

# *Forgive Us Our Spins: Michael Moore and the Future of the Left*

by Jesse Larner, Wiley, 2006, 277 pp.

**David R. Adler**

Seas of ink have been spilled on the subject of the marginality of the American left. But Michael Moore is anything but marginal. He has gained a level of household recognition that Noam Chomsky and Howard Zinn can only dream of. By playing a skilful double game – straddling the political and pop culture arenas – Moore has evolved into an instantly recognisable brand, much like Martha Stewart and Oprah Winfrey. The same can be said of no other left-wing activist in the world.

While Moore's background is in grassroots organising and muckraking journalism, his ticket to fame was America's flourishing medium of satire – a medium he did much to reinvent. His forebears range from Charlie Chaplin to Abbie Hoffman, as Kevin Mattson observed in a 2003 critique for *Dissent*. Today, Moore operates in a crowded comedic field, much of which could be called 'post-ideological.' Jon Stewart of 'The Daily Show' is unmistakably liberal, but he can be equally merciless toward George W. Bush and Hugo Chávez. Bill Maher, a spirited Bush-basher and opponent of the Iraq war, staunchly defended Israel's July 2006 bombardment of Lebanon and gave an obsequious interview to Benjamin Netanyahu. 'South Park' routinely mocks the pieties of the right and the left. But in Moore's top-grossing documentaries and polemical books, there is no mistaking where his flag is planted. And despite his old-school labour movement roots, he fully understands (to quote Mattson) that today's 'young people are reached via satellite dishes and mega-mall bookstores rather than through cafés or union halls or small magazines.'

Predictably, Moore's withering mass-marketed assaults on the right have spawned a cottage industry of Moore-bashing, to be found on sites like moorewatch.com, mooreexposed.com and moorelies.com, and in movies like 'FahrenHYPE 9/11,' 'Celsius 41.11' and 'Michael Moore Hates America.' Far less common are attacks on Moore from the left. *Jesse Larner's Forgive Us Our Spins: Michael Moore and the Future of the Left*, is the first book-length attempt to redress that imbalance. Melding biography with political history and cultural critique, Larner sets out to determine the significance of Michael Moore 'in a reactionary age' (p. 7), when

## ADLER | The Case of Michael Moore

‘the American news media have been increasingly dominated ... by the views of the extreme right’ (p. 5). Invoking ‘the democratic left’s glory days of *Partisan Review* and *Dissent*’ (p. 6) and brandishing book-jacket endorsements from Mattson and George Monbiot, Larner contends that ‘Moore is a disturbing public leader for many liberals.’ He admits from the outset that Moore ‘has brought important issues of social justice to the attention of people who would otherwise not know of them’ (p. 7). But in Larner’s view, the Moore franchise – the instant, universal association of Moore with progressive causes – does the left more harm than good. Not for nothing did Andrew Sullivan nominate Larner for his blog’s ‘Yglesias Award,’ named for blogger Matthew Yglesias and reserved for writers who ‘criticize their own side, make enemies among political allies, and generally risk something for the sake of saying what they believe.’

Like Peter Beinart’s *The Good Fight*, Larner’s book is part of a growing literature of left diagnostics. (Sullivan’s *The Conservative Soul* is a center-right variant.) The focal point is Moore, but Larner’s broader aim is to address ‘a hole at the heart of American politics’ (p. 6) where robust left-liberalism used to be. The prose is journalistic in tone, geared toward political junkies and general readers alike. The sourcing is thorough. The pace is brisk, the structure efficient. And for a book that flays Michael Moore, *Forgive Us Our Spins* ends up being one of the more effective critiques of the Bush II presidency, and the red-state pundit class, to have reached the market. (A different version of the book, titled *Moore and Us: One Man’s Quest for a New World Order*, came out in Britain in 2005. The present edition is available in the U.S. and Canada.)

