conspiracy theorist" as wacky as your colleague from Whitewater.

Since you seem to be willing to listen to reason, a rare quality in these times, I thought you might consider looking at some material showing that my educated guesses about what probably happened on 9/11 are in fact backed up by quite a bit of evidence—which makes a liar out of Mr. Nass.

8/10/2006

To get a sense of whether I sound like a reasonable guy or a nut, please listen to my Ben Merens interview (which Nass bowed out of):

<http://www.wpr.org/merens/index.cfm?strDirection=Prev&dteShowDate=2006%2D07%2D17%2016%3A00%3A00>

Also please note the sources cited in my letter to Frank Lasee, who, like you, seems to be a reasonable man in a legislature with more than its share of lunatics.

Again, I appreciate your courage and lucidity.

Sincerely,

Kevin Barrett

To: laseesnotes@yahoo.com

Frank,

Thank you for your interest. I wish all your colleagues shared your willingness to see whether evidence exists before denying its existence!

For 9/11, the best place to start is David Griffin's two books, *The New Pearl Harbor* and *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*. Or you can read the linked articles at:

<http://mujca.com/newyork.htm> (Griffin)

and

<http://mujca.com/jonesendorsement.htm> (Jones)

For the "war on terror" see Nafeez Ahmed's book *The War on Truth* and the BBC-TV series *The Power of Nightmares*: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/terrorism/story/0,12780,1327904,00.html>

Given the importance of the subject, I think it's worth following up on these leads! If you do, I am certain you will no longer consider me a nut presenting arguments without evidence – though you may disagree with my evaluation of the evidence, which is your right.

Kevin

PS Feel free to forward this to other legislators. Also, I co-edited a book <http://mujca.com/newbook.htm> that will be out in September, featuring my own scholarly article on 9/11.

On Jul 14, 2006, at 10:19 AM, Frank Lasee wrote:

Kevin,

Saw you on tv recently and am interested in learning more about where your theories come from on 9/11. Please forward me any and all proof that you have on this subject, I would like to review what you have. Look forward to hearing from you soon. Thanks in advance.

Regards,

Frank Lasee
State Representative

8/10/2006

Wisconsin's 2nd Assembly District

Do you Yahoo!?

Everyone is raving about the all-new Yahoo! Mail Beta.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jeff Kortsch [jkortsch@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 7:10 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Academic freedom

And you're a moron too...

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Marjorie Lundquist [marlundquist@usa.net]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 5:04 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: jdwiley@bascom.wisc.edu
Subject: Fwd: The "Kevin Barrett affair" is still on the airwaves!



Forwarded
message.eml (4.61 KB)

To: Partrick Farrell, Provost, UW-Madison
cc: John D. Wiley, Chancellor, UW-Madison
From: Marjorie Lundquist, Milwaukee

Error Correction + More Info

I wish to correct an error in the attached e-mail I sent on Friday, and supply a bit of additional information.

I erred when I provided the last name of author David Ray Griffin (I wrongly said it was "Griffith"). I didn't have either of his books with me when I wrote my e-mail on Friday, so I did a quick check on the Internet and came up with the name "Griffith" associated with these books, and decided that was him.

But today I checked with Books in Print, and then with Amazon.com, which is where I bought his books, and both of them showed his name as "Griffin".

I have also obtain more complete information for these books, so here is the full, corrected information:

The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions about the Bush Administration and 9/11 David Ray Griffin and Richard Falk Interlink Publishing Group, Inc., 2004

The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions nad Distortions
David Ray Griffin
Interlink Publishing Group, Inc., 2004

These books are listed in the order they were published. David Ray Griffin has said he started out to examine the evidence to see if he could make a prima facie case that the official version of the events of September 11, 2001, was untrue. He considers he accomplished this in The New Pearl Harbor. Then, after the report of the 9/11 Commission was published, he examined THAT, to see whether the Commission had carried out its mission. Again, he made a prima facie case that, in many respects, it had NOT.

