TELLS THE FACTS AND NAMES THE NAMES

CounterPunch

APRIL 16-30, 2009 ALEXANDER COCKBURN AND JEFFREY ST. CLAIR VOL. 16, NO. 8

The Lengthened Shadow of an Institution...

Stiles Hall as Crucible

By Alexander Cockburn

You could say the 60s began, at least in part, in 1884, which is when Stiles Hall was founded in Berkeley by some high-minded do-good Christian Protestants. This private, non-profit institution – a YMCA for much of its existence, though no longer – was never formally part of UC Berkeley, but its premises, which shifted about over the decades as the university expanded unrelentingly, have always been right next to the campus. In the 50s, Stiles Hall was where it is today, at Bancroft and Dana.

On March 14, Stiles Hall celebrated its 125th anniversary. The university chancellor was there. So was the mayor of Berkeley. So were a good many veterans of the 50s and 60s, among them Joe Paff, my friend and neighbor here, in Petrolia, and president of another nonprofit, the one that publishes *CounterPunch*. In the 40s, returning GIs had changed the UC Berkeley campus dramatically in dress, style, and new kinds of students. Clearly, fraternity draft dodgers were not about to haze returning soldiers. By the mid-50s, they were regaining their "piss and vinegar" (to use the words of UC Vice Chancellor Alex Sheriff) and reached their zenith in the notorious panty raid of 1956.

By 1957, Middle America was resurging with khaki buckle-in-the-back pants and button-down collar and oxford cloth. It was, Joe recalls, pretty much a uniform. Compulsory ROTC required males to drill in uniform once a week; fraternity boys at the entrance to campus enforced conformity; the student body elections were considered jokes ("if elected, I will launch Sather Gate into space to compete with Sputnik"). Faculty opposing the loyalty oath had been purged.

COCKBURN CONTINUED ON PAGE 7

Bombing Media Workers, Blaming Victims, and the Strange Role of CNN: An Investigation, Ten Years After the Bombing of Radio-Television Serbia

By Tiphaine Dickson

Dragoljub Milanovic, the former director of Radio Television Serbia (RTS), which was bombed by NATO on April 23, 1999, at 2:06 a.m., was convicted on June 21, 2002, of "causing grave danger to public security" by a Belgrade court, for having failed to evacuate his workers. Sixteen people were killed, and as many were injured when a bomb slammed into the building – news desks, studios, and the makeup room – in downtown Belgrade. Most of the victims were young people – a makeup artist, technicians and production personnel. Judge Dragicevic-Dicic of the Belgrade District Court sentenced Milanovic to nine-and-a-half years in prison, in addition to a six-month sentence for an unrelated financial charge.

He was found to have ignored an official order to evacuate personnel, but there are credible accounts that the order produced as evidence was merely an internal draft document bearing neither stamp nor seal, and did not explicitly require the evacuation of RTS employees. It is unclear how Milanovic could have known of its existence, let alone be held to follow it. A witness claimed that the original document had been burned on October 5, 2000, when a mob set fire to RTS (destroying decades of film archives) and nearly beat Milanovic to death. The author of the order ("Order 37") has not been identified.

Dragoljub Milanovic is to this day the only person to have ever been tried and punished for NATO's bombing. He is currently in custody in Serbia's Pozarevac prison, having served almost seven years of his sentence, where I met him last month, as part of an international delegation – the first one he'd been authorized to meet in seven years of detention. Milanovic is still reeling from the charges against him: a former member of the Head Committee of the Socialist Party of Serbia, he said he was not surprised by the outcome of what he describes as a political trial. "This was not justice," he said, wearing a standard issue navy blue prisoner's uniform – which in Serbia looks like a mechanic's smock and pants – "but what's even more shocking is to see what passes in the name of 'journalism'. What a paradox! We were doing our job, informing people about NATO's aggression and its consequences. NATO bombed us, then foreign journalists made sure we were blamed." Milanovic has access to Serbian dailies but doesn't subscribe to them: "Why would I pay to read the lies of 'pro-democracy' revisionism? I'd rather read a book from the prison library."

