

[Home](#) | [About](#) | [Search](#) | [Archives](#)

The Distortions of Acumen Continued: More Liberal Trashing of Ward Churchill
[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/frank02072005/

By Joshua Frank

The continued trashing of radical professor Ward Churchill from the left end of the political spectrum is ever-increasing.

Take Marc Cooper, contributing editor to *The Nation* magazine, and columnist for the *LA Weekly*, who [on his personal blog](#) responded to Churchill's essay "Some Push Back":

Move over, Mumia. The Left has a new *cause celebre* that's a guaranteed loser: Ward Churchill ... I saw the essay at the time and was nauseated by it. I have been tempted over the years to write something about it, but have always decided not to. Only because I consider Churchill to be an irrelevant and clearly deranged loner on the edge of the looniest left.

Now I regret not having denounced him. Too bad others on the left also didn't quickly hurry to divorce themselves from this guy.

Churchill, as you know, surfaced in the news last month when he was invited to speak at an upstate New York university and some conservatives raised a ruckus—as they damn well should. If this guy can hang on to his tenure at CU fine. But damned if student funds from somewhere else should be used to host him as some sort of guest speaker.

Cooper claims to have reread the essay only to have found "it more offensive than when I originally saw it right after 9/11." If one only reads Cooper's grotesque distortions of Churchill's fiery analysis they would most likely believe Churchill deserves the filthy muck that is being shoveled his way.

What does Cooper find so offensive anyway? Most likely it is the following, as Churchill writes about the "technocrats" in the World Trade Center:

If there was a better, more effective, or in fact any other way of visiting some penalty befitting their participation upon the little Eichmanns inhabiting the sterile sanctuary of the twin towers, I'd really be interested in hearing about it.

Churchill's Eichmann reference is what got him in deep do-do with the likes of Governor Pataki of New York and Bill O'Reilly of Fox News. Certainly it is difficult to defend Churchill's remarks when his comment is taken out of context.

Leaving the above statement on its own clearly, seems to illustrate that Churchill is praising the attacks of 9/11. But is he really championing the horrific atrocity?

Not exactly.

Prior to his Eichmann comment, Churchill used the following precursor to set up his case: "They [the 9/11 terrorists] did not license themselves to 'target innocent civilians.'"

There you have it. Churchill was trying to make the argument that the 9/11 terrorists did not target the WTC simply to kill innocent Americans. According to him, the 9/11 attackers went after the WTC because it was a legitimate military target in an act of war. Plain and simple.

I don't necessarily agree with his assessment, although I think this was the crux of his argument. Of course, Churchill should have clarified his position better in his original essay, which could be categorized as sloppy given the weight of his argument and tone of his language (he defends and explains himself later, which we'll get to in a moment). But unfortunately his vagueness has aroused a plethora of reactionary attacks, both from the right and left.

Churchill should have emboldened this "little Eichmann" argument by pointing out that CIA offices were housed in the WTC along with a large office of the cruise missile manufacturer, Raytheon.

Churchill could have also stressed that the terrorists likely attacked the WTC in hopes of inflicting a massive fracture in the US economy, which is the driving force behind the violent US war machine. But instead he left his readers to sit quietly with his "little Eichmanns" reference.

Even so, Marc Cooper and many others who criticize Churchill's statement fail to point out that nowhere in Churchill's original essay does he argue that the WTC attacks were *morally* justified. In fact he says it was an act of war, of which he detests.

Churchill writes that "if what the combat teams did to the WTC and the Pentagon can be understood as acts of war—and they can—then the same is true" for the US conduct in the Middle East.

He goes on to compare the terrorists to Madeline Albright, who oversaw the US imposed UN sanctions of Iraq, which killed tens of thousands of people, mostly elderly and small children. "Evil—for those inclined to embrace the banality of such a concept—was perfectly incarnated in that malignant toad known as Madeline Albright, squatting in her studio chair like Jaba the Hutt, blandly spewing the news that she'd imposed a collective death sentence upon the unoffending youth of Iraq."

Does such a harsh critique of the US military actions, and Churchill's comparison of these ventures to the WTC attacks imply that he is delighted people were killed on 9/11?

Not in the least.

In fact, as noted, Churchill argues that these were not individual acts of terror (unless you can also categorize US military activity as *terror*): “This is to say that, since the assaults on the WTC and Pentagon were an act of war—not ‘terrorist incidents’—they must be understood as components in a much broader strategy designed to achieve specific results.”

Of course those results can be debated. Perhaps they knew the US government would react violently, attack countries in the Middle East—which would only inflame more rage against the US and consequently aid in the recruitment of more fighters to sign up for Bin Laden’s jihad.

Nevertheless Churchill’s argument is relatively sound. Does the fact that his interest “in hearing about” other ways/places the terrorists could have struck that would have inflicted some “penalty ... upon the little Eichmanns” still bother you?

His question, to me, seems to express that *if* the assault on the WTC was only about killing innocents: then how can one ignore the fact that the WTC housed a CIA office and a weapons producer like Raytheon? Was this irrelevant or coincidental? Like it or not, Churchill is forcing us to address his claim that the WTC was a military target.

Churchill, due to the misinterpretations of his Eichmann statement, later clarifies his original essay in a piece titled “On the Injustice of Getting Smeared,” where he writes:

I am not a “defender” of the September 11 attacks, but simply pointing out that if U.S. foreign policy results in massive death and destruction abroad, we cannot feign innocence when some of that destruction is returned. I have never said that people “should” engage in armed attacks on the United States, but that such attacks are a natural and unavoidable consequence of unlawful U.S. policy. As Martin Luther King, quoting Robert F. Kennedy, said, “Those who make peaceful change impossible make violent change inevitable.”

This is not to say that I advocate violence; as a U.S. soldier in Vietnam I witnessed and participated in more violence than I ever wish to see. What I am saying is that if we want an end to violence, especially that perpetrated against civilians, we must take the responsibility for halting the slaughter perpetrated by the United States around the world ...

Finally, I have never characterized all the September 11 victims as “Nazis.” What I said was that the “technocrats of empire” working in the World Trade Center were the equivalent of “little Eichmanns.” Adolf Eichmann was not charged with direct killing but with ensuring the smooth running of the infrastructure that enabled the Nazi genocide. Similarly, German industrialists were legitimately targeted by the Allies.

Now back to Marc Cooper who hisses that he would “be terrified if this guy was teaching [his] kid.” First Cooper makes no mention of Churchill’s counter essay “On the Injustice of Getting

Smear'd" in his online screed, even though he has "kept half-an-eye on Churchill since" his original essay first appeared. We can certainly call Cooper's blindness selective-perception, for he wants to see what he wants to see.

This leads us to the much larger issue: What the implications are for tenured professors and academics that voice publicly their objectionable political and cultural opinions. What is now happening to Ward Churchill is all just pure intimidation, which was spearheaded by Republican Gov. Pataki, exacerbated by Fox News, and condoned by liberals such as Marc Cooper.