Larner is a New York-based journalist. His first book, *Mount Rushmore: An Icon Reconsidered*, was published by Nation Books in 2002 and excerpted briefly in *The Nation* at the time. Some of that magazine’s positions square with Larner’s own: support for national healthcare, ‘a steeply graduated income tax,’ gay civil rights, labour rights, strong church/state separation, fighting global warming. But Larner is not one to put the words ‘war on terror’ in scare quotes. He insists on ‘the absolute necessity of the Afghan war’ (p. 217). On Iraq, he is generally sympathetic to the liberal hawk worldview. If he supported the decision to invade in March 2003, he does not say so explicitly. His heart seems to be with those who ‘support the war without supporting the president’ (p. 218), and so he resorts to soundbites like ‘the world is a better place without Saddam’ – a notion that even Peter Beinart backed away from during a recent appearance on ‘The Colbert Report.’ There are certainly antiwar arguments that Larner takes very seriously. Now and then, however, there’s

## Democratiya 7 | Winter 2006

a tone of strained optimism on Iraq that doesn't sit well with the outright collapse of 2006 (Larner wrote in the autumn of 2005).

Putting Larner's politics to one side, it should be said that locating Moore on the ideological spectrum isn't as easy as one would think. In his introduction, Larner identifies Moore as 'something new on the left, someone who defie[s] its stereotypes':

Not a hippie, not a dour sloganeer, not a humorless disciple of political correctness, not a public executive like Ralph Nader or Marian Wright Edelman. He is an improviser. It's hard to mock him because, in a sense, he presents his work as a joke – a serious joke. He invokes the jester's privilege of saying serious things that wouldn't get heard if serious people said them. (p. 4)

Because Moore is an improviser, he is able to switch between political tendencies at will. When he needs to be, he is either a reformist liberal or a revolutionary; a stern moralist or a clown; a man of the world or a provincial American boob. As Larner notes, Moore 'does not reject the political process,' nor does he deny the legitimacy of the republic. Go to [michaelmoore.com](http://michaelmoore.com) and you will see him with the stars and stripes on his baseball cap. It's a small but significant detail. In short, he is a flag bearer, not a flag burner. 'Moore is of the left, but it is also important to him that he is mainstream,' wrote Larissa MacFarquhar in a 2004 profile for *The New Yorker*.

Christopher Hitchens likes to mention Moore in the same breath as Ramsey Clark, the former attorney general turned hard-left ideologue. But in the 2004 Democratic primaries, Moore rallied behind retired army general Wesley Clark, to the horror of left diehards. (Larner and others claim that Moore sank Clark's chances.) 'Moore is many ways [sic] the American Galloway' (p. 216), asserts Larner, and it is true that Moore – like George Galloway, John Pilger and far too many others – has lauded the Iraqi insurgents, comparing them to the Minutemen. [1] Larner concedes that Moore never went so far as to praise Saddam Hussein, as Galloway did in Baghdad in 1994. But that's not all to be said in Moore's defense. In his 2003 book *Dude, Where's My Country?* Moore wrote the following:

[Saddam] gassed the Kurds, gassed the Iranians, tortured the Shiites, tortured the Sunnis, tortured countless others, and during the sanctions against Iraq, let his people starve ... while he hoarded money and kept his many palaces

## ADLER | The Case of Michael Moore

well-stocked with provisions... This is all gruesome stuff, and the world was right to condemn him and to support any efforts by the people of Iraq to have him removed. [2]

Needless to say, this is a long way off from Galloway and Ramsey Clark. Yet who can forget the ‘deeply offensive and truly callous’ (p. 148) kite-flying scene in ‘Fahrenheit 9/11,’ which seemed to suggest that Iraq was a wonderland before the 2003 invasion? The point is not to exonerate Moore, but to illustrate that he is all over the road. In one forum he’ll glorify the insurgents or paper over Saddam’s record; in another he’ll condemn Saddam and even honor the sacrifice of U.S. troops. (For that matter, he’ll abhor the Balkan intervention and then campaign for its architect, Wesley Clark.) Moore is in some sense a pragmatist, but on a less charitable view, he chases after political fashions, jettisoning principle for point-scoring, shock value or laughs. While Galloway’s praise of the insurgency flows from deep and harrowing conviction, Moore’s is glib and ill-informed, but in the end no less harmful.