In 2001, six families of the bombing victims petitioned the European Court of Human Rights for redress, arguing that their loved ones' right to life had been violated by 17 European NATO countries for their responsibility in the bombing. The European Court held that it did not have jurisdiction over the "extraterritorial" acts of the defendant states, and rejected the families' case.

The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia Prosecutor's office established a committee in May 1999 to examine allegations that NATO had committed war crimes in the course of its bombing of Yugoslavia, including the targeting of RTS. The following year,

the Office of the Prosecutor released a report essentially exonerating NATO of all responsibility for what were described as "mistakes" in the bombing campaign, and finding that the RTS bombing (and others) did not justify an investigation into violations of the Geneva Conventions or other relevant legal statutes.

Tony Blair approved the bombing, stating, "It's very, very important people realize that these television stations are part of the apparatus of dictatorship and power of Milosevic, and that apparatus is the apparatus he has used to do this ethnic cleansing in Kosovo." Blair added, "it's the apparatus that keeps him in power," suggesting that the civilians killed at RTS were not "collateral damage" or accidentally targeted but were, in fact, deliberately bombed. Blair subsequently reinforced his position: "We have to target his military machine and the whole apparatus of dictatorship. The state-controlled media is one part of that, and I think it is a right and justified target for us. We certainly knew that these things were legitimate targets, absolutely, and they are legitimate targets."

Bill Clinton's position was also clear: "Our military leaders at NATO believe, based on what they have seen and what others in the area have told them, that the Serb television is an essential instrument of Mr. Milosevic's command and control. He uses it to spew hatred and basically to spread disinformation. It is not, in a conventional sense, therefore, a media outlet."

That the Belgrade media workers were deliberately targeted by NATO was left without a doubt by George Robertson, British secretary of defense: "The fact is that many of these targets are indeed the brains behind the brutality going on in Kosovo today, part and parcel of the apparatus that is driving this ethnic genocide that is going on inside this part of the former Yugoslavia, and so long as that continues it is seen that we must attack those targets."

On June 29, 1999, Robert Fisk reported that Aleksandar Vucic, then the Yugoslav minister of information, had received a "faxed invitation" from CNN – Fisk claims the network had left RTS premises two days before the bombing – to appear on *Larry King Live* the night of the bombing. Fisk wrote that Vucic was informed that the interview was to be held at 2:30 a.m., and was asked to report to makeup at 2 a.m. According to Fisk, he avoided the bombing, which took place at 2:06 a.m., only because he was running late.

Amnesty concludes: "NATO deliberately attacked a civilian object, killing 16 civilians, for the purpose of disrupting Serbian television broadcasts in the middle of the night."

In reality, the fax, a copy of which I have obtained, bluntly states that Vucic will be interviewed alone, at the RTS studios, and that he should arrive at 2:30 a.m., for a 3 a.m. interview, which was to last 15 minutes, about "the ongoing situation in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia," a puzzlingly vague formulation in the context of the NATO bombing.

Eason Jordan, then chief news executive of CNN international, angrily responded to Fisk's reporting, calling it "inaccurate," and stating that Vucic had canceled the interview 12 hours before it was scheduled to take place. Jordan has also claimed that Milanovic forced workers to remain on the premises of RTS, although it was a target. Jordan has not been critical of NATO's role in the bombing, and despite his claims that CNN reported stories "protesting" the RTS bombing, it appears that CNN was more of a champion of the bombing campaign than it was even minimally critical of the bombing of media colleagues.

Yet, Jordan saw fit to suggest that somehow Dragoljub Milanovic – who was himself working in the RTS building every single night, past midnight, including the night of the bombing, when he stayed past 1 a.m. – should have evacuated his workers because "NATO warned the world" that the studios would be targeted by NATO. Whether or not the information minister, Aleksandar Vucic, canceled his *Larry King* interview is irrelevant: Jordan has failed to address the fact that his network fully expected, and had explicitly asked Vucic to be present for an interview at RTS the very night of the bombing, and fully expected RTS support staff to assist in the broadcast. CNN had, in essence, requested the presence of RTS staff on the premises "the world knew" would be bombed. The suggestion that Milanovic (and Milosevic) deliberately chose to sacrifice RTS workers in order to score propaganda points is patently absurd: indeed, this odd theory would require both CNN and NATO's active participation in the Yugoslav leadership's heartless propaganda plot. That NATO would witlessly deliver such a propaganda coup to Milosevic is equally implausible.

