

***“Power to the imagination.”***

A consistent discourse emerged from the Bush White House following the events of September 11, 2001. It was not so much that the events of September 11 caused this discourse, but that they offered a reasonable excuse for a deeper commitment to an already existing set of ideas that in the shadows of tragedy held the potential to define U.S. policy at home and abroad. The shift I speak of was reflected in the increasing willingness, perhaps eagerness, for the United States to engage militarily at a global level, while at the same time limiting numerous basic rights, including free expression and movement within and to the country. In essence, it was declared that the United States was forever at war in hot pursuit of terrorists, “Here? There? Somewhere?,” in the words of former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (Vidal, 2002a, p. 44). And so the argument followed that such a state of eternal engagement necessitated the suspension of democratic rights and the imposition of a 21st century version of martial law.

I contend that the terrorist attacks of September 11 have been used by the Bush administration and its many complex networks, including the vast conservative and neoconservative political and economic machinery, as a vehicle to strike fear in U.S. citizens and forge the justification for a New Militarism.<sup>1</sup> A new view of the world, a world of endless violence and cataclysmic threats, was thrust into the consciousness of citizens under the guise that terrorism is everywhere, and consequently the U.S. government and its offices of anti-espionage—the Department of Defense (DoD), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), the National Security Agency (NSA), and the Office of Homeland Security (OHS), among others—must also be everywhere, including in the classrooms, libraries, and offices of the country’s finest universities. In essence, the cold war was supplanted by the color-coded “hot war” (Michael Moore’s film *Fahrenheit 9/11* captures this quite nicely), and, of course, militarization was elevated to levels necessary to ensure U.S. hegemony. The emergence of this new form of militarism is rooted in a longstanding motif of American society—“America’s manifest destiny”—but in the context of the 21st century, horizons to the west are displaced by limitless global economic visions, and given that enemies are “here, there, somewhere,” then the military and its surveillance branches must be as well. As a consequence of eternal vigilance and violence—violence paraded before the American people as acts of “preemption,” or “anticipatory self-defense”—the infringement on important democratic rights and ideals is striking. And nowhere is this more telling than in the American academy.

The New Militarism may be understood as the defining element of contemporary U.S. policy, stressing the need for perpetual engagement with enemies, who in the post-9/11 era are quickly and repeatedly identified as

“terrorists.” U.S. political leaders ignore the obvious—that defining terrorists, as well as acts of terrorism, are not such simple tasks— and instead of dealing with the complexity of what constitutes terrorism (and the possibility that acts initiated by the U.S. military may also fit the definition of “terrorism” and perhaps constitute something more than “collateral damage”—the actions of U.S. Marines in November 2005 at Haditha come to mind [McGirk, 2006; Oppel & Mahmoud, 2006; Perry, 2006]), simply resort to their own self-serving rhetoric by essentially describing terrorism as what “they carry out against us” (Chomsky, 2006, p. 44).

Most pertinent to this article, the New Militarism justifies two particular positions with regard to the relationship between the Bush administration and the nation’s universities. First, and because of the potential for criticism to arise from within the walls of the university, the Bush administration and its allies have sought to limit academic freedom through a variety of legalistic and coercive actions. Included in my discussion here are several cases in which academics—both at home and abroad—have faced significant restrictions, including imprisonment and denied entry into the United States.<sup>2</sup> Second, the Bush administration and its supporters have been intent on strengthening the already strong ties between the American university (particularly research universities) and the U.S. military industrial complex, including the Department of Defense. In this instance, I focus on policies predominantly advanced by Bush and his supporters. I argue that these two broad assaults—attacks on academic freedom and steps to strengthen ties between universities and the U.S. military—have resulted in further deterioration of the American university’s democratic potential and its ability to advance a more just world. Embedded in my criticism is a particular vision of the university—a view that stresses the responsibility of the university to serve a democratically negotiated public good, act as an agent of transformation for social inequality, and encourage peaceful means to resolving national and international conflict.<sup>3</sup>

### **The New Militarism**

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq represent the potential for a new norm in U.S. international intervention, reflecting a shift from defensive to “preemptive” strikes—or more significantly, the initiation of massive U.S. military actions as a “preemptive” strategy to “possible” attacks. Noam Chomsky in particular has challenged the Bush administration’s use of the “doctrine of preemption,” as advanced principally by former National Security Advisor and current Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, pointing out that such a philosophy in the past implied that if planes were on their way to attack the United States, then, of course, the U.S. military had every right to shoot them down as well as bomb the

bases from which they came. In an interview with V. K. Ramachandran, published with *ZNet*, Chomsky (2003) argued that the doctrine of preemptive war, as advanced by the Bush administration, is really a doctrine of “preventive war,” giving the United States special powers to engage in military interventions under circumstances of “perceived” threat, as defined by the U.S. government and with the international community entirely excluded. It is essentially a free pass to invade any country defined by the United States as hostile to its interests. As Chomsky explained, “Pre-emptive war is a response to ongoing or imminent attack. The doctrine of preventive war is totally different; it holds that the United States—alone, since nobody else has this right—has the right to attack any country that it claims to be a potential challenge to it. So if the United States claims, on whatever grounds, that someone may sometime threaten it, then it can attack them.”

The Bush administration’s doctrine of preemption, as was presented by Rice when she delivered the President’s National Security Strategy in September 2002, moves far beyond the typical understanding of preemption. Rice (2002) presented the essence of this new policy: “New technology requires new thinking about when a threat actually becomes ‘imminent.’ So as a matter of common sense, the United States must be prepared to take action, when necessary, before threats have fully materialized.” She went on to add, “To support all these means of defending the peace, the United States will build and maintain 21st century military forces that are beyond challenge. We will seek to dissuade any potential adversary from pursuing a military build-up in the hope of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States and our allies.” Accordingly, the greatest minds of American society must be brought to bear on this all-important task of building and maintaining a military machine “beyond challenge,” and thus, the American university and its top scientists must be on board for the endless journey. Whereas World Wars I and II, and then the Cold War, once served as justification for tying academic science and the American research university to national interests—as defined by the nation’s political leaders, principal industrialists, and outspoken war hawks—at the dawn of the 21st century, militarists have found a new justification: the ubiquity of terrorism and the fear it generates within the populace.<sup>4</sup>

The New Militarism thus was launched most viciously by President Bush, who brought a prophet-like, fundamentalist zeal to his quest for “peace” (Editors, 2003). The word “peace,” of course, is nothing more than a kinder and gentler translation of “free market.” As Bush explained to Bob Woodward, in *Bush at War*, while pondering an attack on Iraq, “As we think through Iraq, we may or may not attack. I have no idea, yet. But it will be for the objective of making the world more peaceful” (2002, p. 340). Making the world more peaceful then involved crippling Iraq and installing a government supported by the U.S.

military, and along the way killing an estimated 50,000<sup>5</sup> to 600,000 Iraqi civilians, as of October 2006 with no end in sight (Tavernise & McNeil, 2006). And yes, it also meant turning the world against the United States and raising a thousand points of light in the justifiably hate-filled eyes of countless would-be “terrorists.” As Gore Vidal, in *Dreaming War: Blood for Oil and the Cheney-Bush Junta*, noted in mimicking James Baker, former Secretary of State under George Bush, Sr., “Terrorism is everywhere on the march. We cannot be too vigilant” (2002a, p. 8). Consequently, surely we must increase military appropriations. With so much money targeted for expanding the military industrial complex and related global offenses, other social concerns must be put aside. Yes, and in keeping with a market-driven vision of educational access, low-income students will have to pay their own way to America’s finest universities and assume massive debt along the way. Of course, some will not be able to postpone earning an income and will no doubt be drawn to military service. A more progressive and peaceful vision of the world will have to wait another 100 years or so...

Given that terrorism, or the seeds of global terrorism, may be planted anywhere... somewhere... everywhere, then the reach of a nation under ubiquitous assault must be endless. Thus, the interests of the United States extend to every corner of the world, and this, combined with the Bush/Rice doctrine of “preemption,” means that the U.S. military can pretty much do as it pleases. In an article titled, “War in Afghanistan: A \$ 28 Billion Racket,” Stephen Gowans (2002) drew from a 1919 passage in which Joseph Schumpeter (1951) described the extended reach of the Roman Empire.<sup>6</sup> What is interesting about this passage is the way in which Gowans called to mind (using Schumpeter’s words) U.S. foreign policy of the 21st century, as advanced by the Bush administration: “There was no corner of the known world where some interest was not alleged to be in danger or under actual attack. If the interests were not Roman, they were those of Rome’s allies; and if Rome had no allies, the allies would be invented. . . . The fight was always invested with an aura of legality. Rome was always being attacked by evil-minded neighbors.” Vidal reinforced the short-term annihilatory vision of U.S. political leaders when he wrote, “The United States is the master of the earth and anyone who defies us will be napalmed or blockaded or covertly overthrown. We are beyond law, which is not unusual for an empire; unfortunately, we are also beyond common sense” (2002a, p. 105).