I have also looked for the work of those who debunk the "9/11 Truth" movement. I found one book that is being published but has not yet been released to the public (it has a release date in August, 2006). Popular Mechanics published an article debunking those who don't believe the official version of 9/11 events, but it has been critically reviewed and pretty well shredded as "yellow journalism" on the Internet. There may be more stuff out that I haven't yet found.

However, the issue of VANITY FAIR that is now on the nesstands--August 2006--carries an article titled "Click Here for Conspiracy" by Nancy Jo Sales, on pages 112, 115, 116, 117. This discusses the issue of 9/11 truth as expressed in the (movie? video?) titled "Loose Change" which is viewable on the Internet. Its value is that what appears in the video is now available on the printed page. - Marjorie =====
Forwarded message is attached.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: David Itskowitch [david@dbel.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 15, 2006 6:35 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Subject: Kevin Barrett

Provost Farrell,

I am a proud 1996 graduate of the University of Wisconsin with a BA in Political Science. While I understand that a thriving university must be a forum for the discussion of new and sometimes controversial thoughts and ideas, what Kevin Barrett is teaching about September 11th is ludicrous.

I believe Mr. Barrett has been quoted as stating: "Either we discuss the compelling evidence that 9/11 was an inside job, or there is precious little to talk about."

As a native New Yorker who saw the smoke from the Twin Towers from my living room windows that Tuesday morning as the face of my city, country and world were altered forever, I am outraged and embarrassed that this individual is being permitted to spew such nonsense to impressionable minds at the university that I am so proud to be an alumnus of.

If Mr. Barrett is allowed to continue his "teachings", should I next expect to hear about biology classes being taught about unicorns? Sociology classes about leprechauns? History classes that deny the existence of the Holocaust?

While we're on the subject of conspiracy theories, how about we examine this theory...has anyone considered that Mr. Barrett possibly has a book coming down the pipe about his ridiculous theory and all of this is a mere publicity campaign in order to create a buzz and sell some books? If the University of Wisconsin were to be used a pawn in a scheme to sell books so this person can profit off of the spilled blood of close to 3000 people, it would be a travesty.

Mr. Barrett is stain on the great University of Wisconsin. His twisted views are an embarrassment to a fine institution. I am ashamed that he is in any way a representative of the school that I love. His position at Wisconsin sullies the school's reputation and will no doubt have an adverse effect on the vital financial support that alumni provide. My suggestion is that he be sent packing to another institution of higher learning where his musings will be more openly accepted as truth rather than fiction. Too bad the University of Kabul is no longer under the control of the Taliban as that would have been a great fit.

If I am wrong and his theory is correct, may I be speared by the horn of a unicorn...

Sincerely,
David Itskowitch
Class of 1996

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Marjorie Lundquist [marlundquist@usa.net]
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2006 3:13 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: jdwiley@bascom.wisc.edu
Subject: The "Kevin Barrett affair" is still on the airwaves!

To: Patrick Farrell, Provost, UW-Madison
cc: John D. Wiley, Chancellor, UW-Madison
From: Marjorie Lundquist, Milwaukee

Subject: Update on the "Kevin Barrett affair"

Mr. Farrell, I've already e-mailed you about the conservative radio talk show hosts who are trying to whip up a mob to FORCE the University of Wisconsin-Madison to fire Kevin Barrett. And I've made some suggestions about what I think the University should do by way of response.

Mark Belling, both on his own WISN radio show in Milwaukee, and as a stand-in for Rush Limbaugh, has aired what I consider misinformation about the "Kevin Barrett affair". WISN radio also has a program (with co-hosts Dan and Nicole) called "Early Spin" that airs from 5:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m., and after that comes the "Jay Weber Show" from 8:30 a.m. to noon, or nearly noon. I've told you that Dan (Early Spin) is absolutely rabid on the subject of Kevin Barrett; he literally becomes almost incoherent with rage when he talks about how wrong it is for Kevin Barrett to be teaching a course at the University of Wisconsin.

