Jeffrey Field Follow
It ain't what you think. Former newsman, car salesman, teacher. Everything is Thou, if you so allow it. You can find some of it at https://youtu.be/w6RtVjMDHzE
Aug 31, 2017 · 6 min read

Why I no longer participate in Jack Marshall's Ethics Alarms

CNN
BALLOT
TRUMP
ACLU
WON'T SOMEBODY PLEASE THINK OF THE CHILDREN?
GENDER NEUTRAL RESTROOMS LOCATED ON FLOORS
se Civility

Source

I left after Jack declared Chelsea Manning should have been executed because she "was and is a traitor." I'd followed Manning's story from the beginning. At about the same time, I became acquainted with Glenn Greenwald, a staunch defender, as well as Wikileaks.

> *Bradley Manning, a 25-year-old US private, downloaded more than 700,000 classified documents from US military servers and passed them to WikiLeaks. The Guardian was one of several news organisations to publish a series of stories based on the contents of the files. Below are 10 of the most revelatory:*
>
> *• The first revelation came in 2010, from a video showing a US helicopter crew laughing as they launched an air strike killing a dozen people in Baghdad in July 2007, including a photographer and driver working for the Reuters news agency. The footage was recorded on one of two Apache helicopters which were hunting for suspected insurgents. They encounter a group of men on the ground, who do not immediately appear armed, and there is no sign of gunshots. But one helicopter crew opens fire, with shouts of "Hahaha. I hit 'em," and "Oh yeah, look at those dead bastards". As the wounded are helped, one of the helicopters opens fire again, with armour-piercing shells.*

If you have the stomach for it, watch the video…

Collateral Murder - Wikileaks - Iraq

Jack Marshall says,

> ***I also (I admit it: I knew I would) triggered a freak-out here***, *and some unfair insults that I will gracefully ignore, by stating that I would have supported execution for Manning, who was and is a traitor.*

Freak out I did, but I never insulted Jack or his fellows, as you will see in a moment.

Jack wrote this on Aug. 27 in response to (names redacted)…

> *Jack Marshall*
>
> *August 27, 2017 at 5:21 pm*
>
> *I'm going to ask you to stop spreading false Left wing narratives and propaganda here, _____. If Trump said something that false, he would be called a liar. She was NOT tortured. Headlines said that the UN claimed she was tortured, but that doesn't make it true. The UN is an anti-US propaganda organization, but even then. what was actually said doesn't amount to a legitimate finding of torture:*
>
> *The UN special rapporteur on torture has formally accused the US government of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment towards Bradley Manning, the US soldier who was held in solitary confinement for almost a year on suspicion of being the WikiLeaks source.*
>
> *Juan Mendez has completed a 14-month investigation into the treatment of Manning since the soldier's arrest at a US military base in May 2010. He concludes that the US military was at least culpable of cruel and inhumane treatment in keeping Manning locked up alone for 23 hours a day over an 11-month period in conditions that he also found might have constituted torture.*

> *"The special rapporteur concludes that imposing seriously punitive conditions of detention on someone who has not been found guilty of any crime is a violation of his right to physical and psychological integrity as well as of his presumption of innocence," Mendez writes.*
>
> *Except that Manning was found guilty in a court maartial, and the US does not regard solitary confinement as torture under US law. Thus you can say that some have called what Manning endured "torture," but you cannot state as fact that she was tortured.*
>
> *I think she should have faced a firing squad.*

This exchange followed… names withheld

- August 28, 2017 at 9:54 am
- Jack wrote, *"I think she should have faced a firing squad."*
- I agree.
- I'd be willing to personally provide the weapon, the bullet, and the person to squeeze the trigger.
- August 28, 2017 at 8:45 pm
- No, no! Get away! I can handle this! I'm a good shot! But…can I have three bullets? And a little extra time?
- August 28, 2017 at 9:15 pm
- ___________ wrote, *"No, no! Get away! I can handle this! I'm a good shot! But…can I have three bullets? And a little extra time?"*
- If you can't shoot the pecker off a mosquito at 300 meters in one shot using your own rifle, or the eye of a gnat at 25 meters in one shot with your own pistol shot, you're a NO GO at my station and you'll likely be recycled when your instructor gets wind of your firearm incompetence.