The upcoming battle over whether or not Ward Churchill keeps his position at Colorado University will set the bar for a whole assembly of radical intellectuals who could one day become the focus of McCarthy-like censorship. It's time to move past Churchill's fearless thesis about the US empire, and fight for his right to voice his opinions. No matter how unsavory they may be.

Joshua Frank is the author of the forthcoming book, "[Left Out!: How Liberals Helped Reelect George W. Bush](#)," to be published by Common Courage Press. He can be reached at: frank_joshua@hotmail.com.

Growing Chorus: Prosecute Ward Churchill for Treason

[Press Action](#)

Sunday, February 06, 2005

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/nimmo020620051/

By Kurt Nimmo

Earlier today, I made a promise I am about to break.

I said I wouldn't write about Ward Churchill until after the University of Colorado made its decision to keep him on or fire him, regardless of his constitutionally protected right to free speech, especially pertinent, considering Churchill is an employee of a public institution.

Incidentally, I also made two minor criticisms of Churchill. If you are interested, you can surf on over to my [blog](#) and read them.

In the meantime, a growing number of people have said some rather dangerous and threatening things about Churchill and I feel it would be irresponsible to remain silent until after the factotums at the university complete their so-called investigation.

A growing chorus of people, in the corporate media and government, not only want Churchill fired, they apparently wanted him executed for treason, or at least locked up for a long time.

According to Bob Newman, host of the "Gunny Bob Show" on Newsradio 850 KOA and the "Inhuman Newman's Anger-Management Hour" on 630 KHOW, both in Denver, Ward Churchill has violated U.S. Code Title 18, Section 2381, which states in part that citizens convicted of treason "shall suffer death" or imprisonment. Newman wants Churchill charged under this law archaic law, not used since the days of Joe McCarthy.

Of course, Newman is but a whack job hate radio talk show host, so what's the big deal, I mean, we can ignore him, right?

Not exactly.

I'll let Newman explain the situation, as he did today on the site:

"A few minutes after the state of the union address, Colorado Governor Bill Owens called in to my evening show, during which I cited the treason statute as I had on previous shows covering the 'professor.' My show is heard via the airwaves in 38 states and around the world via streaming audio (an Internet-based parlor trick), so the more I said 'treason' the more the word caught on. Now the governor has apparently looked into the treason angle and agrees that Churchill has committed treason. So, too, have some people like MSNBC's Joe Scarborough, according to one of my listeners who watch MSNBC."

I checked out [Joe Scarborough's web site](#), but there is no mention of Newman's suggestion Churchill be arrested and prosecuted for treason, although "Regular Joe," as Scarborough calls himself, cites a "recent study" (no link provided) that allegedly "showed that an overwhelming number of college professors are big government liberals, while conservative professors rarely get a chance to teach college courses. This ideological monopoly ensures that another generation of college students will be brainwashed to believe that the values parents spent 18 years instilling in them are quaint, obsolete notions." Joe writes, "Enough is enough. It is time to call your state representative and demand action," apparently indicating it is time to sweep the universities of this "ideological monopoly," that is to say opinion differing from that disseminated by the government and corporate media where "Regular Joe" collects a paycheck.

I worked for a state university here in New Mexico, and let me tell you, the political science department wasn't exactly a nest of Marxists calling for armed revolution, although they were not Rush Limbaugh "conservatives," either.

Soon after Bush invaded Iraq, I attended a panel discussion on the "war," as it was billed, and during a question and answer session I complained about Bush's remark that millions of people opposed to the "war" and filling the streets of American cities in opposition were nothing but a "focus group." I was told that if I didn't like Bush's policies, I was free to vote for somebody else. Yeah, like maybe John Kerry, who stated over and over, ad nauseam, that he "supported" the "war" and simply wanted to "manage" it differently than Dubya? I was astounded by this professor's ignorance of the American political system. I guess he is one of the "liberals" Regular Joe wants to throw out on the street and replace with warmongering "conservatives." As for radicals like me, I suppose that's why we have a Title 18, Section 2381.

Anyway, I figured it would eventually come to this—"conservatives," more accurately described as warmongering fascists pathologically unable to tolerate those who disagree with them, calling for the opposition to not only be silenced and fired from their jobs, but rounded up and put on trial for treason, maybe even sent to the gallows, although Bob Newman believes hanging Ward Churchill "would be ruining a perfectly good rope." I guess, instead, Churchill should be summarily executed, the same way the Nazis summarily executed those who disagreed and resisted their sociopathic insanity.

It is entirely possible, considering the political climate in America these days, that after the university of Colorado fires Churchill—and I believe he will be fired—some right-wing nutter in thick reading glasses with nothing better to do will find something "treasonable" in his voluminous writings and Churchill will be arrested, as Sami al-Arian was arrested, and put on trial.

Ward Churchill is a right-wing nutter wet dream come true. He is a poster child for the image right-wingers want to plaster over all of us who believe Bush is a sociopathic war criminal and our government has been hijacked by Republican Christian Zionists and Likudite neocons

determined to torch the Middle East and, for the evangelical Christian Zionists anyway, usher in the Second Coming of Christ who was, by all accounts, a peacenik who turned the other cheek. I'm afraid there are bad times up ahead, folks, especially after Bush invades Iran and Syria, as he essentially tells us he will do. In fact, if what's going on behind closed doors at the Senate Intelligence Committee is any indication, the invasion or bombardment of Iran is pretty much a done deal. It's just a matter of logistics from here on out.

Dissent will no longer be tolerated.

Finally, if you think I'm a paranoid crazy donning a tinfoil hat, consider the following: Eugene Debs, presidential candidate for the Socialist Party of America in 1918, was arrested for making an antiwar speech in Canton, Ohio, and sentenced to ten years in the Atlanta Penitentiary for treason. Debs received nearly one million votes in the 1920 election while locked up in prison. In addition to Debs, Bill Haywood, Philip Randolph, Victor Berger, John Reed, Max Eastman, and Emma Goldman, as well as nearly a thousand other people, were arrested and charged with treason under the Espionage Act of 1917. Anarchists—no relation to the black-clad window breakers of today—were arrested and charged with treason for publishing articles in *Der Shturm*. One anarchist, Jacob Schwartz, was so badly beaten by the police when he was arrested that he died soon afterwards. An antiwar activist, Rose Pastor Stokes, was arrested and sentenced to ten years for writing in a letter published in the Kansas City Star the following: “no government which is for the profiteers can also be for the people, and I am for the people while the government is for the profiteers.”

It can't happen here?

I'm telling you, my dear, as Frank Zappa sang, it can.

And it will.

Kurt Nimmo is a photographer and multimedia developer in Las Cruces, New Mexico. He is the author of [Another Day in the Empire: Life in Neoconservative America](#), a collection of essays published by Dandelion Books. Visit his weblog at [KurtNimmo.com](#).

Warning: More Hate Speech from W. Churchill

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/mickeyz02062005/

By Mickey Z.