Dan was ranting again this morning against Kevin Barrett (I just caught the end of the "Early Spin" program). But this topic kicked off the Jay Weber Show immediately following.

This e-mail message gives you a report on Jay Weber's on-air interview this morning of Assembly Representative Stephen Nass, who is trying to persuade fellow legislators to sign his resolution (now transformed into a letter he plans to send to the University) threatening to withhold funds from the University of Wisconsin if it doesn't fire Kevin Barrett. (I took notes while listening to this program.)

Jay Weber pointed out that withdrawing funds from the University would hurt the students, and asked Nass how he could justify doing something that would hurt UW students. Nass replied that "it's the top echelon at the university that isn't listening to the people" and indicated that he was trying to target this top echelon, not the students.

A little later in the interview Nass said, "I think many of them are hiding behind academic freedom." Surprisingly, he was NOT referring to anyone at the University of Wisconsin when he said this! Nass was answering a question about why so few Democrats (only one to date) in the Assembly had signed his resolution, and "them" referred to these Democrats!

Nass went on to say that the University of Wisconsin is telling the state legislators to "butt out" of university affairs because of the recent scandals at the University that have been uncovered; he implied that the University would prefer to deal with these quietly, out of the public eye, instead of being held publicly accountable.

There was passing mention of an offer from Kevin Barrett to debate Rep. Nass on the events of 9/11, but Nass wasn't interested.

That was pretty much it. Jay Weber, like the other conservative radio talk show hosts I've mentioned, is certain that Kevin Barrett is a nut, a "wacko"--whatever derogatory term you want to use to describe a person who is seriously out of touch with reality. He mentioned at the outset of his show this morning that he had discussed Kevin Barrett several times already in the past few weeks [I don't normally listen to the Jay Weber Show, so I didn't hear anything he said previously].

By the way, did you see the editorial that ran in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel yesterday (July 13)? It's at the bottom of page 16A and it is titled "Fiction and Fact at UW". When the publishers of a large newspaper hop on the bandwagon, it seems to me that it is time to get REALLY worried! Somebody there needs to respond to that editorial, and such a response would have more impact, I think, if it came from the Chancellor instead of the Provost.

Marjorie Lundquist

P.S. These radio talk show hosts all vehemently deny that there is any evidence to support skeptics of the official version of the events of September 11, 2001. Actually, there is a great deal of evidence, including a number of books. Here is a list of books that I have purchased and read:

The New Pearl Harbor

and

The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions

both by David Ray Griffith, often described as a "noted theologian", retired from California's Claremont College (if I recall correctly)

9/11 Revealed: The Unanswered Questions
Ian Henshall and Rowland Morgan
New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, 2005

Painful Questions: An Analysis of the September 11th Attack Eric Hufschmid [Copyright 2002, apparently self-published; this is a paperback book]

David Ray Griffith is a scholar who has published many books (mostly on theology); he is a professor emeritus now. His two books are probably the most "respectable" of all because he is undeniably a scholar of some stature (they are extensively footnoted), but each of the books I have listed has information that the other books lack. The Henshall and Morgan book also has extensive references provided. Eric Hufschmid's book has no footnotes or references, but does have a great many photographs, including photos of WTC buildings 5 and 6 burning (his is the only book I've seen that discusses what happened to WTC buildings 4, 5 and 6, for which there is NO evidence of controlled demolition, as there is for buildings 1, 2 and 7).

I've provided this information because I think it may be time to tell the general public about the existence of the various books that report problems with the official version of the events of September 11, 2001--and the only way to do that is to list them! Kevin should be able to give you more references, I expect.