My final comment below…

- fattymoon
- August 27, 2017 at 6:38 pm
- Jack said, "I think she should have faced a firing squad."
- I say, goodbye everyone. I'm done here.

I'd been a participant on Jack's site since March 18, 2011 when I posted my thoughts about the Casey the Punisher.

If you need refreshing, this viral video was the hot topic that day…

Casey The Punisher

I wrote…

> *At first I was with the herd, but, upon reflection, I changed my tune. This morning I wrote the boys a letter. It's at* *http://fattymoon.posterous.com/the-bully-and-the-punisher-are-both-angels#*
>
> *It reads:*
>
> *An open letter to Casey (The Punisher) Heynes and Ritchard Gale*
>
> *"I'm a victim too," says Ritchard Gale, the bully boy who got body-slammed by Casey Heynes.*
>
> *Dear Ritchard and Casey,*
>
> *I've been thinking about this incident and I now realize you are each other's angels in disguise.*
>
> *Casey, this isn't the first time you've been bullied. It's been going on for years. You were so desperate at one point that you contemplated suicide. Ritchard's actions actually turned your life around.*
>
> *Ritchard, my initial thoughts about you were most unpleasant, however, I soon began having second thoughts. You are correct when you say that you, too, are a victim.*
>
> *You are both victims. And, while Casey is now a celebrated celebrity, you are spit upon and vilified.*

> *You helped Casey turn his life around. But the story need not end there. Now it's your turn to get your life in order. Whether Casey agrees to help you or not, and I hope he will, it is you, Ritchard, who must take that first step. Casey is redeemed, thanks to you. Your redemption depends on no one but yourself, so you must not depend on Casey's help. However, I intuit that you and he have been around this block before, if you get my drift. Perhaps the roles were reversed and you, Ritchard, were the victim and Casey the bully. For want of a better term, call it karma. And so, I do believe that Casey will help you like you helped him.*
>
> *The time, for action, Ritchard, is now. You can jump on this most holy of opportunities and begin to shine like the diamond you are, or, you can keep on keeping on, trodding the same dismal path.*
>
> *Casey, I submit that you are Ritchard's angel, and he yours. Boys, think on these thoughts I've presented here, and then act on what your heart, not your head, tells you.*
>
> *God bless the both of you!*
>
> *Pax,*
>
> *Jeffrey*

The response was, shall I say, harsh and demeaning. No matter. I stayed. I liked the intelligence of the people there, even though many of their views on hot topics of the day differed from mine.

I wish Jack and friends all the best. I won't be going there again. My conscience won't allow it.

Criminal Justice Reform · Ethics · Morality · Chelsea Manning · Glenn Greenwald

Like what you read? Give Jeffrey Field a round of applause.
From a quick cheer to a standing ovation, clap to show how much you enjoyed this story.

3

Jeffrey Field
Follow
Medium member since Mar 2017
It ain't what you think. Former newsman, car salesman, teacher. Everything is Thou, if you so allow it. You can find some of it at https://youtu.be/w6RtVjMDHzE

Other Voices
Follow
A sanctuary for orphaned poems and prose.

More from Other Voices

The Time Has Come To Take To The Streets En Masse

Jeffrey Field
6 min read
303

More from Other Voices

Crushing Depth

Eric Griggs
9 min read
356

More from Other Voices

Graying Coats, Dull Teeth

Nils A. Blondon
1 min read
40

Responses

Write a response…

Conversation between Bruce Bartup and Jeffrey Field.