Jordan has yet to comment on General Wesley Clark's claim that Milosevic (and presumably Milanovic) were made aware of the bombing in advance, via none other than CNN itself, and yet "ordered" workers to be present in the premises, a claim upon which Milanovic's conviction, at least in the court of public opinion, almost entirely depends. Clark stated that "first of all, we gave warnings to Milosevic that that was going to be struck. I personally called the CNN reporter and had it set up so that it would be leaked, and Milosevic knew."

If Wesley Clark is to be believed, he "personally called" a CNN reporter to advise that RTS was a target, and that same network either did not take the supreme allied commander of NATO's words very

CounterPunch

EDITORS
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

ASSISTANT EDITOR
Alevtina Rea

BUSINESS
Becky Grant
Deva Wheeler

DESIGN
Tiffany Wardle

COUNSELOR
Ben Sonnenberg

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org

seriously, or deliberately attempted to ensure that RTS staff and the Yugoslav minister of information would be in studios they had been informed would be bombed.

There was no evidence that Dragoljub Milanovic had any more detailed knowledge that RTS would be bombed than what NATO had threatened two weeks before the bombing, when proposing how RTS could become an "acceptable" media outlet as opposed to a "legitimate target." David Wilby, NATO's spokesman, made the following demand on April 8, 1999: "Serb radio and TV is an instrument of propaganda and repression. It has filled the airwaves with hate and with lies over the years, and especially now. It is therefore a legitimate target in this campaign. If President Milosevic would provide equal time for Western news broadcasts in its programs without censorship, three hours a day between noon and 18:00 and three hours a day between 18:00 and midnight, then his TV could become an acceptable instrument of public information."

But such a threat, reportedly abandoned when Yugoslav officials responded by accepting NATO's proposal, on the condition that Western media broadcast six minutes of Yugoslav media daily, does not constitute evidence that Milanovic knew that his studios would be bombed in the early hours of April 23, 1999. In fact, 52 witnesses testifying in his criminal trial said that he had no such specific knowledge. It could be argued that he knew considerably less than the CNN network, whose reporter was tipped off by Wesley Clark personally, and who attempted to arrange a live interview with the minister of information on *Larry King* on the night of the bombing, and whose former chief news executive, Eason Jordan – who, in an ironic twist, later resigned under fire from CNN for having suggested that the media were being targeted by U.S. troops in Iraq – has no qualms about blaming Dragoljub Milanovic for the loss of life at RTS.

According to Amnesty International, NATO officials confirmed to them that no warning of imminent attack was given to Yugoslav or RTS officials, as such warning would have endangered their pilot. Further, Amnesty concludes: "NATO deliberately attacked a civilian object, killing 16 civilians, for the purpose of disrupting Serbian television broadcasts in the middle of the night for approximately three hours. It is hard to see how this can be consistent with the rule of proportionality."

But Eason Jordan, interviewed by Amnesty in 2000, referred to "public threats" made by NATO – including statements by Jamie Shea assuring that NATO would not strike Serb transmitters – as having been made to "minimize civilian casualties." That is a perplexing interpretation of what constitutes a "threat." Jamie Shea had, in addition, reassured the International Federation of Journalists that "Allied Force targets military targets only and television and radio towers are only struck if they are integrated into military facilities... There is no policy to strike television and radio transmitters as such."

What RTS did in addition to broadcasting swastikas, or mocking Clinton and Albright, was to show NATO destruction that Western media outlets were too delicate to report and broadcast to their viewers.