Thus, the discourse of the New Militarism reflects a shift from a “cold war” centered on fighting and eliminating communism to a perpetually “hot war” focused on battling global terrorism that is at the same time “here, there, somewhere”—in essence, everywhere but nowhere. Consequently, the money must flow to the military industrial complex, while social concerns such as affordable education and health care necessarily must be relegated to subordinate status, thereby facing a permanent state of underfunding. And, of course, the

university and many of its greatest minds must be brought to bear on the endless battle against global terrorism. To adopt any other position is to be anti-American and unpatriotic or naively idealistic and stupid, as Rice (2002) suggested, when she defended a dominate-or-be-dominated view of U.S. foreign policy. Given the level of global hatred toward the United States that such a vision has spawned, conservatives and neoconservatives have more or less advanced a self-fulfilling prophesy. Of course the bully in the global schoolyard will be despised by everyone, perhaps even by professed allies! When it comes down to it, the central concern of the Bush administration has been about power and who has it. The doctrine of preemption, as advanced by Bush and Rice, admits as much. As Rice (2002) explained in her National Security talk, “Power matters in the conduct of world affairs. Great powers matter a great deal—they have the ability to influence the lives of millions and change history.”

Rice’s position is perfectly consistent with the neoconservative think tank, Project for the New American Century (PNAC), which has included among its membership and supporters the same folks who were so adamant about the need to capture Saddam Hussein’s weapons of mass destruction (i.e., Dick Cheney, Paul Wolfowitz, Donald Rumsfeld, William Kristol). In PNAC’s “Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century” (2000), the organization outlines a clear strategy for strengthening U.S. domination, arguing, of course, for massive increases in military spending, a necessity for assuring their guiding principle in an age of terrorism: “we need to accept the responsibility for America’s unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles” (PNAC, 2006). The PNAC and other neoconservative think tanks with vast conservative financial support, and often with connections to the same corporations and industries leading the military industrial complex (i.e., Halliburton), clearly have had a sizeable influence on the Bush administration. Unfortunately, Dwight D. Eisenhower’s famous farewell address of January 17, 1961—often described as the “military-industrial complex” speech—appears to have had no influence on PNAC’s great thinkers, especially his point about the need to “guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex.”

There is a counter-argument to the idea of a “*New Militarism*” that must be addressed. For example, if one looks back throughout recent U.S. history there is a degree of continuity in the nation’s foreign policy and its tendency toward the imperialistic deployment of the military. The argument that the interests of the United States and the extension of its military ought to be everywhere is not entirely a new one. This imperialistic vision is in fact revealed at different periods in U.S. history, as the nation’s leaders have repeatedly used the military to advance particular interests—almost always the interests of political and

economic elites. In *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, Gore Vidal (2002b) noted some 200 such examples of U.S. military interventions, simply since the middle of the 20th century! Thus, an argument could be proffered that the New Militarism isn't anything new at all, but is simply a contiguous extension of U.S. international policy and the tendency of the nation's political leaders to engage in violence of a massive scale in pursuit of the interests of the elite class to which they belong. If one mainly examines the New Militarism in light of foreign policy and U.S. interventionism, then this conclusion seems plausible.

Similarly, attacks on professors and efforts to incorporate university talent into U.S. military initiatives are hardly new. Indeed, the nation witnessed the attacks of McCarthyism and the "Red Scare," contributing in part to the power and prominence of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), which survived for some four decades. Looking beyond the professorate, the U.S. government has a history of waging anti-democratic assaults against its own citizens<sup>7</sup>—witness the treatment of Africans/African Americans in the age of slavery and the post-slavery days of the Reconstruction and the subsequent Jim Crow society of the South, the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, and the treatment of Chinese Americans in the period of the Exclusion Act (1882-1943), just to name a few of the racial/ethnic groups denied full democratic rights. With regard to the American university and its ties to the military, universities have long served the needs and interests of the military industrial complex, given the serious efforts of the federal government to capture academic scientists in and around the time of World War II and in the years that followed. In fact, the American university has been enlisted for international espionage, as was evident with Michigan State University's infamous "Vietnam Project," in which CIA agents posed as university professors and performed counter-intelligence operations under the guise of providing technical assistance to the Republic of South Vietnam in the late 1950s (Hinckle, 1966). Given this historical context, what is really "new" about the contemporary assault? Globalization and the advance of global capitalism offer a partial answer here.

Globalization, as the reduction of time and space, has produced a set of conditions barely imaginable some 40 or 50 years ago (Giddens, 1999). With the rise of advanced forms of communication, including the age of computers and the Internet, global communication has never been so readily available to such a sizeable portion of the world's population. Furthermore, improvements in travel have produced dramatic increases in human and cultural exchange. But the engine of the global machine is capitalism, and a particular strain of capitalism at that, one often described as "neoliberalism" (Torres & Rhoads, 2006).

Neoliberalism is grounded in a view of the market as the arbiter of what is just and fair, having as the ultimate goal the privatization of practically everything.<sup>8</sup> As Michael Apple noted, neoliberalism is guided by a view that

“what is private is necessarily good and what is public is necessarily bad” (2000, p. 59). Peter McLaren and Ramin Farahmandpur offered their appraisal: “Neoliberal free market economics—the purpose of which is to avoid stasis and keep businesses in healthy flux—functions as a type of binding arbitration, legitimizing a host of questionable practices and outcomes, including deregulation, unrestricted access to consumer markets, downsizing, outsourcing, flexible arrangements of labor...increasing centralization of economic and political power, and finally, widening class polarization” (2001, p. 137). They went on to describe neoliberalism as “re-imagining” democracy along the lines of a market discourse complete with “parasitic financial oligarchies” (p. 137). Consequently, in an age defined by neoliberal globalization, and guided by intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) such as the World Trade Organization, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, all largely operating in the interests of political and economic elites, the concerns of U.S. capital and capitalists, like the assault on terrorism, extend to everywhere. As McLaren and Farahmandpur mockingly proposed, “Imagine the possibilities for privatizing public spaces and spreading neoliberal domination over vast exotic populations hitherto unconquered!” (p. 138). Given the control of U.S. elites over the mightiest military machine ever to exist, should it surprise even the most casual of observers that that machinery might be put into use when economic interests are at stake, which in an age of global capital is everywhere and all the time?

Thus, in coming to terms with the assault of the Bush administration and its conservative and neoconservative allies, we must understand the complicity of neoliberals and their global free-trade mantra. For Apple (2000), they are “the most powerful element within the conservative restoration” (p. 59), which essentially represents the movement of the past 20 years or so to reverse and/or limit progressive social reform and holds to a view that “too much democracy” (p. 58) has led to the decline of the United States. Hence, the rise of the Bush administration, in conjunction with the formulation of neoconservative thought, as advanced since the days of Ronald Reagan, combined with the growing domination of neoliberal forms of global capitalism, and the environment of fear in the post-9/11 era, has in effect produced the “perfect storm”—a set of conditions leading to the extension of military and surveillance operations “here, there, somewhere.” The New Militarism then must be understood in the context of both the assault on foreign nations (including their autonomy as nation-states), but also in terms of the widespread attack on basic rights at home, made possible by the attacks of September 11. What differentiates the New Militarism from other periods throughout U.S. history is the pervasiveness and perniciousness of what is being waged both at home and abroad, and most importantly, the manner by which today’s global environment has produced a re-definition of U.S. interests. Consequently, the U.S. government, under the leadership of George W.

Bush, has carelessly utilized surveillance branches and military operations with a goal in mind of dominating “the land of Everywhere”—this is the essence of the U.S.-dominated vision of global capitalism. The violence and domination brought to the plundering of Everywhere essentially constitutes the New Militarism. To understand this perfect storm, however, one must examine how global terrorism has been used as a rationale to forge the New Militarism.

### **Terrorism as the Endless War**

Terrorism has become the ultimate enemy requiring eternal vigilance and expanded militarization. The war against Al-Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan was justified on the grounds that Osama bin Laden was there to be found. But once the U.S. military was firmly embedded in the Afghan countryside, bin Laden soon became secondary, even peripheral. He was simply the embodiment of terrorist threats that might arise anywhere in the world, thus demanding U.S. expansionism and military intervention wherever George W. Bush deemed it necessary. First bin Laden in Afghanistan, then Saddam Hussein in Iraq. Next in line may be Kim Jong Il in North Korea or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in Iran. Indeed, in the July 2006 issue of the *The New Yorker*, Seymour Hersh revealed that the U.S. Strategic Air Command “has been drawing up plans, at the President’s direction, for a major bombing campaign in Iran.”

