

The Academy and Fourth Generation Warfare

Candace de Russy

You've heard it argued that the twentieth century did not begin until World War One. Perhaps you too used to wonder what event would mark the birth of the twenty-first century. Would it be another Great War among nation-states? A high-profile assassination? Sightings of aliens in cornfields? Or even something auspicious?

The answer came, I believe, on 9/11. The century in which we all were born went down with the Twin Towers. Then came to life this new era whose shape we are only now beginning to discern.

On 9/11 a new form of warfare was manifested. This warfare will profoundly influence our way of life during this century and probably thereafter. It is not a kind of warfare that only concerns Pentagon planners and other military leaders. Because it is carried out against civilian populations, and because its perpetrators derive much of their inspiration from widely held radical ideas, this type of warfare should very much concern everyone, and not least those of us in the American academy.

What I am talking about is Fourth Generation Warfare, a term coined in 1989. Fourth Generation Warfare is characterized by a lack of definable battlefields, by groups acting not necessarily under the direct control of a foreign government, and by its transnational nature. It does not rely on massed manpower, massed firepower, or maneuver, as in, respectively, First, Second and Third Generation Warfare.

The new enemy—today's terrorist networks and the regimes that support them—is unencumbered by fixed borders and conventional forces. It is hydra-headed and covert. This enemy's hatred for us is rooted, not in disputes between nations, but in religious fanaticism, tribalism, historic envy, and political ideology. It does not confine its attacks to military targets but murders civilians in an effort to demoralize and destroy the will to fight back.

Perpetrators of Fourth Generation Warfare are typically the self-styled oppressed or those who claim to be fighting on behalf of the oppressed. They tend to be easily swayed by specious rhetoric and false arguments that America and the West are somehow engaged in an unending crusade of militarism,

Candace de Russy, formerly a professor of French, is a member of the board of trustees of the State University of New York. From her base in Bronxville, NY, she writes and lectures on higher education.

imperialism, greed, and other iniquities throughout the rest of the world. America as a champion of freedom, democracy, and human rights is a reality completely lost on them. And many others who pay lip service to peace nevertheless lend their intellectual, moral, and even financial support to the actual perpetrators of violence.

Those who wage Fourth Generation Warfare against us grow in power as their bases of intellectual support grow. And of all the institutions of society, it is our college and university campuses where the ground is most fertile for building such support. Degenerate academic thought not only breeds the extremists themselves, but also worms its way into the mass mind.

A 1983 book titled *The Coercive Utopians*, by Rael and Erich Isaac, explains how this transpires. Cadres of radical “social engineers,” or “The New Class,” came to power within the federal government, media, and popular culture. This “knowledge elite,” the authors point out, was spawned on the nation’s most prestigious campuses. It holds that this country’s institutions are antiquated and oppressive, and it appoints itself as the “change agent” for “restructuring” our way of life. Campus radicalism, then, seeps into the minds and thoughts of millions of people among the general public, affecting American institutions far beyond academe.

Renunciations of an American identity—indeed of Western civilization itself—clearly are heard throughout the world. Witness the international success of the book *Empire*, an academic bestseller. Its authors, a Duke literature professor and a convicted Italian terrorist, joyfully celebrate anticapitalist revolutionary violence and proclaim the birth of a utopian postcapitalist age.

Campus radicals should be called to account for what they promulgate, inside and outside the campus gates. Let us, then, enter the gates. Let us note the cast of these radical teachings. I group them under the rubric of ideological multiculturalism—not multiculturalism in some positive sense, but in the sense of a reflexive denunciation of the West and capitalism, and a blind glorification of all other cultures and systems. Suffice it to say that the radical mind-set implanted by “cultural” Marxists—I refer to Gramsci, Lukács, Horkheimer, and Marcuse, who sought to replace Western institutions with communism—endures in the form of multiculturalism.