Bruce Bartup
Oct 25, 2017

Hi, I was asked to leave or barred from Ethics Alarms about a year ago. I think quite fairly. It was a fair cop. I'm sorry to see someone else in this position. I too retain my fondness and admiration for Jack and the Ethics Alarms project. And all the people there. It leaves a hole. So i'm sorry to see this. All the best.

16

1 response

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017 · 1 min read

Welcome, Bruce. So what'd you do to get kicked off?

I left of my own free will. I like Jack. He can write very funny stuff at times. And I believe at center he is an ethical person. But I couldn'y stomach his comment that Bradley Manning should have been executed. We're on way different poles on this. Ya see, I think George Bush should have been arrested and tried for war crimes. I think *he should be arrested today.* I will not forget what he did, no matter how many portraits of soldiers he cranks out.

1

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Oct 24, 2017 · 7 min read

Hello there Jeffrey! I thought to comment on your post mostly because, sometime back now, you encouraged me to get an account at Medium and were supportive of me and my expression. I did write a bit here on Medium but then realized that the community of writers here, as far as I was able to tell, were mostly Hyper-Liberals. Since I am working (like the devil!) to define a neo-fascist position that is coherent as well as ethical and moral, it simply takes too much energy to combat and attempt to go against the hyper-liberal trends of thinking that dominate our present and most writing spaces.

I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reasons. Jack—to his great and admirable credit in my view—allowed me to remain on his blog when I openly attempt to defend a racial-conscious, pro-White, and anti-egalitarian philosophical and political platform. Additionally—and this only must make it all appear that much more strange—I am a Jew who converted out of Judaism and now define an anti-Judaism position which in out present can only be understood as anti-Semitic (a word that many use and nearly no one actually understands).

What else? Oh, and my position as-against the American military machine, not because I do not understand the need for a military and warrior skills, but rather because the military-industrial complex (an overused but necessary term) has effectively supplanted republican government as it was conceived. When I gained a better understanding of the shift within the American nation —from a Republic to a Nation and then to a neo-imperial nation in fact—and began to talk about it, most everyone on Jack's blog went 'deathly silent' on me. I could simply feel that by expressing this idea—coherent and patriotic though it is—that I became *persona non grata*.

But, I still have a tremendous respect for Jack, one because he tolerated me and two because of the intensity and intellectual-grounding of his general approach. I frankly do not get what you are criticizing and, if you will allow me to say so, your post on the topic is not as tight as it could be.

Yet I would, as perhaps you might guess, go much further in a critique of (what I understand of) your position, and then of course of Jack's and his main follower's position, and quite definitely of that of present American conservatism. I choose a position that is neither Left nor Right specifically. I gather that Jack defines himself as a Conservative. A Reagan Republican I gathered? Certainly many who write on his blog identify as such. Yet I suggest that they are not, not at all if you really look into it, genuinely conservative. And that is another thing that few there would tolerate: letting them know that they are, more in fact and more in truth, classic Cuckservatives. Incoherent, conflicted, self-contradicting anti-Republicans just to the right of center and moreover dominated by the Progressive Left. They are unfree and incapable of free, unfettered thought. One thing you simply cannot do among Americans is to speak in such bold terms as they take it as the gravest of grave insults. Myself, I do not understand this reaction (going cold & silent, refusing to engage, offering no rebuttal, et cetera) and I am always surprised that people clam themselves up and do not take the opportunity to fight. Gird up your loins! I say.

So, unlike you who left because the boys are too aggressive, I left because the boys are too girlish!

I have more-or-less concluded that it is nearly impossible to engage most Americans in a straight intellectually-based conversation. The American mind is an occupied mind and the force(s) that occupy it do so in such a way that if you point this out you anger that occupied soul.

'Americanism' and 'American patriotism', in their perverse forms, is the declared doctrine of the occupied American mind. The so-called Lef and the so-called Right are just poles in a certain unity of Americanism. Ninety percent of any intellectual efforts directed to this occupied mind can only have to do with deconstruction of a propaganda-view and, in the end, this becomes simply exhausting. They resist tooth & claw. Simply by poking at them you make yourself The Enemy and then they close their ears, circle their mental wagons, and do everything to lock you out.

