



March 2014

## **The War On Thought Terrorism**

Dear Friend of Radio Liberty,

**"Law is concerned with external behavior and not the inner life of man."**

Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter: Expressing the traditional American view of the limits on government power. (1)

**"Conformity will be the only virtue. And every man who refuses to conform will have to pay the penalty."**

President Woodrow Wilson: Giving voice to the fundamental tenet of Progressivism. (2)

**"The heart of the new consensus is that the federal government, victorious in warfare, must continue its aggressive intervention in the lives of its citizens.... [The liberty] that comes to the fore ... under the Secret Constitution requires the intervention of government. Liberty is born in the state's assertion of responsibility to oversee and prevent relationships of oppression."**

Professor George P. Fletcher: Columbia University, School of Law.  
His explanation of the totalitarian nature of "**civil rights**" laws. (3)

Several months into his first term, Barack Obama signed into law a "**hate crimes**" measure that enriched the federal government's power to investigate and punish improper thinking. (4) That measure likewise diverted plundered funds to fill the troughs of left-wing pressure groups that gather intelligence on "thought criminals" on behalf of the Feds.

The most repellent aspect of that enactment, however, is the fact that the **“Tolerance Industry”** was willing to abet the murder of innocent people abroad in order to expand the power of the Regime to punish their enemies at home. This is a perfect example of the principle described by Marxist scholar George P. Fletcher: Since the government can conduct mass slaughter through warfare, it has the power to intervene in all private relationships in order to reconfigure them according to whatever political doctrine happens to be in vogue.

In order to ensure passage of the Hate Crimes measure (which we should call the **Thoughtcrime Enforcement Act**), the Obama administration attached it to a \$680 billion military appropriation measure that included at least \$120 billion to fund the then-ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Chris Hedges, a relentlessly candid opponent of the Warfare State, described how this arrangement managed to unite advocates of tyrannical "tolerance" on the home front with those who promote the mass murder of harmless foreigners abroad:

**"It was a clever piece of marketing. It blunted debate about new funding for war. And behind the closed doors of the caucus rooms, the Democratic leadership told Blue Dog Democrats, who are squeamish about defending gays or lesbians from hate crimes, that they could justify the vote as support for the war. They told liberal Democrats, who are squeamish about unlimited funding for war, that they could defend the vote as a step forward in the battle for civil rights. Gender equality groups, by selfishly narrowing their concern to themselves, participated in the dirty game."** (5)

Granted, it wasn't likely that the Pentagon appropriation, including the war funding, would have been defeated. What is significant is that leading elements of the Tolerance Industry – self-enraptured scolds who make a handsome living tutoring the rest of us in the ways of "tolerance" – were willing to take ownership of the avoidable mass murder of innocent people in the Near East.

Like most of the evil done by the Obama administration, the marriage of the Warfare State and the Tolerance Industry was actually proposed during the reign of Obama's predecessor. Proponents of this arrangement explicitly recognized that they were seeking to wage war against domestic enemies.

**"At a time when we are fighting terrorism abroad,"** pronounced then-Senator Ted Kennedy in support of the proposal, **"the United States Senate says, ‘We are going to fight terrorism, hatred and bigotry here at home.’"** (6)

The measure the late Senator Kennedy was promoting in 2007 was identical to the one signed by Barack Obama two years later.

For the squalid collection of pressure groups that promoted passage of the hate crimes measure, — the so-called Anti-Defamation League, the self-styled Human Rights Campaign, the fraudulently named Southern Poverty Law Center, et. al. — this was an entirely acceptable arrangement. Their fund-raising prospered, their stature in Washington grew, their influence over law enforcement expanded, and — most importantly, the power of the state to persecute their political enemies was significantly enhanced.

Oh, sure — the political trade-off behind this "victory" meant that poor brown people in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq would suffer violent death in their homes, streets, and houses of worship, cultivating understandable anti-American hatred that will yield a bloody harvest of terrorism and unending war. But, hey, aren't we talking about religion-obsessed, hetero-patriarchal homophobes, anyway? Wouldn't the world be better off if we were to be rid of such intolerant people? That's the view of such enlightened people — and high-profile Obama supporters — such as Bill Maher, and the *bien-pensants* who are delighted by his variety of progressive vulgarity.