Let us look at recent examples of ideological multiculturalism on campuses. Let us also ask how such radicalism may help fuel Fourth Generation Warfare and weaken the national unity needed to combat it.

To prevail against today’s enemy—as analysts of the new warfare insist—we will need *unprecedented* reserves of national unity, resolve, and moral confidence. Victory no longer depends primarily on military superiority. Political will and mobilization, not smart bombs and mass armies, are now the decisive factors.

Does the climate of ideas in higher education today foster national unity or hinder it? Do these ideas help defend us in this new century of Fourth Generation Warfare, or do they perpetuate such warfare?

Let us ask, in sum, how it came to pass, by the mid-1990s, that an influential sociologist at New York University, Richard Sennett, could confidently proclaim the “evil of a shared national identity.”

The Australian critic Keith Windschuttle observes that multiculturalism originally promoted tolerance and respect for non-Western cultures. It held that the West was not the apogee of human achievement but simply one of many equally worthy cultures. But this essential relativism has been seized and manipulated by campus radicals. Their “fair-mindedness” has not applied to American or Western cultures. The radicals ignore our own history or retell it as little more than a litany of sins against humanity.

Ideological multiculturalism also whitewashes non-Western failings. Its proponents wish away—to quote the French writer Pascal Bruckner—“bloody messes in banana republics, . . . butchery of political opposition and . . . dictatorial lunacy by . . . petty chieftains.”

This particularly applies to the events of 9/11 and the Fourth Generation War currently being waged. In the 1980s and 1990s, prominent professors of Middle Eastern studies tried to wish away the growing threat of radical Islamism and terrorist attacks on American soil. In his book *Ivory Towers on Sand*, Martin Kramer relates that almost all of these scholars simply refused to study extremist Muslims and even Islam itself. Academics such as John L. Esposito of Georgetown University dismissed Bin Laden’s many threatening statements and actions. Sarah Lawrence professor Fawaz Gerges accused “the terror industry” of fomenting an “irrational fear of terrorism by focusing . . . on far-fetched horrible scenarios.”

Lately we’ve all heard about the study guide on the Koran that incoming freshmen at the University of North Carolina must read. I am all for students studying the world religions and indeed reading the Koran—but in its uncut version. Regrettably, the author of the study guide, Michael Sells of Haverford College, omits those portions of the Koran that terrorists use for justifying their attacks.

But campus radicals do not merely sin by omission. As Daniel Pipes of the Middle East Forum notes, a Harvard professor of Islamic history portrays *jihad* as “a struggle without arms.” The student chosen by the Harvard faculty to deliver this year’s commencement address titled his talk, “Of Faith and Citizenship: My American Jihad.” The student had earlier praised and raised money for the Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development, a militant Islamic group closed down by the Justice Department.

According to Pipes, Middle Eastern scholars have been unapologetic about their errors and, worse, have tended to blame the attacks on U.S. policy.

And they certainly have not been alone in their perverse treatment of matters relating to national security. For example, in a commencement address, radical feminist bell hooks (sic), a professor at Southwestern University, equated terrorism with “life-threatening conservatism.” She excoriated “white, capital-

ist” men for their “imperialist aggression enacted in the name of bringing an end to terrorism.” Noam Chomsky, the MIT linguist and icon of the left, shares Professor hooks’ hysteria. In his widely read book titled *9/11*, Chomsky asserts that the United States is “a leading terrorist state.”

Swayed by such propaganda, fresh new recruits of Fourth Generation Warriors all the more readily carry out murderous attacks on civilians. And their bases of intellectual support continue to grow.

In addition to propagating dangerous ideas, ideological multiculturalists undertake actions that hinder our ability to fight back. Journalist Stanley Kurtz cites a telling example. Networks of influential multiculturalists, such as David Wiley, who is head of the African Studies Center at Michigan State University, are trying to do away with the National Security Education Program, which requires grantees to work for a security-related federal agency after graduation. Those boycotting the NSEP, Kurtz states, believe “scholarly cooperation with the American government to be a form of immoral collusion with imperialism.”