But in this new age of “postmodern politics,” as described by Roger Burbach (2001) in *Globalization and Postmodern Politics: From Zapatistas to High-Tech Robber Barons*, threats and enemies may not be as readily identifiable as a nation-state and the political parties that supposedly direct them (bin Laden and his followers offer one example). Burbach argued that the global context of the 21st century produced new conceptions of resistance and political engagement. As he explained, much of the resistance to “international capital and the policies of its subservient governments around the world” takes place not “under the leadership of political parties, be they liberal, social democratic or communist. Most of these parties are no longer relevant or able to facilitate change because they have been discredited, destroyed, or have fallen under the sway of international capital. Due to the compromised state of political parties and leaders, traditional politics is increasingly viewed as a spurious arena of activity by large swaths of the globe’s population, especially by the youth, which has become apolitical or practices a new ‘anti-politics’” (pp. 9-10). Most troublesome, however, is the fact that many of these new forms of opposition, emerging during the last decade of the 20th century and the early part of the 21st century—evident at the 1999 World Trade Organization (WTO) Summit in Seattle, the 2000 IMF-World Bank summit in Prague, and the July 2001 G-8



summit in Genoa, along with movements by the Zapatistas in Mexico, anti-IMF/global capitalism grassroots rebellions in Argentina, and a host of U.S.-based progressive movements—all constitute forms of terrorism, as defined by the Bush administration.

Reports coming out post-9/11 confirmed that the government's surveillance organizations, most notably the Department of Defense, the Office of Homeland Security, and the FBI, were consistently targeting students and other activists engaged in anti-war, animal rights, and environmental movements, among other progressive-minded causes (see ACLU, 2004; Arno, 2003c; Oregon Joins, 2004; Proctor, 2003; Read, 2003). For example, the DoD, through its Talon database program, conducted surveillance of student anti-war protests at several campuses, including monitoring e-mail messages, even when no threats of violence existed (Henig, 2006). One protest monitored by the DoD culminated in a group bike ride whereby students expressed solidarity with Earth Day. Given such extremist student activity as riding bicycles around campus and through the local community, how can the American people desire anything less than multiple fronts, around the world and in their backyard, in light of the ubiquity of terrorism, personified, even vilified, in the person of Saddam Hussein, but also captured in the faces of radical students and professors? Indeed, when neoconservative David Horowitz gained the ears of legislative bodies with his proposed "academic bill of rights" (Jacobson, 2005), along with his "101 most dangerous academics" list (Horowitz, 2006), and when a conservative UCLA alumnus created his very own website to castigate the university's "Dirty 30" (Fogg 2006; Silverstein & Hong, 2006)—a list of UCLA's 30 most radical professors—it struck me simply as a sign of the times, given the post-9/11 McCarthyism of the war on terrorism. It seems that the Osama bin Ladens of the world, and other "radicals," are "here, there, somewhere," even present at some of the country's top universities!

It is hard not to be struck by the irony of Osama bin Laden as the ultimate manifestation of terrorism and all that is evil at home and abroad. Perhaps no one has captured this more poignantly than Huey Freeman in his 2001 Thanksgiving Day prayer—yes, that's Huey Freeman of Aaron McGruder's comic strip, "The Boondocks": "In this time of war against Osama bin Laden and the oppressive Taliban regime, we are thankful that OUR leader isn't the spoiled son of a powerful politician from a wealthy oil family who is supported by religious fundamentalists, operates through clandestine organizations, has no respect for the democratic electoral process, bombs innocents, and uses war to deny people their civil liberties. Amen" (Nichols, 2002).

A central component of the fight against terrorism has been, of course, the 2001 USA PATRIOT Act and the 2002 Homeland Security Act. The USA PATRIOT Act—officially known as "Uniting and Strengthening America by

Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism”—was passed in 2001 by a vote of 98 to 1 in the U.S. Senate, with only Russell Feingold (D-WI) opposing the act (the House of Representatives overwhelmingly approved the act). The 2006 renewal represented some slight compromises of the original act, but was nonetheless re-authorized, although with higher levels of opposition this time around (the voting in the Senate was 89 in favor and 10 in opposition, with 9 Democrats and 1 Independent opposing re-authorization), as a handful of Democrats no doubt sensed shifting public opinion and the opportunity for political gain. Of course, many concerns about the PATRIOT Act have been expressed by academics, progressives, and libertarians. Given that the act sought to expand the tactics available for enhancing domestic security against terrorism and improving surveillance procedures, including greater authority to intercept forms of communication by conducting wire taps, many informed citizens saw the potential for the government to violate basic rights. One issue particularly significant to academics was the increased surveillance of the book-reading habits of anyone using U.S. libraries, including college and university libraries.

The Homeland Security Act, which created the Department of Homeland Security and the position of Secretary of Homeland Security (initially filled by Republican Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania), was passed in the Senate by a vote of 90 to 9, with oppositional votes coming from 8 Democrats and 1 Independent. This act sought to establish one central federal department to manage efforts and information aimed at securing the homeland. Following 9/11, it was generally accepted in Washington that too many federal organizations charged with protecting U.S. citizens had failed to share information and communicate openly across the numerous complex bureaucracies. The Department of Homeland Security hence would seek to eradicate the structural limitations of the pre-9/11 national security programs.

Given the overwhelming support of Democrats for both the PATRIOT Act and the Homeland Security Act, analysis of the New Militarism must acknowledge their complicity in forging the color-coded hot war against terrorism. Indeed, early manifestations of this shift were evident during Bill Clinton’s presidency, when military interventions in Haiti and Somalia, among others, revealed the aggressive deployment of the U.S. military for the purpose of protecting the nation’s global interests. In fact, in what became known as the Clinton Doctrine (Dobbs, 1996), the basic guides governing possible U.S. military intervention were expanded under Clinton to also include protecting U.S. “values.” As Clinton maintained, “The United States cannot and should not try to solve every problem in the world. But where our interests are clear and our values are at stake, where we can make a difference, we can act and must lead” (Daggett & Serafino, 1995, p. 3). And so, with conservatives and neoconservatives pulling the strings of the U.S. media and fashioning new notions

of patriotism grounded in memories of New York's dissolving twin towers, courageous Democrats were hard to uncover. Indeed, to oppose "anti-terrorist" legislation, or the eventual war against Iraq, was to face accusations of treason, given the zealous and jingoistic forms of nationalism that emerged in the aftermath of 9/11.

### **The Assault on Academic Freedom**

In relating the New Militarism to universities in particular, a most obvious impact has been the general assault against academic freedom and the basic foundation of unfettered intellectual pursuit within the American university. At work here is a long-standing principle upon which many U.S. professors depend, as expressed by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure: "Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free expression." Consistent with the AAUP, the American university, as a common-good institution, ought to represent an important democratic space for social criticism, akin in some respects to the role of a free press. But in the context of the New Militarism, there has been a clear attempt to limit and shape the nature of the social and political criticism of professors. Examples of this are numerous.

Perhaps the most obvious case of the assault on academic freedom has been the charge led by David Horowitz. Co-founder of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture, Horowitz organized the "Students for Academic Freedom," "a national watchdog group that helps college students document when professors introduce their politics in the classroom" (Jacobson, 2005, p. A9). With the backing of large conservative foundations, including the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation (\$2.2 million between 1998 and 2003), Sarah Scaife Foundation (\$1.3 million between 1998 and 2003), and the John M. Olin Foundation (\$1.265 million between 1998 and 2003), among others, Horowitz has waged an assault on what he describes as the liberal bias of the American university (one can only assume that Horowitz is not offended by the fact that nearly every business school in the United States advocates a political and economic ideology almost entirely consistent with conservative economic views). Horowitz has as a goal legislative bodies passing his "academic bill of rights," potentially imposing a variety of restrictions on what professors can and cannot say in their classes (Lipka, 2006). Given that a conservative economic ideology wholly consistent with a U.S.-led vision of global capitalism (i.e., neoliberalism) and a position demanding that universities serve the military industrial complex

have for the most part been effectively situated within the heart of the American university (see for example Apple 2000; Aronowitz, 2000; Giroux, 2002; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Soley, 1995; and Washburn, 2005), one can expect that the viewpoints most likely to be censored and silenced by the Horowitz-led movement are those seeking to challenge the dominance of conservative/neoconservative ideology and the need for an apocalyptic military as the cornerstone of a dominate-or-be-dominated society.