Alert O'Reilly...send word to both the limo liberals and the Soldier of Fortune crowd...Pataki, Zahn, and Hannity take note...we have another repugnant quote from W. Churchill:

"I do not agree that the dog in a manger has the final right to the manger even though he may have lain there for a very long time. I do not admit that right. I do not admit for instance, that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly wise race to put it that way, has come in and taken their place."

Oops...my bad. That wasn't Ward Churchill who said that. It was Winston Churchill. Sir Winston Churchill. The man *U.S. News and World Report* called "The Last Hero." The legend who also said this: "I am strongly in favor of using poisoned gas against uncivilized tribes." The

icon/terrorist who asked British scientists to cook up “a new kind of weather” for the citizens of Dresden.

Do you think the good folks at Hamilton College would get any death threats if they invited Sir Winston to give a talk?

Mickey Z. can be found on the Web at <http://www.mickeyz.net>.

Churchill, Eichmann and Those 9/11 Technocrats

[Press Action](#)

Saturday, February 05, 2005

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/nimmo02062005/

By Kurt Nimmo

In an [article posted on Counterpunch](#), I threw a bit of cold water on Ward Churchill’s comparison between corporate and CIA “technocrats” who died in the WTC and Adolph Eichmann, the infamous Nazi bureaucrat.

As it turns out, Churchill was right on.

According to an article published by the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz*, five of “Adolph Eichmann’s Nazi assistants were recruited and employed by the Central Intelligence Agency after World War II, according to recently declassified intelligence documents” obtained by the National Security Archive through an FOIA request. “The newly-revealed documents are based on internal investigations in the CIA’s history department,” explains [Yossi Melman of Haaretz](#). “The agency has steadfastly refused to make the documents public for fear they would cause embarrassment.” Embarrassment, that’s putting it mildly.

It is nothing less than straight up and down evidence that the CIA is truly depraved and immoral, recruiting the most heinous war criminals, and should be made to answer for its long and villainous history. In fact, the spook agency should be closed down, its headquarters in Langley, Virginia, razed, and salt poured on the ashes.

Of course, none of this matters because, with Bush in office, Rumsfeld running the Pentagon and Porter Goss in charge of the CIA, the agency is now irrelevant. In the future (in fact for the last two years), intelligence operations (i.e., killing people and overthrowing governments) will be conducted from the murky depths of the Pentagon, a fact revealed by ace journalist Seymour Hersh and eventually, after initial denials, admitted by the Pentagon.

It is no secret the CIA recruited General Reinhard Gehlen, the German army’s intelligence chief for the Eastern Front during World War II. “At the end of the war, Gehlen established a close relationship with the U.S. and successfully maintained his intelligence network (it ultimately became the West German BND) even though he employed numerous former Nazis and known war criminals,” writes [Tamara Feinstein](#) for the National Security Archive. “For example, current records show that at least five associates of the notorious Nazi Adolf Eichmann worked for the CIA, 23 other Nazis were approached by the CIA for recruitment, and at least 100 officers within the Gehlen organization were former SD or Gestapo officers.”

Is it a stretch to conclude, then, that when al-Qaeda (or whatever group) flew those planes into the WTC on September 11, 2001, they were attacking, although not specifically, the legacy of Adolf Eichmann and the Nazi Gestapo, or *Geheime Staatspolizei*, Hitler’s secret police, responsible for throwing countless numbers of people into concentration camps?

As an aside, it is interesting to note that the Gestapo made use of *Schutzhaft*, a German word that essentially translates into “protective custody,” in other words the act of locking people up

without judicial proceedings, sort of like Bush throwing Jose Padilla and Yaser Esam Hamdi in military prisons, sans legal representation.

Of course, killing people, regardless of the crimes they willingly or unwillingly commit, is wrong. Nobody deserved to die on September 11, 2001, not even Nazi CIA agents, that is if any of them are currently alive and working for the agency, albeit likely in a walker or wheelchair (Doctor Strangelove comes to mind).

However, as Churchill noted in the essay that will likely cost him his job at the University of Colorado, if we are to use the same “rules of engagement” as the United States military, “collateral damage” is an accepted reality of war and, if we are to believe the story pedaled by Bush, Muslims have declared war on the United States. Of course, when the “good” United States kills innocent civilians it is an unfortunate side effect of war, but when “evil” Muslims kill innocents (and technocrats) it is cold-blooded murder.

In fact, as a cursory examination of history reveals, the United States (and Germany, Japan, Britain) went out of their way to kill civilians, as the fire bombing of Tokyo (100,000 people killed on a single night), Dresden (25,000-35,000 killed), Nagasaki (75,000 killed), and Hiroshima (80,000 killed) demonstrate. As Churchill points out in his essay, the United States had no problem killing 500,000 Iraqi children through murderous sanctions after invading the country and destroying its civilian infrastructure (as the research of Thomas J. Nagy discloses, the United States “intentionally used sanctions against Iraq to degrade the country’s water supply after the Gulf War,” understanding full well “the cost that civilian Iraqis, mostly children, would pay, and it went ahead anyway.” See [“The Secret Behind the Sanctions: How the U.S. Intentionally Destroyed Iraq’s Water Supply.”](#))

Of course, this frame of reference was not mentioned by Bill O’Reilly, John Gibson, Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, the governor of Colorado, or any of Churchill’s critics who self-righteously climbed up on their corporate news and state government soapboxes and loudly excoriated the professor—and now demand his resignation and public humiliation—for stating the obvious, or what should be the obvious.

Regardless of history—even recent history: the current civilian death toll in Iraq is a staggering 100,000, a fact the corporate media refuses to acknowledge—the fatuous mythology that America is “good,” while our enemies, who often use the same loathsome warfare tactics, are “evil,” has immense staying power, even as it is broken on the rocks of reality by a tsunami of facts and figures. More than anything, it was Ward Churchill’s *tone* and the *style* of his prose that so outraged the above mentioned, who are essentially skills and hucksters for a system that deliberately kills 500,000 Iraqi children to make a point about who is boss or recruits Nazis responsible for genocide and the mass murder of millions of innocent people. As Poppy Bush said, after invading Iraq the first time around, “What we say goes.” For disobeying, over 100,000 Iraqis died in the initial assault and 1.5 million died in the decade following the invasion. Bush Senior said mass murder, and so it went.

Meanwhile, crawling up the best seller list is a book by Thomas E Woods (“The Politically Incorrect Guide to the History of America”), a historian and defender of the Confederacy and racism who teaches at a community college in New York. According to Woods, Native Americans were well-treated by Europeans, an assertion that would likely elicit more than a few choice words from Ward Churchill, that is if he wasn’t so busy trying to save his job and fending off death threats. “I think Christopher Columbus was a good person for discovering America and I teach my children that he wanted to become wealthy and spread the Catholic faith to America,” remarked Noreen McCann, quoted in an article on Wood’s book in the [Sunday Times](#).