Kurtz exposes a similar bias in schools of education, which use federally-funded teacher training materials steeped in ideological multiculturalism. Yet another case illustrates the visible bias on many campuses with regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict: at SUNY-Binghamton, a professor of political science, Robert Ostergard, turned his classroom into an anti-Zionist forum.

Should we be surprised, in light of such indoctrination, at signs that our national identity is in ill repute among many students and administrators on campuses? Here are the words of one Joshua Greene, a student at West Virginia University: “In light of the destructive nationalism calling for war, the sight of the flag burning would be preferable to its display.” Here too is what administrators did at San Diego University. An immigrant from Ethiopia took some Arab students to task after overhearing them praise the 9/11 attacks. And the verdict? He was threatened with criminal charges and expulsion, and university public relations officers vilified his name.

In an example of anti-military bias, at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, faculty and administrators shouted down Marine Captain Felix Rodriguez as he attempted to make a pitch for military recruitment. At Washington University, the faculty voted to drop military men and women from a loan-assistance program for graduates who go into public service.

Imagine the cumulative effects of decades of such radical teaching and administrative truckling. Picture the spread of ideological multiculturalism, like a virus, in all our institutions: the popular culture and media, our schools and churches, and government. Does anyone doubt that this virus contributed to the nation’s complacency before 9/11? And post-9/11, is it not reasonable to believe it has hindered the efforts of those whose job it is to protect us? For example, it is widely believed that accusations of racial profiling discouraged FBI, CIA, and INS employees from effectively carrying out their duties.

In this Fourth Generation, we can no longer afford to indulge radicals in the academy who, as historian Donald Kagan warns, are “subversive of our safety.” Our national unity is the stuff of life and death.

How can we more effectively counter campus radicalism? What can be done to prevail in this most consequential war of ideas? Although I do not pretend to have an original strategy, I do have a few suggestions.

First, let us be clear about our goals. Our intent should be to create a new intellectual pluralism in which all issues—including national security-related issues—will be heard from all sides. And whereas we may disagree with the extremist activities of some Muslim professors and student associations, we must protect their basic rights.

Meanwhile, more professors need to fight for intellectual diversity on campuses. They are the first line of defense against the monopolization of ideas by campus ideologues. Among other things, speech codes and other leftist tools of repression must be abolished. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education has been at the forefront of this battle.

Academics should, in particular, demand genuine tolerance for ideas relating to our national security. Students should be permitted to hear, for instance, the case for reinstating the nation’s historic “assimilation compact,” that is, its former embrace of the need better to integrate immigrants into American society. From colonial times until the 1960s, as SUNY Provost Peter Salins reminds us in his book *Assimilation, American Style*, professors extolled this compact.

Professors also have an obligation to tell the truth about the achievements and faults of non-Western cultures. In the present crisis, for instance, students should learn about Islam. But they should not willfully be left in ignorance about Wahhabism, the medieval Saudi doctrine that is a main source of the radical Islamists’ hatred of all “infidels.”

A similar revisiting of the curriculum is in order. For example, Rick Valelly, a professor of political science at Swarthmore College, advocates that political scientists explore “recent revelations of intelligence and bureaucratic failure, and . . . the proposed reorganization of government around the new focus on homeland security.” He specifically points to specialties such as “organizational sociology,” which can help shed light on why the FBI neglected the so-called Phoenix memo, a document warning of suspicious students at aviation schools.

To create a climate on campuses that permits us to combat the Fourth Generation Warriors, more faculty members should become active in the ranks of the National Association of Scholars—those intellectuals, such as Steve Balch and Barry Smith here, who’ve been in the front ranks to restore the curriculum. Faculty members should also spread the message of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture. Who more heroically than its president—my colleague here David Horowitz—has borne witness against the despotism of leftist ideologues, and most recently their autocratic hiring and promotion practices throughout the academy?