There are many other examples of the ways in which conservative and neoconservative forces operating with a militia mentality have sought to gain greater control over academe. Their position is fairly clear—too many liberals and radicals populate the university and so they must be controlled, limited, perhaps erased. The Ward Churchill episode is another excellent case in point. In using an analogy in which the victims of the World Trade Center attacks of September 11 were compared to “little Eichmans” (Smallwood, 2005), Churchill became the center of a national controversy, and his words brought about calls for his firing, despite being a tenured professor at the University of Colorado, Boulder. When leaders at his university realized that he could not so easily be removed, they decided to build a case against his scholarship, raising questions about his academic integrity and forming a five-member panel to investigate his scholarly work. Some even challenged his claim that he is an American Indian. In May 2006 the panel rendered a report that Churchill had indeed “engaged in a pattern of misconduct” (Smallwood, 2006). This was no doubt the finding that many top officials within the University of Colorado had hoped for, as only one month later interim chancellor Phil DiStefano issued to Churchill a formal notice of intent to dismiss him, the precise action that Colorado’s Governor, Bill Owens (Republican), had requested earlier in the year. Whether Churchill’s published work does in fact include instances of “research misconduct” is beyond my analysis, but what is perfectly clear is that the entire process was nothing more than a witch hunt from the start.

Nationally speaking, Churchill’s example was turned into a broader call to weaken (or erase) ethnic studies programs, as Churchill taught within the ethnic studies program at Colorado. Conservatives, and traditionalists for that matter, have long recognized ethnic studies (as well as women’s studies, queer studies, etc.) as sites of resistance against the frameworks of U.S. manifest destiny, global capitalism, hyper-militarization, and race- and gender-based domination. The Churchill incident was used then to bring to the public’s consciousness ways in which ethnic studies programs propagate “anti-patriotic” sentiment, because after all what kind of person speaks harshly of the victims of the World Trade Center? The Churchill case thus was an example of how academic discourse must be controlled, limited, erased. As one of the last remaining sites to be fully

colonized by the conservative-led march to free-market domination of the world, left-leaning scholars as a source of resistance must be contained.

That the Churchill case has been used to wage an assault on interdisciplinary studies programs such as ethnic studies, women's studies, and queer studies, among others, is clearly evident in a report issued by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), a right-wing advocacy group co-founded by Lynn Cheney and often falsely presenting itself as bi-partisan. ACTA's report, "How Many Ward Churchills?" offers a tainted portrait of the American university under the control of radicals like Churchill, using "their classrooms," as noted ACTA President, Anne Neal, stated, "as platforms for propaganda," aimed at brainwashing today's students. The report highlights particular courses from colleges and universities throughout the country, and, of course, targets anyone and anything seeking to challenge the dominant power structures of American society, suggesting in the Forward that "Ward Churchill is not only not alone—he is quite common" (ACTA, 2006).

But threats to academic freedom come in many forms under the New Militarism and often are extended to the international front. Burton Bollag (2003), writing for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, described the case of professor Carlos Alzugaray Treto, a leading expert on U.S.-Cuban relations. Professor Alzugaray and more than 30 other Cuban scholars were denied visas as they sought to participate in the Latin American Studies Association International Congress in Dallas in March 2003. Homeland-security policies deemed them to be potential risks and so instead of participating in three panels on Latin American issues and "giving American scholars and students a Cuban perspective, Mr. Alzugaray [was] driving his blue 1979 Soviet Lada each day down Havana's palm-tree lined roads to his job as professor at the Advanced Institute for International Relations" (p. A16). Additionally, professor Alzugaray was scheduled to visit Ohio's Miami University for six days in April 2003, but this trip too had to be cancelled, because his visa request had been denied. One Miami University professor described it as a "deeply disturbing sign of the many impacts of the 'war on terror'" (p. A17). Professor Alzugaray believed he was being punished for his critical views of U.S. policy toward Cuba.

While Alzugaray was rejected for a visa, the plight of Iraqi scientist Huda Salih Mahdi Ammash is even more frightening. In May 2003, Ammash was "detained" by U.S. military forces under the justification that she was a key figure in the production of chemical weapons of mass destruction (Spinoza, 2003). Interestingly, Ammash, the infamous "Mrs. Anthrax," as dubbed by the Bush administration, was No. 53, the "Five of Hearts," in the "most-wanted Iraqis" deck of cards produced by the Pentagon. She also is a biochemist trained at the University of Missouri and one of the most outspoken critics of U.S. weapons of mass destruction. In a chapter titled "Toxic Pollution, the Gulf War, and

Sanctions,” published in Anthony Arno’s edited book *Iraq Under Siege*, Ammash (2002) alleged that the U.S. played a key role in causing cancers and other illnesses in Iraqi children as a result of the use of biologically hazardous weapons, including radioactive depleted uranium. Ammash had long been cleared by U.N. weapons inspectors of any involvement in the production of chemical weapons, but this fact did not stop the U.S. military from violating Ammash’s basic rights, and of course, effectively silencing her criticism, while imprisoning her for a year and a half (Del Castillo, 2003). The BBC reported her release from prison in December 2005 and noted that Mrs. Ammash “had been accused by the Bush administration of involvement in Saddam Hussein’s banned weapons programme. Neutralising the threat posed by the former leader’s chemical and biological weapons was cited by the U.S. as its prime motive for invading Iraq in 2003. No such weapons have been found since the invasion” (BBC, 2005). And, of course, no weapons of mass destruction were ever found.

Another case linking the New Militarism with assaults on academic freedom involved Professor Sami Al-Arian, a tenured associate professor of computer science at the University of South Florida (USF) at the time his ordeal started. Details surrounding this case were the focus of reports by the American Association of University Professors (2002). Professor Al-Arian long maintained an active interest in Palestinian and Islamic issues. During the 1990s he was investigated by the FBI, after allegations of having terrorist ties. But the FBI investigation found no wrongdoing on Al-Arian’s part. Following the events of September 11, Al-Arian appeared on Fox News’s *The O’Reilly Factor*, during which the show’s host, conservative Bill O’Reilly, questioned the professor about his alleged ties to terrorist activity (Walsh, 2003). This kicked off angry telephone calls and e-mails to USF, demanding that the professor be fired. The university responded by placing Al-Arian on paid leave of absence and asking him to remain off campus. On December 19, 2001 the USF board of trustees held an emergency meeting and decided to dismiss Professor Al-Arian on the basis that his ongoing commentary on controversial topics was impeding the university’s ability to function efficiently. Professor Al-Arian denied the charges against him and appealed through the appropriate university channels. In the end, Al-Arian was suspended for 15 months before being arrested in February 2003 by federal officers on charges of raising money for the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, a group designated as a terrorist organization by the U.S. Justice Department, primarily because of their supposed financial support for the families of Palestinian suicide bombers. Subsequently, Professor Al-Arian was formally dismissed from the university, despite not having been found guilty at the time of his dismissal. Ultimately, Al-Arian was found innocent of 8 of the 17 charges against him, with the jury deadlocking on the remaining charges. Rather than face a retrial, both sides agreed to a plea bargain in April 2006, with Al-Arian pleading guilty to a

lesser charge of aiding the Palestinian Islamic Jihad and facing deportation as a sentence. However, the judge in the case, James S. Moody, later rejected elements of the agreed-upon plea bargain and instead sentenced Al-Arian to an additional 19 months in prison before deportation (Steinhauer, 2006).

What is most interesting in the Al-Arian case is once again the way in which the concept of “terrorism” is used to de-legitimize one organization’s use of violence—most notably that of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad—while on the other hand, ignoring state-sanctioned violence enacted by the Israeli military against Palestinians. From the Palestinian perspective, the Israelis, of course, are the terrorists and U.S. officials are guilty of breaking their own laws—by aiding and abetting terrorism enacted by Israel. The point here is not to defend the support of violent acts on the part of the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, nor to attack the Israelis for what they clearly define as defensive acts, but to suggest that the issues at play in the prosecution of terrorism, as a key component of the New Militarism, are politically and ideologically charged and that university professors acting in opposition to the party line often are targets for containment. And in the case of the University of South Florida, universities sometimes fully participate in support of the New Militarism, as opposed to standing up for fundamental democratic rights.