I guess this clueless woman never heard of the *encomienda* system (in other words, slavery) imposed on the “New World” by Columbus’ followers, or the chopping off of hands and heads by conquistadors to test the sharpness of their swords, or the trained-to-kill mastiffs and greyhounds unleashed by the conquistadors on hapless natives. Speaking of dogs, as Bartolome de las Casas noted at the time, butcher shops throughout the Caribbean region during the years of conquest sold Indian bodies as dog food. No mention of the fact Columbus sent 300 prisoners to Spain in 1496 to be sold as slaves. Also no mention of the fact that when Columbus arrived it is estimated there were 75 to 145 million inhabitants in North and South America. By 1890, the number in North America had been reduced to 250,000.

And Adolph Eichmann passed out lollipops to Jewish kids.

Kurt Nimmo is a photographer and multimedia developer in Las Cruces, New Mexico. He is the author of [Another Day in the Empire: Life in Neoconservative America](#), a collection of essays published by Dandelion Books. Visit his weblog at [KurtNimmo.com](#).

First They Came after Ward, Then...

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/best02052005/

I hope everyone is following the witch hunt against Ward Churchill carefully as the issue is much bigger than him and concerns all of us. The fascist governor of Colorado has been all over the media lately not only demanding Ward be fired, but also that the tenure system throughout the nation be reviewed in order to fire those like Ward who dare to speak out against imperialism and US oppression, and urging those who wish to donate money to universities to first research the political views of potential entrenched radicals in various departments. This is heating up fast and hugely spilling outside the boundaries of an attack on one person into an attack on free speech and radicalism in general. I am writing a piece on this I will post soon. There is now a 30-day review process whereby Deans and the Board of Regents are combing through every word Ward has written, such as his remarks in a [recent Satya interview](#), and no doubt his preface to [Terrorists or Freedom Fighters](#). -Steven Best

Same As It Ever Was

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/cummings02052005/

By Jordy Cummings

With all of the talk of Ward Churchill’s post-9/11 remarks and the resulting McCarthyism, I got to thinking how I myself responded to that “fateful day when everything changed.” (sic) I was 24, lived in Montreal at the time, in my last year at Concordia’s august, if increasingly corporatized journalism school. I don’t watch TV, haven’t had cable for years, nor was I in the permanent news-junkie space that dictated getting onto the computer first thing. I woke up around 9 or so, didn’t have a class until far later in the day, made my coffee and breakfast and tried to phone up a pal. The phones didn’t work, so I ventured out to see if the super knew what was going on. Cops were in the hallway of my floor—I lived in downtown Montreal, where there are lots of Arab Canadians, so I later assumed that they were trying to question a Palestinian neighbor of mine, though I never asked. Getting on the elevator with the mustached, relatively

kind and normal Montreal cops, one of them put their hand on my shoulder and said “its gonna be okay.”

I had no clue what he was talking about. Wandering into my building’s lobby, I saw my landlady, an aging “Yenta” (loudmouthed Jewish spinster) who looked incredibly frazzled and asked her if I could use the building phone. She asked if I had relatives in New York, and I told her I didn’t, and asked why. Didn’t I watch the news, she asked. “The Palestinians just attacked New York.” This seemed to be a stretch. Why the hell would Palestinians attack New York? I decided to call my pal, who told me what had happened, and my first thought was not “Palestinians,” let alone “Osama” or anything else. As I thought after the bombing of Oklahoma City, I immediately actually used the words that Mr. Churchill is considered even by some mushy liberals as being “Fascist” for using. “The chickens had come home to roost.” Part of me thought, and still thinks, that it may have been an inside job, but my overarching response was that it was a tragedy, I was scared shitless that there’d be more attacks—though felt safe in Montreal. But my immediate response was that I was not surprised.

In his critique of Ward Churchill, [Anthony Lappe of the Guerilla News Network](#), not only uses a Hitchensian/Stalinist “elliptical” critique to prove that Churchill was “fascist,” he also says that similar statements made by Noam Chomsky on Sept. 12 were “ill timed.” On Sept. 12, Peter Beinart, editor of the “Kill Arundhati Roy” rag, the rag in question of course being *The New Republic*, stated that “any dissent is at this point immoral,” followed closely by Christopher Hitchens’ nervous breakdown, in which he categorically states that if one immediately didn’t feel they were at war with an invisible enemy, if one talked about root causes, then one was “soft on fascism.” When the late Susan Sontag made the same point as Churchill and Chomsky, in *The New Yorker*, she became the target of actual fascists, spending the last few years of her life better known for her qualities as a “traitor” than as an aesthetic pioneer. That she later qualified herself in an interview with Salon, saying she was not the “same as Chomsky,” may have been her own opinion, likely it was influenced subtly—especially in the liberal circles Ms. Sontag traveled in—by liberal jingoism, by her son David Rieff, a liberal bomber.

I’m sure that just about anyone with any knowledge of the history of US foreign policy had similar feelings to myself, whether on the left or in the foreign service who invented the phrase “Blowback.” In fact, Michael Schneur who was until recently a counterterrorism majordomo at the CIA, one of whose major intellectual influences is Robert Fisk, made the same points as well. One does not need to mention of course that there were a few Americans who did blame their own country for the attacks, those like Robertson, Falwell and others. Then there was Benji Netanyahu who called the attacks a “channukah miracle” because it would draw America closer to Israel, and similar statements by the then-ruling Anti-Muslim BJP party in India.

The day after 9/11, I went to what turned out to be one of the most fascinating classes I took in university, the second session in Dennis Murphy’s great “Seminar in Propaganda.” The week before, serendipitously, we had discussed propaganda, Murphy reminiscing about the Vietnam war and how we were all lucky not to have to live in an “age of propaganda.” What a difference a week makes. It was a fascinating laboratory, that classroom, 60 or so odd students, mostly from journalism, communications or film, discussing their responses to Sept. 11.

I made the “chickens coming home” point uncontroversially, and predicted—correctly—that civil liberties were dead. International students could especially contextualize the experience, whether it was a Latin American who immediately reminded us of the first 9/11, or an Israeli student about how they can identify with the experience, as did one Lebanese student who lived through the siege of Beirut. The attitude was that the attacks were predictable, and sad—so sad.

Everyone seemed to still feel stoned on confusion. Very few people, from any political stripe, seemed vengeful, except when one woman said “right on” to the attacks and was firmly reprimanded by many of us.

Churchill was not saying “Right On” to the attacks. Even if one does not totally accept his contention that bourgeois/capitalist Americans are *knowingly* complicit in Empire—my own thoughts are more complex, influenced by Lukacs and others’ notions that those within the bourgeois and capitalist class are as “caught up” in reified social reality, if not more, than workers—one cannot deny that he was spot on in regard to the legitimacy of targeting, if one uses the same yardstick as the United States. As well, unlike what some of his critics have said, the role that bankers play for US hypercapitalism is the role that Eichman played for the Nazis. And many Americans in the ruling class are far less shy than Nazis, even about their penchant for murderous rage. I remember thinking a lot, while driving home the day of that class, about Thomas Friedman’s unforgettable remarks during the criminal Kosovo war, something to the effect of “12 weeks of precise bombings aren’t enough, barbarian Serbs? How ‘bout six months of non-precise bombing....you want 1389, I’ll give you 1389.”