Larner divides his book into four parts, employing a chronological approach in the first three. Moore, we learn, was raised in Davison, Michigan, just outside blue-collar Flint, by devout Irish Catholic parents. Politically active as early as grade school, he won a seat on the Davison school board in 1972 and went on to edit a community paper called *Free to Be*, then the monthly Flint Voice in 1977. Larner has studied these sheets closely and he praises their ‘real journalistic competence.’ He credits Moore and his staff for exposing corruption, police abuse, chemical dumping and racial discrimination, ‘things that the conservative *Flint Journal* would never touch’ (p. 15). He also presents lengthy quotes from people who knew Moore, including auto worker and activist Fran Cleaves and political consultant Sam Riddle. Moore, according to Riddle, ‘could put the “Mac” in Machiavellian’ and ‘has more field experience of hard-core grassroots politics than the rest of Hollywood combined’ (p. 22).

In the second chapter Larner dishes the dirt on Moore’s tenure (April to September 1986) as editor of the San Francisco-based monthly *Mother Jones*. Larner offers much original reporting on this period. ‘[Moore] had no clue as to how to run a four-color magazine with a print deadline, and no interest in acquiring one’ (p. 30), he writes, but naturally Moore sexed this up as one man’s battle against a hidebound establishment. Larner takes the trouble to itemise 14 different reasons Moore has given to explain his dismissal. He also details Moore’s attempt to kill a

piece by Paul Berman that criticized the Sandinista government of Nicaragua. He provides plenty of background on Central American politics during the Reagan era, when the communist threat ‘was used by the political right as justification for every bloodily insane atrocity, every jackboot in the face of democracy and human rights, that was struck by “our” proxies against “their” proxies’ (p. 39). Yet for many on the left at the time, ‘there was no legitimate criticism of the Sandinistas’ (p. 42), who exercised a Leninist ‘monopoly on legitimate political expression’ (p. 40).

Berman’s article, Larner insists, ‘was on the whole favorable to the Nicaraguan revolution but did not ignore its defects’ (p. 43). Hell-bent on burying the piece, Moore enlisted the aid of radical journalist Alexander Cockburn, whom he had recruited to write for *Mother Jones*. Larner portrays Moore as ‘overawed’ by Cockburn and naïvely unaware of previous spats between Cockburn and Berman. But there was a deeper irony: ‘Cockburn and Moore rushed to enforce the style of authoritarian orthodoxy that they denied and the Sandinistas practiced’ (p. 44). They did not prevail. Berman’s piece ran. Moore was fired. Cockburn launched an ad hominem attack on Mother Jones chairman Adam Hochschild in *The Nation* (and didn’t respond to Larner’s queries).[3] During a deposition for his wrongful termination lawsuit, Moore smeared freelance writer Laura Fraser as a drug dealer, based on a lighthearted joke someone had made at the office. Larner gives Fraser her day in court, so to speak. He also prints exclusive recollections from former Mother Jones staffers Deirdre English, Mark Dowie and Chris Lehmann, among others.

