

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

30 August 2006

Senator Judd Gregg (R-NH)  
393 Russell Senate Office Bldg.  
Washington, D.C. 20510-2904  
(202) 224-3324

Main District Office:  
125 N. Main St.  
Concord, NH 03301  
(603) 225-7115

**Subject: Your Attempts to Muzzle Academia**  
**Reference: Professor William Woodward (University of New Hampshire)**

Dear Senator Gregg:

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

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

For your information, it was *this form of patriotism* that eventually led to historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The issue of academic freedom is vital to the survival of America as a constitutional republic, and I will fight your traitorous vitriol to the point of your political demise if necessary. Recently a particular dolt, while accepting his nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court, referred to our nation as a “constitutional democracy,” which is absurdly ignorant . . . or was it? Promoting the lie that the United States is a “constitutional democracy” indicated a purposeful plan to subvert the genius of the Founding Fathers. As a constitutional republic we are a nation of laws; laws that protect the rights of both individuals and institutions, such as the University of New Hampshire. For your information, these laws protect Professor Woodward and his proposed course from your personal opinions, no matter how ignorant the latter may be. The law also protects your right to challenge the veracity and accuracy of his material, but NOT your yelling of “Fire!” in the movie theater, as you have essentially done. Many of your ilk claim to be interested in “true facts” (admittedly I am not familiar with the epistemology of false facts). **In that context let us review a few constitutionally protected facts:**

If Professor Woodward were to lecture that the events of 9/11 were part of what is called a “psy op,” you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

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

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

If Professor Woodward were to lecture that the FBI has officially refused to authenticate or provide evidence of authenticity of what it calls the “Osama bin Laden confession video,” you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

If Professor Woodward were to lecture that World Trade Center Building Seven was NOT struck by an aircraft on 9/11 but collapsed perfectly without explanation from the much-ballyhooed 9/11 Commission Report **or the U. S. Congress**, you have a right to challenge his lecture but you do not have the right to muzzle him.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If the Professor Woodward lectures include the showing of documentaries such as Loose Change – Final Cut (**which has been produced by New York university students**), you have a right to challenge the content of those documentaries but you do not have the right censor the showing or muzzle Professor Woodward.

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

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

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

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

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

In my opinion, based on the foresight and genius of what Bush calls “a goddamned piece of paper,” it is rare that the powers-that-be seek to muzzle the ignorant or the liars. It is always those informed-few that seek and disseminate the truth that are the subject of tyranny. **Always.**

Specifically, if Professor Woodward is “so full of baloney,” then the recent decision by the University to allow his (non-required) course will expose his incompetence, and your brilliance (?). However, if the course leads to the inculcation of critical thinking in his students (rather than your mindless political blather and threats), and furthers the exposure of truth and justice, then we all win. In the “so full of baloney” scenario the students walk-away by virtue of an informed choice, and learning experiences that will be shared with other students. **I am assuming that you would guard such an informed choice for your children/relatives as well.**

Frankly, I am very confident that if Professor Woodward had views of 9/11 which mirrored and was as ignorant as yours, then we would not have heard from you. **Isn't that true sir?** I am glad that the University has not shirked its social responsibilities, and also glad that the University has no intention of muzzling you or your children/relatives.

Cordially,

Paul V. Sheridan

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

P.P.S. Correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that the New Hampshire state motto, as printed on all of its automobile license plates, states “Live Free or Die!” Perhaps you forgot that minor detail?

Attachments

Senator Judd Gregg  
30 August 2006

Courtesy Copy List  
(As of August 30, 2006)

Ms. J. Bonnie Newman  
Mr. Mark Rubinstein  
Ms. Wanda Mitchell  
Mr. Bruce L. Mallory  
Mr. Andy Lietz  
Professor William Woodward

Mr. Scott Brooks  
Mr. John Lynch  
Mr. Jack Barnes  
Mr. Ted Gatsas

Mr. Dylan Avery  
Professor Morgan Reynolds  
Professor Steven Jones  
Professor James Fetzer  
Professor Kevin Barrett  
Mr. Alex Jones  
Mr. David VonKleist  
Ms. Debbie Lewis  
Dr. David Ray Griffin