The debate about human agency on which Churchill and I are on opposite sides has nothing to do with politics, but if one assumes as Churchill seemingly does, that humans have a capacity for critical knowledge and thinking, even within an oppressive social context and what Judith Butler calls “linguistic vulnerability” built into the English language, then of course they were “Little Eichmans.” On another level, though, one can speculate that not even Eichman was a little Eichman. If one assumes contingency over essentialism, then everyone’s got both a “little Eichman” and a “little MLK” in them, so to speak. The German superstructure produced the substructure of Eichmans as the American superstructure produced the substructure of capitalists. The point that needs to be remembered though is not that these people, in Churchill’s or in anyone’s thinking, deserved to die. I often say in anti-death penalty debates, that to truly be against the death penalty, then one must even be against it for Eichman.

Rather, Churchill, a fierce and independent thinker who has criticized Chomsky for his free-speech defense of Faurrison, and one of the few philosophers to understand the Holocaust’s social context outside of either the Zionist abuse of holocaust memory, of the attitude, as exemplified by the historian Eric Hobsbawm or the liberal philosopher Hannah Arendt that it was “banal.” Churchill asserts, in his writings about the holocaust and genocide in general, that once one accepts evil as “Banal” as opposed to the individuals, one accepts evil as normal. Eichman was banal, but Arendt was stretching when she claimed that evil is a “Banal” side to the “human condition.” Arendt’s sometimes nemesis Theodor Adorno once put it that once one “codifies” genocide as one of the “crimes” of humanity—as opposed to calling it for what it is, an unnecessary, spectacular mechanized evil, then humanity is doomed to more genocide. In other words, to truly understand war crimes, genocide and evil, one has to be able to make a universal, if constructed judgment; in other words, in regard to being complicit in the machine. This isn’t simply “collective responsibility” that would dictate “right on” to an attack on even a legitimate military target like the Pentagon. It is class-consciousness.

Only about 10 days after 9/11, I went to see David Byrne, one of my favorite artists, perform live at a little club. A New Yorker, this was Byrne’s first show of his first tour after 9/11. While not as wild as he was in the days of Talking Heads, Byrne is an incredibly emotional performer. When he took to the stage, the crowd—still stoned on confusion, it seemed—went apeshit. Byrne literally broke down in tears, before playing “Life During Wartime”—“This Ain’t no Party, This ain’t no disco, this ain’t no fooling around,” while talking between songs about oil and

capitalism. Later in the show, he played “This must be the place” While singing about wanting to be “home,” the lyric being about an idealized feeling of being at home, we all realized that we would never be going back.

As my friends Ron, Shiri and I walked into the Montreal night after the show, Ron turned to me and said “That really made me feel better. For the last week, I felt like the world was gonna end.” I turned back and repeated Byrne’s line “This ain’t no party. This ain’t no disco. This ain’t no fooling around.” I got on my computer late that night and read about the round-ups taking place already in New York, of hundreds, if not thousands of Muslims and Arabs, even before the rubble was clear. To quote another David Byrne lyric, “same as it ever was.” For thinking Americans, and Canadians, 9/11 served to remind us that we were part of the planet that was under attack by a rapacious capitalism, that we too couldn’t hide out any longer in our doldrums, “letting the days go by.”

Jordy Cummings, editor of [Pure Polemics](#), lives in Toronto and can be reached at yorgos33ca@yahoo.ca.

The Distortions of Acumen: Liberals Trash Ward Churchill
[Press Action](#)

Friday, February 04, 2005

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/frank02042005/

By Joshua Frank

I am sure you’ve heard of Ward Churchill’s latest tribulations—so I’ll save you the repetition. However, I bet what you didn’t know was that liberals were running hand in hand with conservatives in hopes of clothes-lining the radical professor.

In a recent [CommonDreams.org column](#) titled “Ward Churchill’s Banality of Evil” Anthony Lappé argues that Churchill’s critique of 9/11, along with his calling the workers in the World Trade Center “little Eichmanns,” was utterly reprehensible:

Consider the professor’s twisted logic: People who work in the financial industry are legitimate military targets. Where do you draw the line? What about the secretaries who serve coffee to the little Eichmanns? They keep the evil system caffeinated, should they die? What if you own stock? Does earning dividends on GE mean your apartment building should be leveled with you in it? What if you keep your money at Chase or Citibank? Buy stuff at Wal-Mart? Pay federal taxes? Or better yet, what if you work for the government? Churchill himself works for a state university. He takes a paycheck from an institution that in all likelihood does military research and is probably ten times more complicit in the actual machinery of war than any junior currency trader.

To start, Churchill never actually said that WTC workers *should* be legitimate targets. What he did say was that using the US governments’ own rationale the WTC would most likely *be* a target for a military attack—for if no other reason than it housed a large CIA office and was an economic bastion of the military industrial complex.

Arguing that the WTC would be a justifiable military target using the US government's bloody rationale, Churchill writes in his now infamous essay "[Some People Push Back: On the Justice of Roosting Chickens](#)":

They [the WTC] formed a technocratic corps at the very heart of America's global financial empire—the “mighty engine of profit” to which the military dimension of U.S. policy has always been enslaved—and they did so both willingly and knowingly. Recourse to “ignorance”—a derivative, after all, of the word “ignore”—counts as less than an excuse among this relatively well-educated elite. To the extent that any of them were unaware of the costs and consequences to others of what they were involved in—and in many cases excelling at—it was because of their absolute refusal to see.

Now where Lappé really gets off track is when he implies that Churchill somehow condones the WTC attack, let alone the attack on the Pentagon. In [Churchill's own words](#) I think he spells it out quite clearly in response to misinterpretations such as Lappé's:

It should be emphasized that I applied the “little Eichmanns” characterization only to those described as “technicians.” Thus, it was obviously not directed to the children, janitors, food service workers, firemen and random passers-by killed in the 9-1-1 attack. According to Pentagon logic, were simply part of the collateral damage. Ugly? Yes. Hurtful? Yes. And that's my point. It's no less ugly, painful or dehumanizing a description when applied to Iraqis, Palestinians, or anyone else. If we ourselves do not want to be treated in this fashion, we must refuse to allow others to be similarly devalued and dehumanized in our name.

The fuzzy nature of “collateral damage” is what I think Churchill is really getting at. And Churchill's rejoinder to critics was only clarifying his early position, not backpedaling as Lappé contests. Indeed, Churchill sees the WTC attack as “ugly” and “hurtful.” It was. He also thinks such militaristic conceptions, when applied to other US ventures such as Iraq and Palestine, for example, are also “ugly and “hurtful.”

This isn't “twisted logic” as Lappé puts it. Or rather, it isn't Churchill's “twisted logic”: but the “twisted logic” of the US government.

Churchill simply took the WTC massacre and looked at it through the lens of the US military establishment, and pointed out why the attack on the WTC could be justified militarily. Nowhere in Churchill's original essay did he state such a terrorist act was morally justified.