Moore is the first to decry censorship when it happens to him. In the introduction to *Dude, Where’s My Country?* he recalls how Regan Books withheld his previous title, *Stupid White Men*, in the aftermath of 9/11, and even insisted on a substantial rewrite. Moore takes pains to laud one lone librarian, Ann Sparanese, who created a firestorm of bad publicity for Regan, pressuring them to release the book as is. This is the same Ann Sparanese who received a drubbing from Nat Hentoff in the pages of *The Village Voice* in January 2004. The topic was Cuba – specifically, a wave of repression that swept the island in the spring of 2003. Even Chomsky and Zinn denounced these abuses, but not Sparanese. She went to bat for the Castro regime, stooping so low as to put the word ‘crackdown’ in quotes.[4] Moore, of course, isn’t responsible for Sparanese’s conduct, which occurred after his book was written. But clearly the indulgence of left authoritarianism typified by the *Mother Jones* affair persists in some quarters. Moore’s flyleaf dedication to Sparanese – which reads,

## ADLER | The Case of Michael Moore

‘one simple act, a voice was saved/are there a million more of her/to save us all’ – is simply embarrassing.

There are many other instances of poor judgment and unethical behavior on Moore’s part, and Lerner traces them back to ‘Roger & Me,’ the 1989 feature that catapulted Moore to national fame. Lerner is attuned to economic injustice under Reagan, and to the plight of cities like Flint. He explores the radical changes in U.S. auto manufacturing during the 1980s to reveal a sociological layer ‘entirely beyond the sphere of Michael Moore’s consciousness’ (p. 62). There is more to the story, Lerner insists, than ‘lost jobs and martyred workers.’ It’s a compelling discussion, although one could argue that Moore’s intent was to expose the human cost of corporate decision-making, not to offer a treatise on industrial policy itself. The more consequential issues include a flawed historical timeline, misleading edits and the inconvenient truth that Moore interviewed General Motors CEO Roger Smith on camera in 1988. (The film’s central conceit is Smith’s refusal to speak with Moore.) Lerner surveys the critical responses to ‘Roger & Me,’ along with Moore’s responses to the responses, and deals with the vexed issue of documentary versus entertainment. He writes: ‘It’s a cheap dodge to insist, as Moore does, that the movie is meant to inform by entertaining and to imply that its entertainment value justifies the fudging of facts. Why? He could have had both’ (p. 70).

Moore’s worst infraction, however, was also the most intimate. There’s a scene that depicts a ‘Great Gatsby’ party, ostensibly an arrogant display of wealth in the face of Flint’s misery. It was actually an annual fundraiser for a battered women’s shelter, something Moore had supported in his *Flint Voice* editorials. One guest, a middle-aged man, speaks about Flint’s many virtues and comes across as a heartless, privileged ass. Moore does not disclose that this man, Larry Stecco, is an acquaintance of his, a lawyer who had given money to the *Flint Voice* and performed pro bono civil rights work in the area. Stecco is now a judge, and Lerner met with him. We learn that Moore asked Stecco a misleading question to elicit the desired quote. Stecco sued Moore and won; he tells Lerner that the black actors paid to pose as ‘human statues’ at the Gatsby event sued as well (Moore chose not to film the white actors). In a commentary for the ‘Roger & Me’ DVD recorded in 2003, Moore not only fails to mention any of this – he continues to badmouth Stecco as part of ‘the other side.’ If Moore is this dishonest toward a friend at a tiny local event, he can scarcely be trusted on matters of world-historical scope. Lerner’s summation hits the mark: Moore ‘exhibits both a solid show-business instinct and a cold, hard core of relentless ideology, an attitude that, as with Leninists of yore, will

always put the cause of increasing human well-being before the well-being of any particular human, and will put the meta-truth before the actual, immediate truth of any situation' (p. 78).

It's a pattern that holds true for much of Moore's work. Larner traces the arc of Moore's career, gathering quotes from disillusioned former producers at his late 1990s television series 'The Awful Truth' and lingering over a particularly senseless smear of former Defense Secretary William Cohen. In the chapter on 'Bowling for Columbine,' Larner excoriates right-wing gun culture but argues that Moore 'dismisses all actual gun-control arguments' and 'has to torture the facts for social explanations' (p. 102). He also identifies Moore's controversial acceptance speech at the 2003 Oscars as 'the moment that Moore became indelibly associated with the left and with opposition to Bush' (p. 113). But if anything explains Moore's rise to international stardom, it is what Larner terms 'the stolen election of 2000.' No, this isn't left hyperbole: the Republicans subverted democracy, not simply during the Florida recount but 'before anyone stepped into a voting booth' (p. 171). Larner proves it, up, down and sideways, with great patience and nuance. His goal, however, is to contextualise what became the dominant view on the left: that 'it was no time for fine-grained reason and delicate, balanced argument... What was wanted was a return to democracy itself. Yes, and revenge. The blunter the instrument, the better' (p. 133).