Jordan further told Amnesty that in early April he received a call from a NATO official claiming that a sortie was underway to bomb RTS and that he should tell CNN people to get out. Jordan claims that he told the official that the loss of life would be substantial, as NATO's plane was only half an hour to reaching its target, and that the official convinced NATO to abort the bombing at that time. Did Jordan also warn Milanovic or any other RTS or Yugoslav government official, in early April, or any time before the bombing? That is not known, but it is unlikely, given the network's attempt to secure a live hookup from the premises of RTS for *Larry King Live* with Information Minister Vucic, on the night the bomb hit the RTS studios. In 2000, Vucic's secretary told Belgrade magazine *Nin* that she fielded insistent calls from CNN for two days before the bombing, despite her repeatedly conveying that the minister refused to grant interviews with the media of "aggressor countries"; she added that Vucic had not even seen the fax setting out the details of the interview. This fax inexplicably "confirms" that Vucic "will join CNN's *Larry King Live* program on Friday 23, 1999, at 3 a.m. (BELGRADE) for a live interview," that the interview "will take place" at RTS, and that Vucic "will appear alone," yet no such appearance had ever been agreed to: in fact, several requests had been rebuffed. Eason Jordan's indignant claims that Vucic had "canceled" the interview seem stranger still in light of the statements of Vucic's secretary, who added that Vucic only learned of the bombing when contacted by his brother because their mother, Angelina, a news editor working on the night shift, was in the building when it was struck.

Dragoljub Milanovic is currently facing new charges in connection with the allocation of apartments to RTS workers. As a result, and although he is presumed innocent in this current trial, Pozarevac prison authorities seem likely to exercise their discretion to decline to afford him early parole – in Serbian prison practice, an inmate is eligible

for release after serving 50 per cent of a sentence, and detainees are released after serving 70 per cent of it, in nearly all cases – but recent decisions taken do not portend well for Milanovic's release. I learned in a meeting with the director of the Pozarevac's Zabela prison last month, that Milanovic has been "reclassified" as a "more violent" inmate, and has already lost a number of privileges, such as his job in the prison's library and conditions of detention earned before these new charges triggered "reclassification." Milanovic wonders if there is any chance he can have a fair trial. "This is just more politics," he said, echoing his statement in court last December, answering the charges that he'd allocated 53 apartments to RTS workers. He said he hadn't done this, "but rather between 200 and 300. I am charged with something that anyone would be proud of. The indictment, which disgusts me, is a showdown with the Socialist regime, since everything was done according to Socialist laws." Milanovic's counsel, Ivan Mladenovic, a former journalist currently practicing law in Belgrade, is optimistic. His client expresses his gratitude but shakes his head grimly when Mladenovic reassures him about the current trial, an investigation he says was started in 2001, with charges only coming when Milanovic was poised to be released – a coincidence he finds difficult to believe. "There won't be justice," says Milanovic. "They are not only trying to destroy me, but to destroy my family."

Milanovic's wife, Ljiljana, is also a journalist, and used to work for RTS. She recently published a book in Serbia about her husband's trial that includes a rich section reproducing documents tendered in Milanovic's trial. She read excerpts from it last month to a gathering in Pozarevac, a few minutes from where her husband is jailed, and the careful sourcing, and use of quotes, apparently culled from NATO's extensive repertoire of obtuse, bellicose rhetoric, was reminiscent of what had so many upset about RTS in the first place.

Though it had been described as spewing propaganda – and perhaps Serbs could be forgiven, in the midst of a war of aggression, for journalistically unorthodox practices, such as animations of the NATO logo morphing into a swastika. After all, they were bombed mercilessly by the Nazis after the people demonstrated en masse against their government's extremely short-lived pact with Hitler, yelling "better grave than slave," and "better war than pact," and having endured Hitler's rule that 100 Serbs would be killed for each German, in the face of very fierce resistance and sabotage by the partisans. For Germany, as NATO combatant, to be dropping bombs on Belgrade again, for the first time anywhere, for that matter, since defeat in World War II, could provoke Serbian outrage.