And there's the key point. It wasn't *right*, but evil and iniquitous. Churchill's larger parallel is what liberals like Lappé cannot seem to stomach: that the US “military” interventions can also be classified as “terror”.

Lastly, if you are a taxpaying American (yes I am a taxpayer) you certainly are a “little Eichmann” in a very real sense. Especially if you do not speak out against the actions of our government and the corporations that run the damn show.

Nevertheless, this complicity by no means implies we should be all bombed in our apartments and homes, or forced to jump from a flaming skyscraper. And I certainly have never gotten the impression in any of Churchill's writings that would indicate he would condone such horrific acts.

In fact I think Ward Churchill would say that such an act of terror is just as evil as bombing “selective targets” in Iraq.

Joshua Frank is the author of the forthcoming book, “[Left Out!: How Liberals Helped Reelect George W. Bush](#),” to be published by Common Courage Press. He can be reached at: frank_joshua@hotmail.com.

Jackowski and Colmes

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/jackowskicolmes02042005/

Rosemarie Jackowski, a regular contributor to Press Action and antiwar activist, is scheduled to be interviewed on the Alan Colmes Fox News Radio program tonight (Feb. 4, 2005) at 10 p.m. EST.

Jackowski’s recent Press Action article, “[Super Patriot, Ward Churchill](#),” apparently drew interest from Colmes’ production staff. In the article, Jackowski argued:

“The news broadcasters don’t have a sufficient understanding of the effects of US foreign policy to enter into a discussion. They have to resort to ad hominem attacks on Ward Churchill and anyone else who questions or criticizes the government.”

As many of you probably remember, the 67-year-old Jackowski on March 20, 2003, the day after the war in Iraq began, was one of a group of protesters arrested during an antiwar demonstration at the main intersection in the city of Bennington, Vt. Jackowski refused to plead guilty and later wrote an article about [her trial](#).

For more information on the Alan Colmes radio show, visit:

<http://www.foxnews.com/alancolmesradio/>

Leslie Gelb Asks Iraq: Who's Your Daddy?

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/mickeyz02022005/

More Lessons from our Founding Fathers(tm)

By Mickey Z.

Leslie H. Gelb is president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations. As a former editor and columnist for *The New York Times*, however, he transforms into the Amazing Gelbo and gets to spout his ill-informed paeans to denial on that paper’s op-ed page. February 2, 2005 saw the publication of a little something called “The Lessons of 1787,” in which Gelbo waxed poetic about the “truly heartwarming effects of Sunday’s (Iraqi) elections.” He reminded us: “Elections decide who is to govern” but warned that only a Constitution can “define the reach and limits of electoral power, and the viability and legitimacy of a government.”

The new Iraqi National Assembly, says Gelbo, “should forgo drafting the constitution and establish a special constitutional committee” that engages “Iraq’s James Madisons and Ben Franklins” (I’m not making this up). That where the whole 1787 thing comes into play. Iraq

needs to follow in America's footsteps (then again, doesn't everyone?) It's as if Gelbo was asking those poor Iraqis: "Who's your daddy?" because, as we all know, you ain't nothing without Founding Fathers(tm).

The year 1787 saw a certain Daniel Shays arrested, thus this op-ed reminded me of a lesson about constitutions that the Amazing Gelbo neglected to reference.

"When Massachusetts passed a state constitution in 1780, it found few friends among the poor and middle class, many of them veterans from the Continental Army still waiting for promised bonuses," explains historian Kenneth C. Davis. To add to this decidedly non-support-the-troops mentality, excessive property taxes were combined with polling taxes designed to prevent the poor from voting. "No one could hold state office without being quite wealthy," Howard Zinn adds. "Furthermore, the legislature was refusing to issue paper money, as had been done in some other states, like Rhode Island, to make it easier for debt-ridden farmers to pay off their creditors."

Perhaps heeding the advice of Thomas Jefferson that "a little rebellion" is necessary, Massachusetts farmers fought back when their property was seized due to lack of debt repayment. Armed and organized, their ranks grew into the hundreds. Local sheriffs called out the militia...but the militia sided with the farmers. The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts indicted eleven members of the rebellion. Those who had so recently fomented revolt were no longer tolerant of such insurrection.

Enter Daniel Shays: Massachusetts farmer and former Army captain. He chose not to stand by idly as battle lines were being drawn and friends of his faced imprisonment. In September 1786, Shays led an army of some 700 farmers, workers, and veterans into Springfield. "Overtime radical Sam Adams, now part of the Boston Establishment, drew up a Riot Act," says Davis, "allowing the authorities to jail anyone without a trial." Shays' army swelled to more than 1000 men.

Writing from Paris, Jefferson offered tacit approval for, at least, the concept of rebellion. Closer to home, the American aristocracy was less than pleased. Sam Adams again: "In monarchy, the crime of treason may admit of being pardoned or lightly punished, but the man who dares rebel against the laws of a republic ought to suffer death."

In a classic shape-of-things-to-come scenario, Boston merchants pooled money to raise an army to be led by General Benjamin Lincoln, one of George Washington's war commanders. Clashes were fierce but the outnumbered rebels were on the run by winter. Most were killed or captured. Some were hanged while others, including Shays, were eventually pardoned in, yes, 1787.

Within a year, a penniless Shays was dead. In other words, the government took from the poor to give to the rich and anyone with the audacity to protest was brutally put down.

Now, there's a lesson most Iraqis have learned the hard way.

And speaking of putting down protest and how it might pertain to our beloved Founding Fathers(tm), there's the recent issue of Ward Churchill. The longtime activist and author is now the poster child for "we like free speech and all but you've dang gone too far, red man" crowd. As Ward has meticulously documented, the history of repressing dissent in America goes back almost as far as the Amazing Gelbo's lessons...all the way to the Alien and Sedition Act of 1798. In section two, this Ashcroftian piece of legislation reads:

"If any person shall write, print, utter or publish, or shall cause or procure to be written, printed, uttered or published, or shall knowingly and willingly assist or aid in writing, printing, uttering or publishing any false, scandalous and malicious

writing or writings against the government of the United States, or either house of the Congress of the United States, or the President of the United States, with intent to defame the said government, or either house of the said Congress, or the said President, or to bring them, or either of them, into contempt or disrepute; or to excite against them, or either or any of them, the hatred of the good people of the United States, or to stir up sedition within the United States, or to excite any unlawful combinations therein, for opposing or resisting any law of the United States, or any act of the President of the United States, done in pursuance of any such law, or of the powers in him vested by the constitution of the United States, or to resist, oppose, or defeat any such law or act, or to aid, encourage or abet any hostile designs of any foreign nation against United States, their people or government, then such person, being thereof convicted before any court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars, and by imprisonment not exceeding two years."

President John Adams signed the bill into law and soon after, Americans were put in jail for criticizing their government. The Amazing Gelbo might call this "heartwarming," but in solidarity with Ward Churchill and so many others persecuted for not toeing the party line, it's high time we learn some new lessons.