Another case highlighting how the concept of “terrorism” is exploited to advance a particular political or ideological position is revealed in the important example of Dora Maria Tellez, a Nicaraguan, who in 2005 was offered a visiting professor post at Harvard University. Tellez was denied a visa by the U.S. Department of State under a section of the immigration law that bars people from entering the country if they have participated in acts of terrorism (Burge, 2005). And so what terrorist acts was Tellez guilty of committing? She was once a Sandinista leader who helped to overthrow Nicaraguan dictator Anastasio Somoza. In fact, she was a “Commander 2” and helped to take over the National Palace, an event “seen as a key moment that indicated the Somoza regime could be overthrown” (Campbell, 2005). Of course, there are clear reasons why the Bush White House would invoke sections on terrorism within the immigration law, given that the Reagan administration had opposed the Sandinistas, even after they won the 1984 democratic elections. Indeed, the “Irangate” scandal involved several of Reagan’s top officials selling arms to Iran in order to fund the Nicaraguan Contras, or counter-revolutionaries. One of the more interesting aspects of the Tellez case is that John Negroponte, who was appointed Director of National Intelligence by Bush in 2005 and charged with overseeing the war against terrorism, had been a diplomat to Honduras during the time that the Reagan administration was illegally funding the Contras and working with Honduran forces to oppose the Sandinistas. As Trevor Royle (2005) of Scotland’s *The Sunday Herald* reported, “According to critics, all this would have

been known to Negroponte but he kept his silence and the cover was not blown until October 1986, when Sandinista forces shot down a CIA aircraft carrying arms to Contra forces inside Nicaragua.” Given these considerations, it seems much more likely the case that Tellez was denied a visa not because she was in fact a terrorist—much in the same manner that George Washington or Paul Revere might have been defined by the British as terrorists—but because her views are too far to the left, given that the Sandinistas embraced various Marxist ideals and aligned themselves more with Cuba and the former Soviet Union than with the United States.

There are many more cases that could be discussed, including the example of Pomona College professor Miguel Tinker-Salas, who showed up for office hours one day only to be met by two officers from a joint terrorism task force from the Los Angeles County Sheriffs Office and the FBI (Marquez, 2006; Pomona College, 2006; Younge, 2006). It seems the two officers took time to question some of Tinker-Salas’ students who just happened to be waiting outside the professor’s office. And so what egregious act of terrorism had Tinker-Salas committed? The professor had become too much of an expert on Latin America, especially Venezuela and its President Hugo Chavez, whom Donald Rumsfeld compared to Adolph Hitler (CBS News, 2006). Tinker-Salas had spoken and written many times about U.S.-Venezuelan relations, but apparently departed too far from the party line and Condoleezza Rice’s call for “a united front” (BBC News, 2006). Then there’s the case of Paul Gilroy, former chair of African American Studies at Yale and the first Anthony Giddens Professor of Social Theory at the London School of Economics, who made the mistake of stating that the U.S. war with Iraq seemed motivated by “a desire to enact revenge for the attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon,” adding, that it’s important “to speculate about the relation between this war and the geopolitical interests of Israel” (Younge, 2006). These comments led to Gilroy’s addition to “discoverthenetworks.org,” a website committed to exposing “radical” professors around the country, similar in its ideological and political orientation to the website created to expose UCLA’s so-called “Dirty 30.” In these sorts of cases, sometimes universities have acted courageously and stood against the New Militarism’s “new McCarthyism,” as was the case at Pomona College, when academic leaders came out against the informal interrogation of one of its professors. But there have probably been just as many, if not more, University of South Floridas and University of Colorado-Boulders, in which universities quickly abandoned support for professors, and in some cases dismissed academic freedom altogether (Porter, 2006).

What is interesting about the cases of Carlos Alzugaray Treto, Huda Salih Mahdi Ammash, Sami Al-Arian, Dora Maria Tellez, and Miguel Tinker-Salas is that all five scholars engaged in public expressions critical of or in opposition to



the Bush administration and its policies. Alzugaray was critical of U.S. policies toward Cuba. Ammash was critical of weapons of mass destruction employed by the United States in the first Iraqi-U.S. war. Al-Arian supported the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, which clearly stood in opposition to the U.S. government's support of Israel. Tellez advocated leftist principles as part of a socialist view consistent with the Sandinistas. And Tinker-Salas was less than complimentary of U.S. foreign policy pertaining to Latin America in general and Venezuela in particular. What is also similar about all five cases is that U.S. officials sought various means to silence these scholars, from imprisonment (in the cases of Ammash and Al-Arian) to exclusion (in the cases of Alzugaray and Tellez) to intimidation (in the case of Tinker-Salas), and all in the name of the New Militarism and the never-ending fight against terrorism "here, there, somewhere."

By acting in a manner consistent with the New Militarism, the U.S. government has sought to suppress various oppositional voices—sometimes successfully and sometimes not so successfully—and occasionally, in combination with a university acting on what it describes as a concern for efficiency or productivity, as in the case of Al-Arian and the University of South Florida, has quite effectively rendered serious damage to the principle of academic freedom and the important role of the university as a source of criticism. And all this damage has been done in the name of homeland security, as the New Militarism and its martial-law-like tactics effectively limit forms of dissent. But is the silencing really intended to produce greater security, or does it represent the essence of a conservative/neoconservative assault aimed at severely weakening an already weak American Left and any hope of a truly democratic society?

The argument advanced here suggests that the New Militarism is in essence an assault on dissenting voices, at home and abroad. The assault is embedded in the logic of U.S. engagement in "perpetual war" (see Vidal, 2002b), and therefore, perpetually tied to a conservative/ neoconservative vision in full support of a "dominate-or-be-dominated" view of American society—one in complete symbiosis with a neoliberal economic perspective seeking global hegemony. This strategy necessarily demands further securing the ties between the university and "national security" interests.

### **Strengthening Ties between the University and "National Security"**

One way in which connections between universities and what get defined as "national security" interests have been solidified in the post-9/11 era is the federal government's demand on colleges and universities to track foreign students and scholars through a computerized system known as the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System, or SEVIS (see Arno, 2002, 2003a;

2003b; Campese, 2003; Field, 2004). The U.S. government requires that colleges and universities keep track of individuals admitted, visiting, and/or hired from foreign countries, including when they enter and leave the country; for students, institutions must manage data concerning dates of arrival and/or program registration, enrollment data, expected dates of program completion, up-to-date addresses, and so forth. Such information is passed on to the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and is conveyed to the Department of Homeland Security and made accessible to the FBI. In effect, SEVIS requirements create a situation in which members of a particular academic community are expected to monitor the movement of other members of the same academic community, thus further contributing to an environment of mistrust. In considering this, one must keep in mind that foreign students and professors are full members of the same academic community that under SEVIS requirements must monitor their coming and going. The responsibility for managing SEVIS is more likely than not to fall on staff at campus international centers. Consequently, instead of providing academic and cultural support, staff may be just as likely to be engaged in information management for the Department of Homeland Security, all in the name of the New Militarism and its endless fight against terrorism.

A second facet of the government's effort to control universities is connected to the Department of Homeland Security and its powers through the USA PATRIOT Act to target universities and the pursuit of knowledge. More specifically, Section 215, dealing with access to records under the Foreign Intelligence Security Act (FISA), permits the FBI ominous powers in gathering library records, including book circulation records, Internet-use records, and registration information stored in *any* medium. Furthermore, Section 215 does not require FBI agents to demonstrate "probable cause;" all the agents need to do is provide evidence that the records are needed as part of an on-going investigation related to terrorism or intelligence gathering. Librarians have been quite concerned about the PATRIOT Act and its assault on the free pursuit of knowledge. For example, the American Library Association (ALA) has repeatedly opposed key elements of Section 215. Michael Gorman, ALA president when the PATRIOT Act was re-authorized in March 2006, stated that the association opposed the lack of "a more stringent standard" for Section 215 orders. According to Gorman, the association believed that libraries should only be required to share user data when an individual is "connected to a terrorist or suspected of a crime" (ALA, 2006).

A third way in which the current administration and its supporters have sought to strengthen ties between the New Militarism and the university is through the Solomon Amendment, which was originally passed in 1995, in the wake of the Department of Defense's adoption in 1993 of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy with regard to lesbians, gays, and bisexuals (LGBs) in the military

(Paletta, 2005). Adoption of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy was the catalyst for a movement among university law schools to deny military recruiters access to their campuses. Their concern was that in supporting the Defense Department’s recruitment programs, they would, in effect, be violating their own institutional policies of non-discrimination against LGB students, who, if “out,” likely would be of little interest to military recruiters, despite their qualifications. The original Solomon Amendment (Solomon I), enacted as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, sought to penalize colleges and universities that excluded military recruiters by denying such institutions DoD funds. Given that most universities do not receive such funds, the impact was minimal. Consequently, the 1997 Solomon-Pombo Amendment (Solomon II), enacted as part of the Omnibus Appropriation Act, sought to expand the act in two ways. First, the revised amendment included not only denying access to military recruiters as justification for restricting funds, but also any college or university that denied or restricted Reserve Officer Training Programs (ROTC) could be penalized as well. Second, the new act expanded from limiting only DoD funds to encompass additional sources of federal funding, including the Department of Education. Thus, the revised amendment touched far more campuses than the initial legislation. Eventually, the Solomon Amendment was challenged in the courts by a coalition of law schools—the Forum for Academic and Institutional Rights (FAIR). However, in March 2006, the Supreme Court ruled that under the Congress’s power to raise armies, the federal government could withhold funds to colleges and universities that barred or restricted military recruiters. As Kelly Field (2006b) of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (“Today’s News”) noted, “The unanimous decision, written by Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr., rejected arguments that colleges have a First Amendment right to exclude recruiters whose hiring practices conflict with their own antidiscrimination policies.”