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Bruce Gruett [gruett@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2006 9:58 PM
To: Pat Farrell
Subject: WOW

Hi Pat,

Well, I was surprised to see you in the news. The story about your allowing a guy to teach that 9/11 was a hoax was in the Sunday paper here. I assume that you are "provost" Pat Farrell. I'm not sure what a "provost" is, but it sounds impressive. Congratulations.

I'm sure that your decision was unpopular, but I for one agree with you. It takes courage to stand up for a principle when you know it will be unpopular.

Good for you.

Bruce

Do You Yahoo!?

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

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Jeff Kortsch [jkortsch@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2006 2:48 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; jbartell@quarles.com; kreilly@uwsa.edu; jdwiley@bascom.wisc.edu; board@uwsa.edu
Subject: Academic freedom

UW System Staff:

I have just read the text a speech by Kenneth H.W. Hilborn that was presented at the Society of Academic Freedom and Scholarship Annual General Meeting (May, 2004), in a symposium entitled: Limits to Academic Freedom (see <http://www.safs.ca/academicfreedom/hilborn.html>). It makes for fascinating reading in light of recent events and you might want to take a look at it.

Key points he presented:

"In my view, participants in a university course are not members of a secret society under an obligation to keep to themselves whatever is said behind closed doors. Academic freedom does not mean freedom to misrepresent, to distort or to talk nonsense to students while enjoying security against outside criticism. Faculty members should not feel free to give students any version of the facts that those faculty members are unable or unwilling to defend in a debate with people better qualified than students are to detect errors, and if necessary to expose falsehoods. Students may not only lack the knowledge to challenge a professor's misrepresentations, even when those misrepresentations arouse suspicion; students may also (not unreasonably) fear the consequences of doing so, such as retaliation in terms of grades. The imbalance of both knowledge and power between students and the professor, especially when the professor's political outlook is shared by his administrative superiors, makes outside monitoring all the more valuable as a protection for truth – a safeguard against abuse of academic freedom in the interests of a political agenda."

"The question of professional competence, narrowly defined, would not arise; but all academic disciplines rest supposedly on respect for truth established through evidence. Even when you venture outside your own field, particularly when you still invoke your academic status to make your statements more credible, you continue to have a responsibility to the principle of seeking truth through use of evidence. Even if your specialization lies in (let's say) astronomy, academic freedom does not give you the right to defy evidence and make false statements with impunity on, for example, the events of "9/11." The astronomer might reasonably be warned that if he persisted in bringing discredit on the university in such a way, he could expect his career to suffer adverse consequences because of lack of confidence in his honesty and reliability. In the circumstances, I think, adverse consequences – such as a low merit rating for so-called "service to the community" – would not be unjust; nor would a decision to deny tenure or promotion.

Telling lies that are demonstrably inconsistent with the evidence is obviously different from expressing mere opinions, even what most intelligent people would consider silly or scandalous opinions. Even if they are related to an academic's field of professional expertise, outrageous opinions (unlike lies) do NOT provide proper grounds for revoking tenure; but they may well call into question an individual's judgment and intellectual maturity – possibly even his mental stability. And those qualities of an individual can reasonably be taken into account in decisions on hiring, tenure, salary and promotion."

My question:

What does "academic freedom" mean to you?

- The freedom to misrepresent, to distort or to talk nonsense to students while enjoying security against outside criticism?
- The freedom to defy evidence and make false statements with impunity?
- The freedom to give students any version of the facts that those faculty members are unable or unwilling to

8/10/2006

defend in a debate with people better qualified than students are to detect errors, and if necessary to, expose falsehoods?

- The freedom to abuse academic freedom in the interests of a political agenda?
- The freedom to tell lies that are demonstrably inconsistent with the evidence?

I would like to know. Based on the Kevin Barrett decision to allow the teaching that "9-11 was probably an American operation to launch a war on Islam countries", I'd say all of the above.