Mickey Z. can be found on the Web at <http://www.mickeyz.net>.

Super Patriot, Ward Churchill

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/jackowski02022005/

By Rosemarie Jackowski

From Scarborough Country to the Spin Zone, the attacks on Professor Ward Churchill are coming across the airwaves. Near Hamilton College in Clinton, New York the hills are alive with the sound of fascism.

In a statement released on January 31, 2005, [Churchill says](#), "...*The bottom line of my argument is that the best and perhaps only way to prevent 9-1-1-style attacks on the U.S. is for American citizens to compel their government to comply with the rule of law. The lesson of Nuremberg is that this is not only our right, but our obligation. To the extent we shirk this responsibility, we, like the "Good Germans" of the 1930s and '40s, are complicit in its actions and have no legitimate basis for complaint when we suffer the consequences. This, of course, includes me, personally, as well as my family, no less than anyone else...*"

Please notice that Churchill does not exclude himself and his family from responsibility. The argument that all of us share in the guilt for the actions of our government is seldom accepted, yet can not be ultimately denied. For centuries, the most respected scholars have postulated that any government derived from the will of the populace requires the active and willing participation of its citizens. When the bloated, nihilistic, self-absorbed populace denies its responsibility for the firm entrenchment of a defacto royal family, known as the Bush dynasty, our commitment to the basic tenets of the US Constitution, and humanity everywhere, is poorly

served. But let's not be too harsh on the Bush dynasty. Much has happened under the Clinton and other administrations.

Churchill explains that it is the actions of the US that brought about 9/11. That is such an obvious and simple fact that it is remarkable that there is anyone left who still doesn't get it. It is simple and obvious. It is not rocket science. It is Blowback. *Blowback* is a term coined by the CIA many years ago because those in the CIA knew that US policies would result in blowback. Anyone who did not know that there would be some retaliation against the US was not paying attention.

Remember May 12, 1996, when Madeleine Albright was asked on 60 Minutes about the deaths of 500,000 Iraqi children. Her answer was, "...we think the price is worth it." That should be the focus of the national discussion. Were those 500,000 deaths plus the deaths of the additional 100,000 slaughtered Iraqi civilians worth the price that we may eventually have to pay? Until that national discussion takes place, we are a nation in denial, a dysfunctional nation divorced from reality. Those who control the major means of communication do not have the right to prevent that discussion. The time has come for us, the people, to take control of the airways, which we already own.

There should have been a great national debate before the Gulf War. US Ambassador April Glaspie gave Saddam the go ahead for his invasion into Kuwait and then the US used that as an excuse for the Gulf War. That was a case of bait and switch, which resulted in the slaughter of thousands. Then came the deaths of the 500,000 Iraqi children and the official statement that *it was worth it*.

I propose a series of great national debates. On one side there could be experts such as William Blum, Ward Churchill, John Perkins, Ralph Nader, Mickey Z., Howard Zinn, Noam Chomsky, and/or Gore Vidal. There are too many who are well informed to list them all here. The opposing side would pick experts. The debate question is, *Were the deaths of the 500,000 children worth it, or should there be a change in US Foreign Policy*. Let the debate begin.

The members of the uninformed Press would have us believe that the attack on the Twin Towers was just a coincidence... that there was no logical reason why those two buildings were selected out of the millions of tall building that exist on the planet. Unfortunately, the uninformed behind the microphones, don't know what they do not know. Yet they continue to mold public opinion. The news broadcasters don't have a sufficient understanding of the effects of US foreign policy, to enter in to a discussion. They have to resort to ad hominem attacks on Ward Churchill and anyone else who questions or criticizes the government.

Meantime the doomsday clock is ticking away and other attacks, similar to 9/11, are predicted unless we learn the lessons that Churchill is teaching. He says, "...*the best and perhaps only way to prevent 9-1-1-style attacks on the U.S. is for American citizens to compel their government to comply with the rule of law.*" Churchill is trying to protect his fellow citizens. He is a humanitarian, a super patriot, and a gifted scholar. We would all be much safer if he was appointed National Director of Homeland Security or, better yet, Secretary of State. Come to think of it, I like the sound of President Ward Churchill.

Rosemarie Jackowski is an advocacy journalist living in Vermont. She can be reached at dissent@sover.net.

Ringling in 1984 with Ward Churchill & Derrick Jensen: Bigoted Terrorist Supporters Make Sounds

[Press Action](#)

Tuesday, February 01, 2005

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/oxman02012005/

By Richard Oxman

Ward Churchill, University of Colorado at Boulder professor, recently resigned his post as head of the school's ethnic studies department following an uproar over an article he wrote about the people who died in the World Trade Center 9/11 event. Pressure had been applied.

The longtime native rights activist and leader of the Colorado chapter of the American Indian Movement had written an article underscoring how US foreign policies in Iraq and its support of the Israeli occupation of the Palestinians played a role in the attack in inspiring the hijackers. He questioned whether the victims inside the World Trade Center should be described as "innocent civilians."

I remember (very well) the first time I came across his "little Eichmans" take; if I live long enough...I think it'll stay with me more vividly than the JFK assassination moment has to date. To draw from one of Democracy Now!'s headlines which delved into Churchill's mind/recent statements: "They formed a technocratic corps at the very heart of America's global financial empire—the 'mighty engine of profit.' Churchill accused the victims of Sept. 11 as being among the Americans who were too busy in their own lives to see the abuses being carried out by the U.S. overseas. This week Churchill said 'The overriding question that was being posed at the time was...why did this happen, why did they hate us so much,...and my premise was when you do this to other people's families and children, that is going to be a natural response.'"

The enrolled Keetoowah Cherokee said, "they were civilians of a sort. But innocent? Gimme a break." That set off New York's Governor Pataki who immediately objected to Churchill's scheduled appearance (this Thursday) at Hamilton College. He said "'There's a difference between freedom of speech and inviting a bigoted terrorist supporter.'" A firestorm has followed.

(1)

The *Wall Street Journal* didn't take long to chime in: "It's déjà vu all over again. Less than two months after Hamilton College tried to hire a former Weather Underground activist who was indicted in the 1981 Brinks murders, the Clinton, N.Y., liberal-arts college plans to showcase a cheerleader for the 9/11 attacks. Just the sort of thing parents pay nearly \$40,000 a year in tuition and board to have their children hear." (2)

The New Criterion took the occasion to lambast Hamilton's President, the cutting-edge Kirkland Project and the "misrepresentation" of academic freedom on campus, as they sought to undermine Churchill's upcoming appearance/standing:

"Churchill is scheduled to appear at Hamilton courtesy of the Kirkland Project—or, to give it its full name 'The Kirkland Project for the Study of Gender, Society and Culture,' an organization, as the campus website puts it 'committed to social justice, focusing on issues of race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, as well as other facets of human diversity.' In other words, it is a left-wing, activist organization that has nothing to do with liberal arts education and everything to do with political agitation. It was the Kirkland Project, for example, that just last month invited the convicted felon (and former member of the Weather