This is the great beauty—and the wonder!—of the American ideological coercion-system. I avail myself of the Chomskian view when I say this (manufactured consent, *et cetera*), and yet my politics are quite unlike his in most respects. My larger crime is to disagree with The American Creed. I do not think that all people are equal and I do not think that America was intended to be, nor should it be now, a credal republic. It was formerly made up of individual states and it was not—not ever!—intended to be the Lincolnian nation it became as a result of the destruction of the South.

I recognize that what I have just said is 'intolerable thought' and deeply suspect thought within the American present. But there you have it! The Conservatism that I define has teeth, and an intellectual foundation, and defines it as crucial and necessary to liberate thought from the claws & clutches of a coercive national thinking system. To attain to 'free thought' is to have to undergo a sort of de-indoctrination from 'the tenets of the American civil religion'. As you can imagine, saying such things on Jack's blog, did not win me many friends. It is radical material and the potential ramifications of it *will result* in radical shifts. These are occuring now and they are on-going. And *The System* is terribly freaked-out about them as it clearly understands that *it* is being challenged. To understand this requires a distance and a height and a great deal of discrimination. It requires an almost spiritual dispassion. I suggest that very few who gravitate to Jack's blog have much understanding at all of these questions and issues and little desire to be exposed. But I also suggest that very few Americans (if you will allow me to speak so generally) really have much understanding of theirselves, the system of Americanism, and their position in the world and in the world of ideas. America is a nearly mad creature on the verge of a postmodern explosion. (See: Tomislav Sunic's '*Homo Americanus: Child of the Postmodern Age*'.)

The thing about WikiLeaks and the Snowden Affair is that it is bound up with a peculiar late-republic and late-national crisis. These are the before-stages of a destined Balkanization. Since I cannot defend the corporate-government military-machine which has, in my opinion, installed itself through a 'coup' of sorts (either a coup in fact or a soft coup by which they have become a 'shadow government' and control from *tras bambalinas*), I can't define it as non-patriotic to see these secrets revealed. Within *their system* of course a traitor must be punished. There are very strict rules against treason. But at the same time a great number of people do not see her or his actions as treasonous, but rather as necessary actions to reveal 'the real nature' of American policies, and the policies which are now, and will result in, the final loss of the Republic in precisely the sense that the Founders understood.

I would suggest that Jack's politics are classically 'patriotic' and derive from 'the tenets of the American civil religion' in a story-book form. He is of the view that his father's generation 'saved the world' and 'saved Europe' from the evil Nazi (the vilification of *The Hun* was a long-term propaganda-creation with tremendous impact and power). His view is rather simplistic, as are the views of most who think along those lines. I take a very different viewpoint as a *potential* perspective. It is that by bringing an attack against German Nationalism and the 'heart of Europe' a great evil was accomplished. It would have been much better if the Germans had received aid in destoying Communist Russia and the German Empire allowed to expand. We would live, now, in a diffferent world obviously. Yet what happened was inevitable. (Within general decline).

The basic reason we cannot think in such terms is one that requires some *years* of investigation. It is obviously revisionism. And it is crucial to undertake it. And within this, of course, I situate myself in my neo-fascistic definitions. To understand fascism and neo-fascism one has to understand the Interwar period in Europe and the profound thinking that stands behind it. That one is *not allowed* to think in such terms (if you do *they* will turn against you and destroy you) is all for very good reasons: if people began to really examine *our present* in real intellectual depth, I suggest a different picture from the propaganda-narrative would emerge. That position is explored and defined by the New European Right and by some very small factions within America. But in American terms it is *unthinkable thought*. Having read a great deal of what you write, here and there, I do not imagine that you will be able to relate at all to what I am saying except out of a certain politeness. But I suggest that we have to come to see, and it will serve us better to be realistic, that we are on the verge of very serious idea-wars that have *real-world* consequences.