What RTS did in addition to broadcasting swastikas, or mocking Clinton and Albright, was to show NATO destruction that Western media outlets were too delicate to report and broadcast to their viewers. The BBC's Allan Little suggested that NATO determined RTS to be a target because it was broadcasting NATO destruction and civilian killings, which would be the opposite of "disinformation," something more accurately called "journalism." And Western media was beginning to broadcast RTS pictures. Until April 23, 1999.

Not a single member of NATO has yet been asked to account for the lives of 16 media workers when portions of Radio Television Serbia's 4-floor building were reduced to 15 feet of rubble.

On the tenth anniversary of the bombing, Amnesty International issued a call for NATO to be held accountable for the lives of those killed at RTS: "The bombing of the headquarters of Serbian state radio and television was a deliberate attack on a civilian object and as such constitutes a war crime". Amnesty's Balkans expert, Sian Jones, pointed out that victims' families had never obtained redress for the consequences of this war crime, and that "ten years on, no public investigation has ever been conducted by NATO or its member states into these incidents."

NATO's response was quick, self-exculpatory, and essentially counterfactual. NATO spokeswoman Carmen Romero claimed the bombing had "been investigated thoroughly by the international war crimes tribunal for the former Yugoslavia as part of the overall investigation into the 1999 air campaign," and that it had been concluded that NATO had "no case to answer." Not quite right: the Hague Tribunal did not investigate the bombing; the prosecutor's office merely established a committee – whose members were never identified in the report – to examine whether an investigation was justified, and concluded, based largely on NATO's own press statements and evidence, that it was not. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) report describes its reliance on NATO evidence with a deadpan naiveté that might make Voltaire's Candide blush: "The committee has conducted its review relying essentially upon public documents, including statements made by NATO and NATO countries at press conferences and public documents produced by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It has tended to assume that the NATO and NATO countries' press statements are generally reliable and that explanations have been honestly given. The committee must note, however, that when the Office of The Prosecutor requested NATO to answer specific questions about specific incidents, the NATO reply was couched in general terms and failed to address the specific incidents. The committee has not spoken to those involved in directing or carrying out the bombing campaign."

That was that.

Not a single member of NATO has yet been asked to account for the lives of 16 media workers when portions of Radio Television Serbia's 4-floor building were reduced to 15 feet of rubble. Dragoljub Milanovic, still sitting in his office at RTS less than half an hour before a bomb killed 16 of his workers, languishes in jail for the results of crimes against the peace and violations of the Geneva and Helsinki Conventions, committed by NATO. **CP**

Tiphaine Dickson is a defense attorney specializing in international criminal law. She was the first woman, as lead counsel, to represent a person accused of genocide before a United Nations Tribunal. She can be reached at tiphainedickson@mac.com.

Did Custer Have it Coming?
Adventures in Indian Country

By James Abourezk

In the 1960s and continuing through the 1970s, some American Indians began organizing themselves to protest what they saw as an uncaring federal government. Poverty had reached a high level on most of the Indian reservations, and the agencies charged with dealing with the Indians – the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS) – were not giving much help. Not only were they seasoned bureaucracies, but, to make matters worse, they were not given enough money by Congress to deal with the problems created by decades of oppressive poverty, both in the cities to where the government had relocated a great many Indians, but also on the reservations, where most of them remained.

Indian militants – calling themselves the American Indian Movement (AIM) – decided that physical confrontation would be the only way to attract enough attention to right the wrongs of more than a century of neglect. AIM had a couple of slogans that were helpful in organizing Indians politically. One was, "Custer Had It Coming," and the other, created by Indian writer and intellectual Vine De Loria Jr., was set to music by the Sioux Indian folk singer Floyd Westerman, entitled, "Custer Died For Your Sins."

The federal government in the 19th century sought to settle the American West with non-Indians. The only obstacle to that settlement was the mass of Indian tribes scattered throughout the young country. The decision was made by the government either to kill the Indians or to begin moving them onto reservations, where they would not be in the way of the settlers. The government also ran a series of scams, which gave it legal cover to take Indian lands; then the lands were opened up for white settlement.