Moore certainly rose to the occasion. 'Fahrenheit 9/11,' his most controversial product to date, was 'more than a movie,' according to Larner. It was 'a perceptual test, a magnetic pole of ideological attraction or repulsion charged by the brutish certainties and edgy uncertainties of a crucial moment in American politics' (p. 141). Larner traveled to Texas to cover a nasty left/right showdown over the movie. Allowing himself space for first-person reflection, he interacts with loopy peace activists and rabid red-staters and concludes that arguments about 'Fahrenheit 9/11' are not about 'whether Michael Moore manipulates the facts, but about the very nature of reality and the rules that we use to assess it' (p. 139). Around the time Larner was writing, Stephen Colbert coined the term 'truthiness,' the mot juste for the hyper-speed media age. Larner shows, in effect, that 'truthiness' is not the sole province of Fox News and Karl Rove. Moore mastered it long ago. The difference, as Larner notes elsewhere, is that Moore 'does not have any influence on policy' (p. 224). It's too early to tell whether the 2006 midterm election results will change this. In any case, the campaign laid bare the Republicans' transition from 'truthiness' to outright falsehood.

## ADLER | The Case of Michael Moore

It is in part four of the book ('The Road Ahead') that the future of the left, Larner's subtitle, comes into play. The first chapter in this section, 'Populism,' draws on the historical perspectives of Michael Kazin, Todd Gitlin and others, deconstructs 'the bizarre and sentimental world of Republican populist fantasy' (p. 203) and critiques Moore's view of American politics 'as a scene of competing entertainments' (p. 200). But there is a better gloss on 'the nastier aspects' of Moore's populism in an earlier chapter, 'Moore Abroad,' a comparative study of the filmmaker's reception in various European countries, (in France he's the new Jerry Lewis.) Moore loves to tell foreign audiences that 85 percent of Americans can't locate Iraq on a map. Yet when he mocks 'the coalition of the willing' in 'Fahrenheit 9/11' and in *Dude, Where's My Country?* he panders to that very ignorance. Larner touches on this but doesn't note the most egregious examples. Concerning Eritrea, Moore asks: 'where the hell is that?' Of Ethiopia he remarks: 'nothing like sending a squad of starving children to help!'<sup>[5]</sup> Ethiopia has one of the largest militaries in Africa; it battled neighbouring Eritrea from 1998-2000 and is currently on the move against the Islamic Courts Union of Somalia. Moore's knowledge of the country appears to end in 1985 with Live Aid. If you're seeking wisdom on Africa, Gideon Yago of MTV News is a far better source than Michael Moore. That shouldn't be the case.

Moore's sloppiness on international politics is more glaring when it comes to terrorism. Larner devotes a chapter to this as well. He begins with George Galloway's blustery and evasive Senate testimony in May 2005, which many on the left greeted 'like water in the parched desert of American politics' (p. 215). After exposing Galloway's appalling anti-democratic record, Larner presses the case that Moore is a kinder, gentler version, whose 'very unserious' arguments about terrorism have harmed the left's standing with the American public. Surprisingly, Larner doesn't mention the line that has generated the most anti-Moore flak. In *Dude, Where's My Country?* Moore announced: 'There is no terrorist threat.' He also wrote:

I am not saying that there are no terrorists, or that there are no terrorist incidents, or that there won't be other terrorist incidents in the future. There ARE terrorists, they HAVE committed evil acts, and, tragically, they WILL commit evil acts of terror in the not-too-distant future. Of that I am sure. <sup>[6]</sup>

With that caveat in place, Moore proceeds to dispute the idea that 'we are all in an exaggerated state of danger.' This is not an outrageous position. Granted, the line 'there is no terrorist threat' is bad politics at the very least, making light of the electorate's justifiable security concerns. But the fear-mongering that Moore

identifies in 'Bowling for Columbine' is real. Moreover, right-wing apologists for torture, habeas corpus erosions and an unchecked executive branch have tried to justify their arguments with the slogan: 'You have no civil liberties if you're dead.' The American mass media play into this by reporting on terrorism from the angle of personal safety, shorn of political context and often hysterical in tone ('that bird flu/arthritis medication/terrorist might kill you!').

Larner contends: 'It will be fatal for liberalism if liberals indulge themselves in hating Bush more than they hate terrorism' (p. 224). There is truth in this. It should also be said that Larner denounces pro-torture pundits in the strongest terms. But the situation has worsened since he finished his book. According to Yale constitutional scholar Jack Balkin, the Military Commissions Act of 2006 'has created a new regime in which [the president] is a law unto himself on issues of prisoner interrogations.'<sup>[7]</sup> Republicans brandished the act as a weapon in the run-up to the November midterms, tarring Democratic 'no' voters as soft on terror. <sup>[8]</sup> Taking the terrorist threat seriously must not entail capitulation to right-wing demagoguery, much less support for the barbaric and anti-democratic policies it serves.

Not that Moore is a reliable guide on these matters. His chapter 'How to Stop Terrorism? Stop Being Terrorists!' is one of the worst things ever published on the subject. Discussing everything but the Jihadi movement, Moore claims that terrorists are bred by long-ago coups in Chile and Guatemala, low wages in Mexico and China, child labor in Ecuador, U.S. domination of water and energy resources and so forth. '[T]his gluttony will result in more of us losing our lives to angry terrorists from the Third World,' says Moore, after devoting the previous chapter to the statistical improbability of death from terrorism.<sup>[9]</sup> What, then, are the odds of dying at the hands of a Salafi from South or Central America? Who's fear-mongering now?

Moore's piece is a caricature of bad 'root causes' argumentation, which in Larner's words 'seeks to minimize or excuse terrorism through a relativistic comparison with the crimes of empire.' However, Larner does not dismiss talk of 'root causes' altogether. A good argument is 'one that recognizes that terrorism must be defeated and that this involves war on terrorists, knowledge of what creates them, and a desire to right historical wrongs – a desire that springs not from fear or guilt or appeasement but from an understanding that this is in everyone's interest' (p. 227). Larner also deplores the 'chasm of unreason on the right' and insists that 'there

## ADLER | The Case of Michael Moore

actually were historical causes of 9/11' (p. 226); he critiques Peter Beinart for all but endorsing 'Bush's unhelpful tautology: "They attacked us because they are evil"' (p. 222). [10] On similar grounds, in the chapter 'Fahrenheit Versus Celsius,' Lerner makes short work of the right-wing anti-Moore films. Aside from a fairly credulous tone on Iraq, he is equally clear-sighted about the sins of imperialism and the distortions of anti-imperialism. It's exactly the sort of analysis the liberal left needs.

Speculating on Moore's next move in the chapter called 'Prospects,' Lerner cites rumors of a film on the Hurricane Katrina debacle. But Spike Lee beat Moore to the punch. The next Moore production, 'Sicko,' will focus on America's dysfunctional health care system. In any case, Lerner's aim is to assess the left now that 'Moore has so thoroughly captured the market for symbolic rebellion' (p. 230). He looks at Moore's history with Ralph Nader and his strained dealings with the Democratic Party. He acknowledges some of the good that Moore has done (confronting the psychotic Reverend Fred Phelps in a pink 'Sodomobile' is surely one of Moore's finest moments). But we're also told of Moore's 'mutually profitable relationship with corporate America' (p. 238). Moore's foundation has allegedly owned stock in Merck, Sunoco, McDonald's, Boeing and even Halliburton. (Alas, Lerner's source is the partisan author Peter Schweizer.)