Underground) Susan Rosenberg to campus to teach; it was the Kirkland Project that, back in 2002, invited the former prostitute Annie Sprinkle to campus to instruct undergraduates in the joys of pornography and sex toys. Question for Hamilton's Trustees: What legitimate academic role does the Kirkland Project play at Hamilton College? Why does it exist?" (3)

Hamilton's president, Joan Hinde Stewart is taken to task by The New Criterion for saying, "open-ended and free inquiry is essential to educational growth." (4):

"...surely a college president should understand that 'open-ended and free inquiry' is one thing, political agitation and proselytizing is another. Our society provides many outlets for the expression of political opinions. Thank God for that. It has also taken care to provide for educational institutions whose purpose is learning, scholarship, and pedagogy. Pace President Stewart, academic freedom is not the same thing as free speech. It is a more limited freedom, designed to nurture intellectual integrity and to protect those engaged in intellectual inquiry from the intrusion of partisan passions. The very limitation of academic freedom is part of its strength. By excluding the political, it makes room for the pursuit of truth." (5)

Even Bill O'Reilly felt compelled to put in his two cents, informing viewers that it would be cruel to let Churchill speak "spreading his vile opinion around the country." (6)

Why am I suspecting that continued denial of Churchill's "little Eichmans" concept is going to be the cruelest thing imaginable for the country? And beyond.

There are plenty of people whose academic freedom have been compromised since Bush took office. For me, it doesn't even matter if Ward himself says it's no biggie to step down from his post. I'm not asking people to get riled up on this for the first time/obvious reasons. Rather, I want people to know—on a very personal note—that I'm not the only radical writer in these here parts who has taken much inspiration from Ward...and that this coordinated effort to silence him rings in an Unhappy New Year.

As soon as I heard the news I immediately contacted Joe Bageant and Derrick Jensen (in part, to get them to contact Churchill for a response). Joe's known Ward for quite some time, but I haven't heard back from him yet. Derrick has shared the stage with him twice, and Ward's given him a couple of blurbs for his published work. (7) They've very clearly both enjoyed working together when they have, moving their audiences deeply.

When I reached Derrick this morning, he immediately emailed back: "One of the things I love about sharing the stage with Ward is that I don't feel like I'm the one who's pulling to be more radical and militant. It's really fun to not be the most radical and militant person in the room for once. It feels very supported. I'm hoping I do something similar for him."

I hope readers will pick up that baton and run with it. I trust that I don't have to tell leftists what to do to address the abomination.

I close with cherished words from Derrick Jensen. Food for thought, as always:

"I don't think there really is anything even remotely resembling academic freedom or freedom of discourse within the culture. I keep thinking about RD Laing's 3 rules of a dysfunctional family, which are also the 3 rules of a dysfunctional culture. Rule A is Don't. Rule A.1 is Rule A does not exist. Rule

A.2 is Never discuss the existence or nonexistence of Rules A, A.1, or A.2. The way this plays out within an abusive family structure is that the members can talk about anything they want except for the violence they must pretend isn't happening. The way this plays out on the larger social scale is that we can talk about whatever we want—we can have whatever 'academic' or 'journalistic' 'freedom' we want—so long as we don't talk about the fact that this culture is based on systematic violence, and has been from the beginning. Anyone who's been paying any attention at all for the last 200 years knows that the United States is based on systematic violence. We live on land stolen from Indians. The economy runs on oil stolen from people the world over. The entire economy is based on conquest and theft. It's no wonder most of the people in the world hate the U.S. But of course we can't talk about that. Anyone who does talk about that and is noticed must be silenced as quickly as possible.

I've never written this before in public, but my first thought on September 11 when I heard someone was attacking the World Trade Center is, 'Ah, so now it begins. Someone is finally fighting back. Given the terror that the United States routinely inflicts on people (including nonhumans, of course) the world over (and of course now a couple of years later the United States calls these programs of systematic terror 'Shock and Awe'), I'm surprised it didn't happen long ago. The poor have been very patient and longsuffering, more patient and longsuffering than anyone could ever expect.' That is what I thought.

One of the fundamental premises of this culture it is based on a clearly defined and widely accepted yet often unarticulated hierarchy. Violence done by those higher on the hierarchy to those lower is nearly always transparent, that is, unnoticed. When it is noticed, it is fully rationalized. Violence done by those lower on the hierarchy to those higher is unthinkable, and when it does occur is regarded with shock, horror, and the fetishization of the victims.

As we see.

Those in power may kill with impunity, but when those lower on the hierarchy fight back, they are committing blasphemy and must be eliminated. Even to acknowledge that this is what is happening is itself a form of blasphemy, and those who speak the unspeakable—that those who are being terrorized by those in power have the right to fight back—must be silenced.” (8)

Notes:

(1) <http://www.democracynow.org/article.pl?sid=05/02/01/1515239>

(2) <http://www.opinionjournal.com/taste/?id=110006217>

(3) http://www.newcriterion.com/weblog/2005_01_01_cano.html The article also adds: "Please do not launch into a sermon about 'free speech,' 'diversity,' and 'academic freedom.' For one

thing, The Kirkland Project is not about diversity, it is about promulgating a single, left-wing, anti-American, moral antinomian line. For another thing, Colleges and Universities do not exist to promote free speech. They exist to pursue and teach the truth.”

(4) http://www.hamilton.edu/news/more_news/display.cfm?ID=9011

(5) http://www.newcriterion.com/weblog/2005_01_01_cano.html

(6) <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,146031,00.html>

(7) See <http://www.derrickjensen.org>

(8) Emailed response on the first day of February, 2005.

Richard Oxman, who holds the world's record for being dismissed prematurely (the most times) from east coast institutions of so-called higher education, can be reached at dueleft@yahoo.com.

Ward Churchill Under Attack

[Press Action](#)

http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/akpress02012005/

[An AK Press statement:](#)

After finding himself at the center of a media firestorm—and receiving a barrage of death threats—AK Press author, Ward Churchill, has stepped down from his position as Chair of the Ethnic Studies Department at the University of Colorado. Not satisfied with this, Colorado Governor Bill Owens is demanding that Ward resign his position as a tenured professor as well. The controversy is based on an essay Ward wrote soon after 9-11, which he later expanded into an AK Press book, “On the Justice of Roosting Chickens: Reflections on the Consequences of U.S. Imperial Arrogance and Criminality.” Conservative protestors used the essay to force Hamilton College in New York to cancel a speaking engagement Ward had scheduled there. The mainstream media (including Bill O’Reilly and Fox News) has picked up the story, distorting and misrepresenting the facts, as usual.

AK Press wishes to voice our support for Ward in this struggle—in terms of both his well-researched analysis of factors that contributed to the 9-11 attacks and his right to express that analysis in public without having his life and livelihood threatened. We also recommend that you read “On the Justice of Roosting Chickens” yourself, rather than relying on the media’s version on it. Individuals can order it [here](#).

Copyright © 2002-2004 [Press Action](#).

[Powered by ExpressionEngine](#)