In the 19th century, the Indians had no concept of what selling or buying land meant. What they knew was that land was to be used by those who lived on it. Sale and purchase were unknown terms to them.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, the government convinced many of the Tribes to accept anywhere from 50 cents an acre to a $1 an acre for their land. What could not be purchased was simply taken by force. One glaring example was the Great Sioux Treaty of 1868, also known as the Ft. Laramie Treaty, named for the place in Wyoming where it was negotiated. The Treaty came about mostly because the U.S. Army learned the hard way that it was unable to inflict military defeat on the Sioux Indians, who, back then, moved freely through South Dakota, Wyoming and Nebraska. (The government doesn't negotiate treaties with anyone they can defeat). The Treaty asked the Sioux to withdraw to the west of the Missouri River in South Dakota, with the entire western part of the state, including the Black Hills, designated as the Great Sioux Reservation. The Treaty also reserved to the Sioux the Eastern part of Wyoming as their hunting grounds.

The story was that, after the battle, the Indian women punctured Custer's ears with an awl, so he could hear better when he arrived in the spirit world.

The 1868 Treaty lasted only until gold was discovered lying underneath the Black Hills in South Dakota. Gold was discovered in 1874, ironically by an expedition led by Col. George Armstrong Custer. When that news got out, prospectors flooded into the Black Hills, coming under attack by the Indians, whose complaints about the trespass to the government went unheeded.

The reaction of President Grant's administration to the unlawful trespass by the whites was to ask the Sioux to renegotiate the 1868 Treaty to facilitate moving them out of the way of the gold seekers, and onto reservations – just what the Indians didn't want.

The Sioux, of course, refused, which prompted President Grant to declare them as hostile renegades. He sent the U.S. Army out to bring in the Indians and herd them onto reservations by force.

Two years later, Grant's orders culminated in the battle that is called today the "Custer Massacre" by the whites, and the "Battle of The Greasy Grass" by the Indians. Although the Indians emerged as the victors in that battle, they began to disperse, fearing the massive retaliation from the Army that they were certain would ensue. Most were eventually captured and forced onto reservations. Sitting Bull, chief of the Minneconjou Sioux, fled with his band to Canada, where he stayed, returning to play a role in Buffalo Bill Cody's Wild West Show before he returned to the Standing Rock Reservation, which straddles the border between North and South Dakota.

The finale was by the river flowing through the area in Montana where the battle took place, the end result of Custer trying to round up the superior force of Sioux and Cheyenne Indians who happened to be camped there. We all know what happened next. Custer, along with all of his command, was killed in the battle. The whites called it a massacre, and the Indians called it victory in battle. After the fight, Indian women walked among the dead, mutilating the bodies of those dead soldiers who, when they were alive, had threatened the lives of Indian women and their children. The story was that, after the battle, the Indian women punctured Custer's ears with an awl, so he could hear better when he arrived in the spirit world.

In an earlier time, a U.S. Army officer, when told that the Indians under his charge were starving, was reputed to have said, "Let them eat grass." The same officer was killed in a different battle, when he attacked an Indian encampment, and his body was found with grass stuffed in his mouth.

The Sioux were among the last tribes to be defeated by the U.S. Army, offering perhaps the strongest resistance to total white domination during the 19th century. But by 1890, they had been totally destroyed. The government had taken their hunting grounds and their weapons away from them; had herded them onto reservations; and had forced them to live on meager handouts – rations that were often withheld, if it suited the whim of the corrupt Indian agents in charge.

The last gasp of Indian resistance to occupation by whites took place in 1890, at Wounded Knee Creek in southwestern South Dakota. In reaction to the misery that occupation had imposed on the Plains Indian tribes, a Paiute Indian from Nevada, by the name of Wovoka, developed a new religion called the "Ghost Dance." Wovoka, who had been raised by a white Christian family, combined the teachings of his Indian father, a Pauite holy man, with the teachings of Jesus, which he learned from his adoptive parents. He counseled the Indians, who sought his guidance to work willingly for the whites, to farm and to send their children to school. Meanwhile, by performing the Ghost Dance, he said, they would ultimately restore the dominance of the red man, bring back the buffalo, and make the white man disappear. His vision attracted the once free Indians, now living in unbearable conditions under the total control of the government and its often capricious Indian agents.