Jeff Kortsch
Irritated Wisconsin Taxpayer

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Diane Kortsch [dkortsch@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2006 1:10 PM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu; board@uwsa.edu; jdwiley@bascom.wisc.edu; kreilly@uwsa.edu;
jbartell@quarles.com
Subject: Kevin Barrett: Truth or Lies

I am writing this e-mail because, as a taxpayer whose dollars go to support the UW system, I am outraged. I attended the UW Madison law school many years ago. I support the UW system and I support people's right to freedom of speech and freedom of expression. What I don't support is my tax dollars, money that I have no control over where it goes, going to keep someone employed whose ideas are "theories" or lies.

If Kevin Barrett taught at a private university system and I didn't support his ideas, I could make my displeasure known by revoking any financial support for that system and clearly stating that I was doing it because of Kevin Barrett was being kept on as an instructor. I have no way in this situation to withhold financial support because that would mean non-payment of taxes, which would be a criminal offense.

If Kevin Barret chose to express his views by writing editorials for the paper, speaking on local radio stations, or standing on the Capitol square during the Farmer's Market handing out fliers, I would support his right to freedom of speech and expression, just as I would support my right to perform the same actions stating that this man is a fraud and a prevaricator. The difference between this and what Kevin Barrett is doing now is that in my example, I would not be forced to financially support Kevin Barrett as I am now.

Mr. Farrell stated "Instead of restricting politically unpopular speech, we will take our cue from the bronze plaque in front of Bascom Hall that calls for 'continual and fearless sifting and winnowing' of ideas." (<http://www.news.wisc.edu/12701.html>). He also stated that Barrett will teach as scheduled his course on Islam. Will the UW system, in keeping with not restricting politically unpopular speech, hire a member of the Aryan Nation to teach history of the holocaust or African American history?

Diane Kortsch
A disgruntled tax payer and graduate of the UW system

8/10/2006

Eden Inoway-Ronnie

From: Geoff Davidian [Geoff@MilwaukeePress.Net]
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2006 10:57 AM
To: pfarrell@provost.wisc.edu
Cc: peter.phillips@sonoma.edu
Subject: Farrell01.pdf

Public records request attached

8/10/2006

Milwaukee Press

4101 N. Prospect Ave.
Tel: (414) 964-2123

Shorewood, Wisconsin 53211
Fax: (414) 431-8389

July 16, 2006

By Fax (608)265-3324, email and US Mail

Patrick V. Farrell
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of Wisconsin-Madison
150 Bascom Hall
500 Lincoln Drive
Madison, WI 53706

RE: Request to inspect public records pursuant to Wis. Stat. §19.35(1)(a) *et seq.*

Dear Provost Farrell:

This correspondence is a request to inspect public records pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.35(1)(a) *et seq.*

This request covers the period May 1, 2006 to the present, and the records requested are the following:

1. all correspondence generated or received by you or your staff regarding Dr. Kevin Barrett and his course to be offered this fall that includes elements of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center;
2. all memoranda, research notes, reports, evaluations, voicemail, handwritten notations and other material in your possession or available to you regarding Dr. Kevin Barrett and the university's inquiry into his fitness to teach;
3. records of any contacts by you or from any federal or state legislator, any federal agency or intelligence organization, the governor of Wisconsin, James Doyle, any judge or other public official, including the regents of the University of Wisconsin and its policymakers regarding whether Dr. Barrett should be allowed to teach; and
4. records of communications between your office and Jessica McBride, Charlie Sykes and any other news reporter, news media employee, opinion maker, journalists or the public regarding Dr. Kevin Barrett.

If you possess material responsive to this request but feel that material is exempt under the cited statutes, please identify each such record and retain it as under request pending a resolution of the issue raised.

I request this correspondence and other records in electronic format if it exists electronically. After I have inspected the non-electronic data, I will decide whether I need copies.

I apologize for the logistical and clerical problems this will create for your staff, but I hope you understand that the public has an interest in who wants to influence public policy on this important national controversy, and how.

Very truly yours,

Geoff Davidian, editor & publisher

Cc: Dr. Peter Phillips