Various other academic constituencies must address the leftist bias that undermines our national security. Concerned parents, alumni, donors, governors and legislators, higher education trustees and administrators, and federal education officials must also rise to the occasion.

Chancellors such as Robert King of SUNY are to be commended for mobilizing the scientific resources of the system against terrorism. At his behest SUNY campuses have begun to expand upon three areas of existing expertise: cybersecurity, sensor technology, and vaccine development.

But the mounting of such relatively uncontroversial scientific projects, however vital to our defense, is not enough. He and other higher education leaders must also take bolder action in behalf of intellectual pluralism on campuses. They must stop ignoring and legitimizing campus radicals and confront them publicly, in particular, for their irresponsible approach to national security-related issues. Consider the example set by Robert M. Berdahl, the chancellor of U.C. Berkeley, in his response to a particularly raw display of political bigotry on that campus. In a description for a course involving the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, "conservative thinkers" were urged to seek other sections. Reacting to a torrent of criticism by civil libertarians, Chancellor Berdahl spoke out publicly against teaching that crosses the line into "indoctrination."

Another promising sign is efforts to create curricula that focus on the foundation principles of the West. An alliance of administrators and faculty at the University of Buffalo, for instance, is considering establishing a humanities program focused on Western civilization.

There is also a need to redirect public and private funding of higher education. Parents and students should reject, and alumni and other benefactors withhold money from, campuses that recklessly purvey anti-Americanism and anti-Westernism. The American Council for Trustees and Alumni has a program for redirecting such funds toward institutions that practice intellectual pluralism.

Foundations should also rethink their priorities. Unfortunately some of the most influential of them avidly conform to the most nationally divisive academic fads. The Ford Foundation, for instance, has funded a "demonstration model" for Middle Eastern studies at New York University, which it has handed over to "'progressive' activists."

Federal funding also deserves scrutiny. The program known as Title VI is a particularly relevant example, since it funds the various area studies that have so often degenerated into mindless multiculturalism.

I need not dwell again, by way of conclusion, on this nation's current great need during this Fourth Generation War. I will but urge my colleagues in the academy to respond to this need and join the fight. "We fight," President Bush said on the first anniversary of 9/11, "not to impose our will but to defend ourselves and extend the blessings of freedom."

This fight is therefore about much more than what goes on at the Department of Defense. The ubiquity and elusiveness of Fourth Generation Warfare require profound changes throughout society, and above all throughout the nation's college and university campuses, since they so heavily shape the nature of our society.

The extremists currently waging war against us justify their actions in the name of religion but also in the name of ideological multiculturalism. Typical among such ideologues everywhere, radical Islamists tend to regard the United States and the West as the chief cause of poverty and oppression throughout the world, and are deeply suspicious of capitalism. The fact that the terrorists targeted the World Trade Center, which was probably the greatest symbol of capitalism in the world, attests to their deep, quasi-Marxist worldview.

Our nation's colleges and universities are helping to fuel this mind-set. It not only broadens support for the Fourth Generation warriors but also breeds new warriors themselves, who are ready and willing to unleash remorseless violence against innocent civilians in the name of anti-Americanism.

In a different time, when American shores were immune from malevolent attacks, we perhaps could afford to treat ideological multiculturalism as an irritant.

But not anymore. We all know what can happen when mass-murder weaponry falls into the hands of extremists. It is up to us to help prevent the breeding of new extremists and to neutralize the existing ones. The principal weapons at our disposal are intellectual pluralism, national unity, resolve, and moral confidence.

Though academic radicals have much influence, they are not invincible. Try as they might, they could not contain the tide of patriotism that engulfed our campuses in the aftermath of 9/11 and that continues to this day. So there is cause for much hope.

Entrusted as we in the academy are with passing on the American and Western democratic heritage, it is no small part of our mission to extend its blessings.