Eliminationist violence is written into the genetic code of **“Progressivism.”** One particularly potent illustration of this fact can be found in the doctrine of **“Repressive Tolerance”** devised forty years ago by Marxist academic Herbert Marcuse. A member of the Frankfurt School of Cultural Marxism, Marcuse was also one of the most influential members of the **“New Left.”** It's reasonable to believe that his theoretical influence on modern Progressivism is at least as significant as the tactical influence exerted by Saul Alinsky.

According to Marcuse, while revolutionaries are out of power, they should demand tolerance from those who defend traditional values and institutions. Once in power, however, the revolutionaries should abolish tolerance for those with whom they disagree. This is, of course, an application of Lenin's dictum that the fundamental social and political question is “Who does what to whom.”

**“Liberating tolerance ... would mean intolerance against movements from the Right and toleration of movements from the left,”** wrote Marcuse. (7) Officially sanctioned intolerance would include suppression of **“discussion and propaganda, of deed as well as of word.”** That is to say that there would be no freedom of speech for those who peacefully express opinions now deemed to be reactionary.

Marcuse's doctrine of **“repressive tolerance”** was put on display recently when Brendan Eich, the former CEO of the Mozilla computer technology company was forced to resign because of a small donation he made several years ago on behalf of California's ballot Proposition 8. That measure defined marriage as a union of a man and a woman. Eich was targeted as a thought criminal by Bill Maher's **“gay mafia.”** (8) He won't be the

last. And the nexus between the Warfare State and the Tolerance Industry suggests that the expression “culture war” may soon cease to be a metaphor.

David Adler, a political consultant, newspaper columnist, and director of the Andrus Center for Public Policy at Boise State University, describes discrimination against gays and other people identified as “protected classes” as **“a form of domestic terrorism that requires swift and sustained remedies.”**

Assuming that Adler uses language with responsible specificity suitable to an adult conversation, he is implicitly endorsing the use of lethal means to punish those who decline to associate with certain people.

The case of Elane Huguenin, a photographer from New Mexico who was fined \$7,000 for declining to provide services for a same-sex “wedding,” illustrates that the Regime is already punishing people for the kind of “terrorism” Adler describes. (9) If present trends continue, the day could soon come when a discrimination complaint filed against a landlord, a restaurant owner, or an employer will be treated as sufficient grounds for a drone strike, or at least the summary arrest and indefinite military detention of the thought criminal until he is suitably re-educated. The former would meet Adler’s criteria for a “swift” remedy for that supposed act of **“domestic terrorism”**; the latter would represent a more “sustained” approach to a remedy.

Writing in the June 6, 1993, issue of the *Idaho Statesman*, Adler commended the City Council of Coeur d’Alene for joining Boise, Sandpoint, Moscow, and Ketchum in enacting municipal ordinances **“to prohibit discrimination against their residents in the areas of employment, housing and public accommodations on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity.”** (10)

The **“courage”** supposedly displayed by those city governments, Adler insists, stands in severe contrast to the timidity of the Idaho state legislature in refusing to expand the state’s anti-discrimination laws to include sexual orientation. Appropriating one of George W. Bush’s preferred post-9/11 themes— **“If you’re not with us, you’re against us”** — Adler insists that those who are not enlisted in the ranks of coercive “tolerance” are on the side of benighted bigotry: Anyone who refuses **“to prohibit discrimination ... effectively endorses it,”** he asserts.

No, it’s even worse than that, Adler insists. The social division runs between enlightened **“neighborhoods and community centers where patriots gather to promote the concept of liberty”** – which, in Adler’s universe, requires government regimentation of all private associations and commercial transactions – and the squalid ranks of domestic “terrorists” and those who enable them. Thus if you reside in Idaho, and aren’t actively working to expand anti-discrimination laws, you must be considered an ally of domestic

terrorists, and shouldn't expect to be spared when the anti-discrimination drones begin to fly.