Throughout the 1990s, the Solomon Amendment was “weakly enforced,” but following 9/11, “the Defense Department insisted on fuller compliance” (Paletta, 2005). Hence, although the initial legislation emerged during the Clinton years (it was introduced by Republicans), later the Bush administration used such legislation to forge greater control over colleges and universities—much like the Clinton Doctrine helped to frame the later expansion of national interests and “values” under Bush. It should also be noted that following the Supreme Court’s decision in 2006 to uphold the Solomon Amendment, the House of Representatives held a vote to express “continued support of Congress for requiring an institution of higher education to provide military recruiters with access to the institution’s campus and students at least equal in quality and scope to that which is provided to any other employer in order to be eligible for the receipt of federal funds.” The final results were 347 Yeas and 65 Nays, with all

Republicans voting in support (222), while roughly one-third of the Democrats opposed the amendment (64).

A fourth avenue that the Bush administration and its supporters have used as a means of containing universities in the post-9/11 era is through the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), and in particular Title VI, dealing with international and area studies. The reauthorization of HEA, which is supposed to take place every five or six years, has been used by the federal government as a vehicle for shaping the direction of colleges and universities. Established in 1965 primarily as a means of allocating federal funds for student financial aid, the federal government subsequently has used its reauthorization to shape higher education policy. For example, the 1998 reauthorization included the Drug Provision, which essentially denies or delays federal financial aid to any student convicted of a drug offense.<sup>9</sup> A recent rendition of the HEA included proposed legislation as part of Title VI aimed at increasing the federal government's role in monitoring federally financed international and area studies programs through the creation of an advisory board. The proposed advisory board would have reported to the Secretary of Education, Margaret Spellings, and the Congress, and concerned itself with national security interests. The board was to be made up of seven members with two appointees named by the Senate, two named by the House, and three named by the Secretary of Education, of which two would come from national security agencies.

To many observers the board seemed much more than advisory; indeed, as many critics pointed out, the proposed board would have the power to investigate faculty, programs, and classes. David Ward (2003), President of the American Council on Education, explained ACE's position after the proposed Title VI legislation became public knowledge: "We believe the current legislation leaves open the possibility that the Advisory Board could intrude into the academic conduct and content of higher education and could impinge on institutional decisions about curriculum and activities." Ward also spoke on behalf of nearly 20 other professional associations, including the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the Association of American Universities, and the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities. The commentary from Ward was hardly a critique from the "radical left." But other critics spoke more directly to significant concerns coming from within the international and area studies arena, seeing the proposed advisory board as part of an effort by the Bush administration to restrict criticism of U.S. foreign policy and further define international/area studies as an extension of the war on terrorism (see for example Craig, 2004). This became painfully clear when lobbying from higher education groups led the U.S. Senate to drop the proposed advisory board and replace it with foreboding language requiring international and area studies programs to ensure that their programs offer "diverse and balanced perspectives" or face the possibility of

immediate suspension of funds by the Secretary of Education “if complaints are lodged against them” (Burd, 2005). *The Chronicle of Higher Education* noted that, “the Senators acted after hearing complaints from conservative scholars that some federally supported area-studies centers had an anti-American bias” (Burd, 2005). Do international and area studies programs really have an anti-American bias or do they simply raise critical questions about U.S. foreign policy? Given efforts to undermine this important scholarly arena, it seems no great leap of faith to conclude that the U.S. government sees the cultural, geopolitical, and linguistic knowledge advanced by area and international studies programs as not so much about benefiting the human condition or advancing global peace, but about serving the New Militarism.

One final strategy adopted by the Bush administration was the formation of the Commission on the Future of Higher Education, charged with developing a national strategy for meeting the needs of American society in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. And what might the needs of American society be these days? Providing improved educational opportunities for immigrants and a growing population of linguistically and culturally diverse students? Unlikely, given the rampant xenophobia of the nation’s political leaders. Improving the resources for low-income schools so as to make college-going a more likely possibility? Not really, given the growing push in the reverse—to privatize education. How about involving academic communities and the nation’s brightest minds in advancing a more just and peaceful world? Unimaginable, given the context of “perpetual war” and terrorism, “here, there, somewhere.” And so, what are the needs suggested by the Commission’s charge and its composition? Spellings explained, “It is time to examine how we can get the most out of our national investment in higher education. We have a responsibility to make sure our higher education system continues to meet our nation’s needs for an educated and competitive workforce of the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). And who gets to define “an educated and competitive workforce”? Well, about 19-20 of the most privileged people in America, including at least nine corporate executives from companies such as IBM, Microsoft, Boeing, Autodesk, and Kaplan, along with several active and retired university presidents, including Robert Mendenhall, of Western Governor’s University, one of the leaders in on-line “mis-education.” For good measure, Spellings added a professor of higher education, Robert Zemsky, a noted economist from the Learning Alliance for Higher Education at the University of Pennsylvania, who in 2006 argued that if enrollments are increasing, then higher education must be affordable...otherwise, people would not purchase it (Hebel, 2006; Zemsky, 2006). Following the classic market logic of Professor Zemsky, if poor parents have to sell one of their children in order to purchase enough food for the rest of the family to survive, then food must therefore be affordable.

Not too surprisingly, society's needs, as defined by Spellings' Commission, are mostly those of the nation's leading corporations, many of which, of course, are deeply implicated by the nation's state of "perpetual war" and the need for maintaining a gargantuan military industrial complex. Right from the start the Commission's focus was clearly on a corporate/industrial model of higher education aimed at further vocationalizing academic study. This was most apparent in the various reports focusing on issues such as accountability and assessment, standardized testing, quality assurance, accreditation reform, and the federal regulation of higher education. Perhaps the Commission should receive some credit for paying attention to rising college costs, unwarranted complexities and inconsistencies in financial aid, and concerns of affordability and access for low-income individuals, but even then the stress remained on workforce needs. Clearly, the vocationalization of American higher education was the real charge of Spellings' Commission and most of its contributions in the end reinforced the kind of education criticized by Stanley Aronowitz in *The Knowledge Factory*, in which he described the U.S. educational system, including colleges and universities, as aiming to "train kids to become cogs in the corporate capitalist machine" (2000, p. 3). Little that came from the Commission on the Future of Higher Education suggested anything different. Certainly, there was no suggestion that college graduates ought to develop the skills and dispositions to critique and challenge oppressive social structures in the name of advancing democracy. Such an idea would indeed be "radical," and dare I suggest, a form of terrorism, relative to the ideological positions to which most economic and political elites gravitate, including the vast majority of members of Spellings' Commission. Indeed, in the face of the fall 2006 elections, the Bush administration and its allies repeatedly resorted to linking oppositional voices to terrorism, suggesting that any American who opposed the administration's policies in Iraq or those aimed at fighting terrorism were in some manner or form terrorists themselves.<sup>10</sup>

### **Concluding Remarks**

The decision by George W. Bush to invade and then occupy Iraq was rooted in his administration's fixation on global terrorism and its appeal to a seemingly childlike desire to strike out at some amorphous entity as a consequence of an injustice suffered. The tendency for his administration to resort to simplistic jingoisms, such as defining other nations and leaders as "evil," or constituting an "axis of evil" (Woodward, 2002, p. 329), in the case of Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, revealed the frightening reality of a nation adrift, isolated, and increasingly compromised in terms of its national security. It is perhaps the

ultimate paradox that in supposedly seeking to advance a nation's security, its leaders have given birth to hatred in countless spaces, "here, there, somewhere." The willingness to engage in "perpetual war," in some cases with a vague or deceitful rationale and an even vaguer plan of action, demonstrates the most inhumane kind of decision-making imaginable and suggests in some manner or form that Bush sees himself above all of it, as the quintessential prophet, capable of seeing what others cannot, including formless weapons of mass destruction. Indeed, in February 2003, the editors of *The Progressive* suggested that Bush had a "messiah complex," and engaged the nation in a form of "messianic militarism," seeking to "rid the world of evil—at the barrel of a gun" (p. 8). In exercising his vision of U.S. domination, disguised as global peacekeeping, Bush has pushed democracy aside and has led an assault on his own citizens and their vital institutions, including the American university.