Oddly, Moore was not a major presence during the midterm election season, the results of which have put the Democrats, long consigned to irrelevance, in charge of both houses of Congress. They will govern in a climate shrewdly described by Lerner at the start of the book: 'What George W. Bush has done to reward the rich and to destroy the established international order has brought centrist liberals and the radical left closer together, and drawn these groups closer to marginal protest groups that do not look to mainstream political leaders' (p. 6). So, whither U.S. politics? Will Cheney continue to insist that the Iraq venture is 'doing remarkably well?' Will well-intentioned liberals continue to ally with International A.N.S.W.E.R. and The World Can't Wait, entities that may as well have been dreamed up by Ann Coulter to discredit the left? And where do writers like Lerner fit in? Karen Duffy, a former associate and staunch defender of Michael Moore, told Larissa MacFarquhar: 'I just hate the way the left is constantly cannibalizing itself.' Does Lerner's meticulous and unflattering study of Moore make him a cannibal? No. His narrative points to a slackening of intellectual and moral standards that must be challenged by the left, or it will continue to be used as a cudgel by the right. *Forgive Us Our Spins* is not the

## Democratiya 7 | Winter 2006

final word, but it is a sterling example of critical thinking – what the left valorizes but too often fails to practise.

---

David R. Adler writes on politics, music and culture from New York. His work has appeared in *The New York Times*, The New Republic Online, *Slate*, *Jazz Times* and other publications.

### References

- Hentoff, Nat 2004 'A U.S. Librarian Defends Castro,' *The Village Voice*, 5 January.  
MacFarquhar, Larissa 2004, 'The Populist,' *The New Yorker*, 16 & 23 February.  
Mattson, Kevin 2003, 'The Perils of Michael Moore,' *Dissent*, Spring.  
Moore, Michael 2003, *Dude, Where's My Country?* New York: Warner Books.

### Notes

- [1] 'The Iraqis who have risen up against the occupation are not 'insurgents' or 'terrorists' or 'The Enemy.' They are the REVOLUTION, the Minutemen, and their numbers will grow – and they will win' (p. 219). 'Mike's Letter,' michaelmoore.com, 14 April 2004.
- [2] Moore 2003, pp. 57-8.
- [3] On his Counterpunch website in August 2006, Cockburn reprinted a fraudulent interview from the Turkish paper Evrensel with Hassan Nasrallah of Hezbollah. When Hezbollah denounced it as a fake, Cockburn made a note of it but failed to retract or apologize, arguing that the text still contained 'interesting and important observations about radical components in the Shi'a tradition....'
- [4] Hentoff 2004. In March 2003, Chomsky, Zinn, Edward Said, Adam Hochschild of Mother Jones and many others signed a statement from the Campaign for Peace and Democracy that condemned Castro's repression, declaring: 'The imprisonment of people for attempting to exercise their rights of free expression is outrageous and unacceptable.'
- [5] Moore 2003, p. 71.
- [6] Moore 2003, p. 95.
- [7] Balkin, Jack M., 'Rights Against Torture – Without Remedies,' Balkinization (balkin.blogspot.com), 17 October 2006.
- [8] Corn, David, 'GOP Fear-mongering; Corn v. Greenberg, Day 2; The Republican Civil War,' davidcorn.com, 18 October 2006.
- [9] Moore 2003, p. 123. He wriggles out of the contradiction with – what else? – a joke.
- [10] Lerner addresses Beinart's seminal New Republic essay 'A Fighting Faith: An Argument for a New Liberalism' (December 2004), not his 2006 book *The Good Fight*.