Although that statement might strike some people as fanciful or even paranoid, consider this: The Department of Homeland Security has already deployed drones to assist police during a confrontation with a peaceful but eccentric family in North Dakota. The family of Rodney Brossart was involved in a dispute with Columbia University School of Law. Brossart could make a compelling claim that he had the right to hold the cattle until he received compensation for property damage. Rather than seeking to de-escalate the situation and find an equitable solution, the sheriff's office intervened by arresting Brossart and his daughter. When deputies returned the following day, they were confronted by three of Brossart's sons, who were carrying rifles. (11)

A standoff ensued during which Sheriff Kelly Janke of Nelson County, who had a long history of antagonism toward the Brossart family, accused the family of being in league with the **"sovereign citizens"** movement and spoke ominously of the need to **"end" it "one way or another."** Those themes were retailed in the media by the so-called Southern Poverty Law Center. Janke called in assistance from the Department of Homeland Security, which deployed two Predator B drones to conduct recon missions over the family's property in preparation for a SWAT raid.

The brothers were later arrested without incident, and Rodney Brossart became the first U.S. citizen to be sent to prison as a result of the domestic deployment of a Predator drone. (12) Of course, the drones deployed against the Brossart family weren't armed – but they easily could have been. If a lethal drone strike had occurred in North Dakota, the Brossarts would not have been the first Americans to be subjected to **"targeted killings"** by drone strike; that dreadful distinction belongs to Anwar al-Awlaki and his 16-year-old son Abdulrahman, who were murdered in separate drone strikes overseas. A federal judge in early April ruled that such summary executions by drone strikes are not subject to judicial review. (13)

While the outcome of the Brossart case didn't involve state-sanctioned murder, it foreshadows future atrocities committed in the name of "tolerance." It was the first test run of the vertically integrated Homeland Security State, in which your federalized local sheriff or police chief, using hit lists compiled by the SPLC and other leftist "watchdog" groups, can call in the drones to help round up – or liquidate — anybody he considers to be potentially troublesome.

## REFERENCES

- 1) Felix Frankfurter, dissent in *West Virginian Board of Education v. Barnette*.
- 2) Quoted in Harold U. Faulkner, *From Versailles to the New Deal* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), pg. 141.
- 3) See Fletcher, *Our Secret Constitution: How Lincoln Redefined American Democracy*. (Oxford University Press, 2001).
- 4) "Obama Signs Hate Crimes Bill," *New York Times*, October 28, 2009.
- 5) "War is a Hate Crime," Christopher Hedges, [www.truthdig.com](http://www.truthdig.com), October 26, 2009.
- 6) "Senators vote to crack down on hate crimes," *Reuters*, September 27, 2007.
- 7) See "Repressive Tolerance" by Herbert Marcuse (1965) at <http://www.marcuse.org/herbert/pubs/60spubs/65repressivetolerance.htm>
- 8) See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PC0sDnVtoLE>
- 9) "Supreme Court declines case of photographer who denied service to gay couple," *Washington Post*, April 7, 2014.
- 10) "Coeur d'Alene council shows courage with gay rights ordinance," *David Adler, Idaho Statesman*, June 6, 2013.
- 11) For details about this incident, see "Send in the Drones: The Predator State Goes Domestic," at <http://freedominourtime.blogspot.com/2011/12/send-in-drones-predator-state-goes.html>
- 12) "Predator Drone Sends North Dakota Man to Jail," *Forbes*, January 27, 2014.
- 13) "Lawsuit over American drone strikes dismissed by US Judge," *Chicago Tribune*, April 4, 2014.

Written by William H. Grigg

Unfortunately, I have to agree with William's conclusion. Please don't fall for the reasonings of these people. When a nation removes God and Christianity from its society, these are the results. I don't know how many of you are old enough as I am to remember the days when we didn't have intolerance, bigotry, and hate. People cared for each other. Stand up for what is "truly" right. We may have to pay a price, but it will be for a worthy cause.

Please keep Radio Liberty and its staff in your thoughts and prayers.

God bless you,

Stanley Monteith