Ideals related to academic freedom and the role of the university as a source of social criticism serve important roles in a truly democratic society (Lal, 2006). Under the principle of academic freedom and in the name of a democratic social good that includes free speech and open public debate, professors and students often engage in heated debates and criticism of public policy. Indeed, one of the hallowed traditions of the academy is the ability of intellectuals to pose critical questions and participate in verbal jousts aimed at governmental and public policies. Similar to the role of the press and the ideals of free speech, the academy and academic freedom help to hold a democratic government accountable to various sectors of society, both public and private. But this is changing and the reason we are told is the tragedy of September 11 and the reality of global terrorism. But what has U.S. society traded for a color-coded perpetual war against terrorism? What I suggest here is that democracy itself has been the exchange, and under the leadership of George W. Bush, the United States has moved that much closer to a totalitarian state, one in which the university and its dissenting voices must by necessity be contained.

Despite containment efforts, many academics have offered forms of resistance to the anti-democratic assault. There are countless examples, including the efforts of the Taskforce on Middle East Anthropology, a group of scholars affiliated with Middle East studies, who produced a resource handbook for scholars and teachers titled, *Academic Freedom and Professional Responsibility after 9/11*. The handbook explicitly addresses the present-day assault, highlighting how many scholars "have come into the cross-hairs of ideologues who argue that, 'everything has changed'—or ought to change—since September 11, including traditional bedrock American values upholding freedom of speech and public debate" (Abowd et al., 2006, p. 4). The handbook offers a variety of strategies and points to consider as part of the struggle to protect academic freedom. Other forms of resistance also have emerged. At UCLA, a group

calling itself “In Good Company” formed in the aftermath of the Bruin Alumni Association’s “Dirty 30” list. This group has attempted to unify support for academic freedom and create solidarity for those most likely to face right-wing persecution. National movements also exist, such as the Internet-based “Defend Dissent and Critical Thinking on Campus” (<http://www.defendcriticalthinking.org>), which was formed specifically to counter the efforts of right-wing attack dogs such as David Horowitz and to raise critical questions about institutionalized attempts to silence scholars like Ward Churchill. “Defend Dissent and Critical Thinking” includes important links to key documents and reports documenting the extensive neoconservative network (including funding sources) and its targeting of the academy, an “Archives” link documenting university statements and resolutions in support of open dissent, as well as an “Action” link for those wanting to get more involved in efforts to support critical dissent (there are additional links to the site as well).

In closing, I want to suggest that pedagogy itself—the primary target of the right-wing assault on the university—ought to be the primary tool of resistance. After all, there is a reason it has been so targeted in this massive effort to turn the academy over to neoconservative ideologues, and the fact remains that despite a vicious, highly funded witch hunt, virtually no cases of ethical abuse in the classroom have been identified. Consequently, pedagogy must remain as the foundation for advancing critical thought and challenging our students to consider possibilities beyond those clever sound bites so frequently uttered in the mainstream media. This is a key part of the democratic potential universities serve, and this not a time to turn and run or to become overly defensive, but just the opposite. Indeed, the challenge to sever the university from the democratic project must be met with increased and more focused energy to democratize classrooms and institutions of higher learning by voicing ever louder, and ever more often, criticism of abuse of power and oppressive structures that seek to silence dissenting voices.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the “new militarism” and the related shift in the nature of warfare and militarization relative to U.S. policy see Bacevich, 2005; Johnson, 2000, 2004; Keeble, 1998; Markusen, Hall, Campbell, & Deitrick, 1991; and Singer 2003.

<sup>2</sup> I include some cases involving foreign intellectuals on the grounds that attacks on these scholars serve to limit academic dialogue among U.S. scholars and add to a climate of fear and persecution.



<sup>3</sup> For a thorough discussion of the democratic potential of universities see Rhoads and Torres, 2006) and Santos, 2006.

<sup>4</sup> For an extended historical discussion of the ties between the U.S. federal government and the development of the American research university see Geiger, 1986, 1993.

<sup>5</sup> See Iraq Body Count website [<http://www.iraqbodycount.net>], which relies upon a media-based methodology for estimating civilian deaths.

<sup>6</sup> This first came to my attention in reading Vidal's *Dreaming War*, in which he notes the relevance of Gowan's use of Schumpeter.

<sup>7</sup> Here, I employ a conception of "citizen" far more expansive than that typically asserted or defined by the state, suggesting, in effect, that residents occupying particular geographic spaces have universal rights and responsibilities as citizens. This broader conception of citizen is explored in Szelényi and Rhoads (2007).

<sup>8</sup> In the film *The Corporation*, one diehard neoliberal suggests privatizing the air.

<sup>9</sup> This provision of the HEA was recently upheld by a federal judge in South Dakota after Students for Sensible Drug Policy filed a lawsuit against U.S. Secretary of Education Spellings (Field, 2006a).

<sup>10</sup> There are many examples in which opponents of the Bush administration have been equated with terrorists and/or terrorism. For instance, former Secretary of Education Rod Paige referred to the National Education Association (NEA) in 2004 as a "terrorist organization;"; David Horowitz has repeatedly described Democrats as "apologists for terrorists;"; Ken Mehlman, chair of the Republican National Committee, accused the Democratic Party of surrendering important tools in the fight against terrorism; Vice President Dick Cheney accused Connecticut Democrats, after selecting Ned Lamont over the hawkish Joe Lieberman in the state's Democratic primary, of supporting terrorists (i.e., al Qaeda); and President Bush accused Democrats of "giving comfort" to terrorists.

## References

- Abowd, T. et al. (2006). *Academic freedom and professional responsibility after 9/11: A handbook for scholars and teachers*. A project of the Taskforce on Middle East Anthropology.
- American Association of University Professors. (2002). The Al-Arian case at the University of South Florida. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/newsroom/press/2002/02-6usf.htm>.
- American Civil Liberties Union. (2004). ACLU launches nationwide effort to expose illegal FBI spying on political and religious groups. ACLU Website (2 December). Retrieved from <http://www.aclu.org>.

- American Council of Trustees and Alumni. (2006). How many Ward Churchills? A report from the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA). Washington, DC: ACTA.
- American Library Association. (2006). ALA president Michael Gorman responds to House passage of Patriot Act Reauthorization Bill. Press release from the ALA (7 March). Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org>.
- Ammash, H.S. (2002). Toxic pollution, the Gulf War, and sanctions. In Anthony Arnove (Ed.), *Iraq under siege: The deadly impact of sanctions and war* (pp. 205-216). Boston: South End Press.
- Apple, M.W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In Nicholas C. Burbules and Carlos Alberto Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 57-77). New York: Routledge.
- Arnove, M.. (6 September 2002). Colleges expect the worst in preparing for new system to track foreign students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/weekly>.
- Arnove, M. (24 January 2003a). Hacker steals personal data on foreign students at U. of Kansas. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com>.
- Arnove, M. (3 April 2003b). Lawmakers suggest using biometric data in system for tracking foreign students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (3 April 2003b). Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily>.
- Arnove, M. (11 April 2003c). Watchful eyes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14-A17.
- Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university and creating true higher learning*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- BBC. (19 December 2005). US sets Saddam's scientists free. *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk>.
- BBC. (17 February 2006). US warns against Chavez "danger." *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk>.
- Bacevich, A.J. (2005). *The new American militarism: How Americans are seduced by war*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bollag, B. (11 April 2003). A Cuban scholar shut out. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A16-A18.
- Burbach, R. (2001). *Globalization and postmodern politics: From Zapatistas to high-tech robber barons*. London: Pluto Press.
- Burd, S. (8 September 2005). Notable provisions in the Senate version of the Higher Education Act. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/weekly>.