50

12 responses

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> My larger crime is to disagree with The American Creed.

As do I.

Conversation between Bruce Bartup and Jeffrey Field.

Bruce Bartup
Nov 8, 2017 · 1 min read

Jeffrey Field I was dismissed for challenging Jack oly n a matter of fact and for doing so in a patronizing manner and failing ethical apology.

loosely jack said it was a fact that the Clinton Campaign was very bad, I said she followed punditry, plus social media, plus Russians, she won the vote so surely you jest? He reminded me that when he calls fact that issue is closed of necessity, and I as patronising. I said I'm sorry it seemed that way but there was no intent and that from the tone of his reaction the blog had changed, not in a good way.

So, breach plus egotism plus tu quoque 'apology'. I'd say that was pretty plumb from a Jack perspective. I'd agree, without changing my opinions at all.

Zoe Brain chose to leave at that time too.

I still feel positive to the project and warmly to Jack.

10

1 response

Jeffrey Field
Nov 8, 2017

I'm glad you feel that way. I feel a little less warmly about him, but such is life sometimes.

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017 · 1 min read

It was a welcome surprise to see you back here, Alizia.

You said, " I did write a bit here on Medium but then realized that the community of writers here, as far as I was able to tell, were mostly Hyper-Liberals." I suggest you hunt around a bit more. I've seen a fairly large number of 'hyper-liberals' complaining that Medium is saturated with far-right-wing sympathizers. Or is it far-left-wing… sometimes I have trouble distinguishing between the two. Perhaps you could use the tag system here to identify and speak with those members.

If you need any assistance in anything Medium I'll be happy to help or show you someone who can.

So, welcome back, Alizia!

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> Having read a great deal of what you write, here and there, I do not imagine that you will be able to relate at all to what I am saying except out of a certain politeness.

Oh, but I do Alizia, and it's not out of politeness. Some of my views correlate and intertwine with some of yours.

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> I situate myself in my neo-fascistic definitions.

Several definitions of the term. Please elaborate as to what *your definition* entails.

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> What else? Oh, and my position as-against the American military machine, not because I do not understand the need for a military and warrior skills, but rather because the military-i…

Jack is an unapologetically flag waving, Constitution embracing patriot with a blind spot as big as all outdoors. Most of Jack's followers share his views.

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> I take a very different viewpoint as a potential perspective. It is that by bringing an attack against German Nationalism and the 'heart of Europe' a great evil was accomplished. It …

"Potential" meaning you are not closed minded about this and may at some point in the future realign your perspective, yes?

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> we are on the verge of very serious idea-wars that have real-world consequences.

Most definitely.

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack's blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> So, unlike you who left because the boys are too aggressive,

I didn’t leave because the boys were too aggressive. I gave as good as I got. The one and only reason I left is Jack’s endorsement of the death penalty for Manning.

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack’s blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> But, I still have a tremendous respect for Jack, one because he tolerated me and two because of the intensity and intellectual-grounding of his general approach. I frankly do not get…

My respect for Jack lessened greatly when he opined that Bradley Manning should have been executed for treason. That’s why I left. (Went back one time to clarify something.)

Conversation between Alizia Tyler and Jeffrey Field.

Alizia Tyler
Hello there Jeffrey! I have also decided to stop posting at Jack’s blog yet for very different reas

Jeffrey Field
Oct 25, 2017

> I do not think that all people are equal and I do not think that America was intended to be, nor should it be now, a credal republic. It was formerly made up of individual states and…

The creed I’m referring to is not what you speak of here; the creed I disagree with is that the U.S. is an exceptional country that stands for what Superman used to stand for, truth, justice, and the American way. Cause it just ain’t so.

Never miss a story from **Other Voices**, when you sign up for Medium. Learn more

GET UPDATES