

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

6 July 2006

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

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

Dear Representative Nass:

On March 20, 1775 the Second Virginia Convention met in secret and at a secret location. The specific reason for the secrecy involved a British overlord Lieutenant-Governor Dunmore and the Royal Marines. The general reason for the secrecy involved what was/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For your information, it was *this* form of patriotism that eventually led to historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.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 a traitorous document entitled "the USA PATRIOT Act." During a meeting at our White House this Bush was reminded of the treasonous effects this fascist document has had on the Constitution. Regarding the latter Bush declared:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cordially,

Paul V. Sheridan

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

Attachments

Courtesy Copy List
(As of July 6, 2006)

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



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

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

07/07/2006

Dear Customer:

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

Delivery Information:

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

NO SIGNATURE IS AVAILABLE

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

Shipping Information:

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

Thank you for choosing FedEx Express.

FedEx Worldwide Customer Service
1.800.GoFedEx 1.800.463.3339