- Burge, K. (8 March 2005). Nicaraguan bows out of teaching post: Ex-rebel leader has visa denied. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <http://www.boston.com/news/local/articles..>
- CBS News. (3 February 2006). Rumsfeld likens Chavez to Hitler. *CBS News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbsnews.com>.
- Campbell, D. (4 March 2005). US bars Nicaragua heroine as “terrorist.” *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.
- Campese, J. (2003). SEVIS and SEVP policy questions & answers. U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service Report (March).
- Chomsky, N. (2003). Iraq as trial run (interview with V. K. Ramachandran). *Frontline* 20(7), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.hinduonnet.com>.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). A world without war. In Robert A. Rhoads & Carlos Alberto Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 39-59). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Craig, B. (April 2004). The battle continues: Advisory boards and the Title VI Higher Education Act. *Perspectives*. Retrieved from <http://www.historians.org/perspectives/>.
- Daggett, S., & Serafino, N. (1995). The use of force: Key statements by Weinberger, Shultz, Aspin, Bush, Powell, Albright, and Perry. Congressional research service report for Congress (5 December). Washington, DC: Library of Congress.
- Del Castillo, D. (13 May 2003). Publishing house criticizes U.S. government for arrest of Iraqi scientist on “most wanted” list. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily/>.
- Dobbs, M. (16 November 1996). Clinton doctrine on use of troops visible in Bosnia, Africa missions. *The Washington Post*, A20.
- Editors. (2003). Bush’s messiah complex. *The Progressive* (February), 8-10.
- Eisenhower, D.D. (1961). Eisenhower’s farewell address to the nation (17 January). Retrieved from <http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/ike.htm>.
- Field, K. (15 September 2004). FBI will get direct access to databases used to track foreign students and scholars. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com..>
- Field, K. (October 31 2006a). Federal judge throws out lawsuit over denial of financial aid to drug offenders. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com.daily>.
- Field, K. (7 March 2006b). Supreme Court’s ruling against colleges in recruiting case defers to Congress’s power to raise armies. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily/>.

- Fogg, P. (19 January 2006). Independent alumni group offers \$ 100 bounties to UCLA students who ferret out classroom bias. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily/>.
- Geiger, R.L. (1986). *To advance knowledge: The growth of American research universities, 1900-1940*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Geiger, R.L. (1993). *Research and relevant knowledge: American research universities since World War II*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
- Giroux, H.A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review* 72(4), 425-464.
- Giroux, H.A., & Giroux, S.S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gowans, S. (2002). War in Afghanistan: A \$ 28 billion racket. *Media Monitors Network* (May 13). Retrieved from <http://www.mediamonitors.net/gowans53.html>.
- Hebel, S. (21 April 2006). Price not a barrier to college for most Pennsylvanians, study finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/weekly>.
- Henig, S. (6 July 2006). Pentagon surveillance of student groups as security threats extended to monitoring e-mail, report shows. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily>.
- Hersh, S.M. (2006). Last stand. *The New Yorker* (July). Retrieved from <http://www.newyorker.com>.
- Hinkle, W. (1966). The university on the make. *Ramparts* 4(12), 11-22.
- Horowitz, D. (2006). *The professors: The 101 most dangerous academics in America*. Washington, DC: Regnery Publishing.
- Jacobson, J. (6 May 2005). What makes David run. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A8-A12.
- Johnson, C. (2000). *Blowback: The costs and consequences of American empire*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Johnson, C. (2004). *The sorrows of empire: Militarism, secrecy, and the end of the republic*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Keeble, R. (1998). *Secret state, silent press: New militarism, the Gulf and the modern image of warfare*. London: University of Luton Press.
- Lal, V. (22 July 2006). Terror at the academy's gate. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://www.epw.org.in/showIndex.php>.

- Lipka, S. (30 May 2006). Pennsylvania students and professors oppose regulations on campus discussion, group says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily>.
- Markusen, A., Hall, P., Campbell, S., & Deitrick, S. (1991). *The rise of the gunbelt: The military remapping of industrial America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marquez, J. (10 March 2006). SoCal professor says anti-terror detectives questioned him. *The Mercury News*. Retrieved from <http://www.mercurynews.com>.
- McGirk, T. (29 May 2006). Collateral damage or civilian massacre in Haditha? *Time Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com>.
- McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 52(2), 136-150.
- Nichols, J. (28 January 2002). Huey Freeman: American hero. *The Nation*. Retrieved from <http://www.thenation.com>.
- Oppel, R.A., Jr., & Mahmoud, M. (29 May 2006). Iraqis' accounts link marines to the mass killing of civilians. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://nytimes.com>
- Oregon joins nationwide ACLU effort to expose illegal FBI spying on political and religious groups (2004). ACLU Website (2 December). Retrieved from <http://www.aclu.org>.
- PNAC. (2000). Rebuilding America's defenses: Strategy, forces and resources for a New Century. Report of the Project for the New American Century (September). Retrieved from <http://www.newamericancentury.org>.
- PNAC. (2006). Statement of principles (document of the Project for the New American Century (retrieved September 1, 2006). Retrieved from <http://www.newamericancentury.org>.
- Paletta, A. (22 July 2005). The wisdom of Solomon? *National Review Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalreview.com/comments/paletta200507220822.asp>.
- Perry, T. (26 May 2006). Probe finds marines killed unarmed Iraqi civilians. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com>.
- Pomona College Dean Gary Kates' official memo regarding "Comments on the March 7 Incident" (20 March 2006). Pomona College, California.
- Porter, H. (13 August 2006). The land of the free—but free speech is a rare commodity. *The Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.
- Proctor, C. (4 December 2003). Academic activists fear greater surveillance. *The Daily Bruin*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailybruin.ucla.edu>.
- Read, B. (11 April 2003). Closing the gates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12-A15.

- Rhoads, R.A., & Torres, C.A. (2006). The global economy, the state, social movements, and the university: Concluding remarks and an agenda for action. In R. A. Rhoads & C.A. Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 321-351). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Rice, C.. (2002). Dr. Condoleezza Rice discusses President's national security strategy (Wriston Lecture delivered at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York). Washington, DC: Office of the White House Press Secretary (October 1).
- Royle, T. (20 February 2005). New front on the war on terror. *The Sunday Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.commondreams.org>.
- Santos, B. de Sousa (2006). The university in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Toward a democratic and emancipatory university reform. In Robert A. Rhoads & Carlos Alberto Torres (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 60-100). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1951). *Imperialism and Social Classes*. New York, NY: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Silverstein, S., & Hong, P.Y. (18 January 2006). UCLA alumni group is tracking "radical" faculty. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com>.
- Singer, P.W. (2003). *Corporate warriors: The rise of the privatized military industry*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Smallwood, S. (10 February 2005). Anatomy of a free-speech firestorm: How a professor's 3-year-old essay sparked a national controversy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily/>.
- Smallwood, S. (17 May 2006). Ward Churchill committed research misconduct, U. of Colorado panel finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily/>.
- Soley, L.C. (1995). *Leasing the ivory tower: The corporate takeover of academia*. Boston: South End Press.
- Spinoza, A. (8 May 2003). Dr. Huda Ammash's detention: Jailed for exposing costs of sanctions and war? *Counterpunch*. Retrieved from <http://www.counterpunch.org>.
- Steinhauer, J. (2 May 2006). 19 months more in prison for professor in terror case. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Szelényi, K., & Rhoads, R.A. (2007). Citizenship in a global context: The perspectives of international graduate students in the United States. *Comparative Education Review*, 51(1), 25-47.

- Tavernise, S., & McNeil, D.G., Jr. (11 October 2006). Iraqi dead may total 600,000 study says. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>.
- Torres, C.A., & Rhoads, R.A. (2006). Introduction: Globalization and higher education in the Americas. In Carlos Alberto Torres & Robert A. Rhoads (Eds.), *The university, state, and market: The political economy of globalization in the Americas* (pp. 3-38). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2005). Secretary Spellings announces new commission on the future of higher education (press release). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/new/pressreleases>.
- Vidal, G. (2002a). *Dreaming war: Blood for oil and the Cheney-Bush junta*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Vidal, G. (2002b). *Perpetual war for perpetual peace: How we got to be so hated*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press.
- Walsh, S. (16 May 2003). AAUP report says U. of South Florida violated the academic rights of professor accused of terrorism. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/daily/>.
- Ward, D. (2003). Letter regarding the international studies in higher education act (October). Washington, DC: American Council on Education. Retrieved from <http://www.acenet.edu>.
- Washburn, J. (2005). *University, Inc.: The corporate corruption of higher education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Woodward, B. (2002). *Bush at war*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Younge, G. (2006). Silence in class. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk>.
- Zemsky, R. (2006). A rising tide: The current state of higher education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Research report by The Education Policy and Leadership Center and the Learning Alliance for Higher Education (April).

### **Author**

Robert Rhoads is a professor of higher education and organizational change in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies. His research interests focus on globalization and higher education, the role of universities in advancing democracy, and the intersection of social movements and educational equity. His most recent book (with Carlos Alberto Torres) is "The University, State, and Market: The Political Economy of Globalization in the Americas" (Stanford University Press, 2006).