Like many of the Plains tribes, the Sioux sent a delegation to Nevada to learn the tenets of the new religion, so that they could return to teach them to the various Sioux tribes. When the Sioux delegates returned, however, they did a bit of revisionism with respect to the Ghost Dance. One of the Sioux delegates, Kicking Bear, introduced an element into the ritual that ultimately had serious repercussions for the tribe. He instructed the Sioux to wear a "Ghost Shirt," which he said would ward off the white man's bullets. The Ghost Shirt, the prayers and the Ghost Dance, the Sioux delegates told their people, would make the white man disappear. When the Army found out about the Ghost Dance, it frightened them, and they set out to stop the practice. Especially fearful of Sitting Bull and his followers on the Standing Rock Reservation, the government ordered his arrest, during which he was shot and killed by an Indian policeman.

In December 1890, one of the Minneconjou leaders, Chief Big Foot, left the Cheyenne River Reservation in northwestern South Dakota, leading his people southward to the Pine Ridge Reservation. He had decided to leave for two reasons. First, he was afraid of the Army's aggressive behavior. And, second, he had been asked to go to Pine Ridge to settle a dispute between some of the Oglala leaders there. Concerned that Big Foot had gone off to join the Ghost Dance craze that had overtaken many of the South Dakota reservations, the Army, specifically the Seventh Cavalry, set out to find him. They intercepted him in the Badlands of South Dakota and began escorting him southward toward Pine Ridge. Camping overnight at Wounded Knee Creek, the troopers surrounded the Indians, their heavy guns placed on a rise and aimed at the Indian camp below them. The next morning, the commander ordered the Indians disarmed. Resentful of the order, which would prevent them from hunting for food, the Indians stonewalled the soldiers as they searched them for weapons. Somehow during the search, one of the weapons being confiscated discharged. Both sides panicked, and the soldiers' ultimate response was to massacre 147 Indian men, women, and children. There were eyewitness accounts of mounted troopers, running down and killing fleeing women and children. The bodies were dumped into a mass grave on the hill where the Army's Hotchkiss guns had been set up.

Wounded Knee has been called, alternately, the last Indian war, a massacre, or the last day of the Sioux Nation. Ever since, it has been, understandably, of great symbolic importance to Sioux Indians.

Wounded Knee has been called, alternately, the last Indian war, a massacre, or the last day of the Sioux Nation. Ever since, it has been, understandably, of great symbolic importance to Sioux Indians. Some in the U.S. government, during the 1973 occupation, began calling it, "Pain In The Ass, South Dakota."

By the beginning of the 20th century, the government and its agents had assumed total control over the lives of the Indians, dictating the kind of homes they could live in, the quantity and quality of their food, and the nature of their education. The government treated the Indians as though they were children; then scoffed at them when they acted like children. The government created business-training programs for Indians that were designed to fail, then complained that the Indians could not succeed in business. It offered courses in farming to Indians whose entire culture was based on hunting, and professed to be mystified when the Indians were unable to master farming on demand. The Indians were kept in abject poverty; then the government wrung its hands, when alcoholism and suicide became rampant in Indian culture. The government prevented Indians from gaining equal access to social and cultural equality; then boasted that Indians were inferior to whites.

In 1934, Congress passed the Indian Reorganization Act, completely washing its hands of Indian affairs. It was a predictable response on the part of the body politic. Indians have no votes to speak of, and there is no campaign money to be extracted from the Indian reservations, so why should politicians spend time worrying about conditions there? The solution, as far as Congress was concerned, was to hand over the "Indian problem" (which is really more of a white problem) to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. This was done by providing blanket authorization to the BIA. It is no longer required, like other government agencies, to return to Congress every year to seek authorization of its programs. Instead, the BIA need only ask for money directly from the appropriations committees, which have no time to investigate whether programs are useful, successful, or just plain bad. Their decisions rest solely on how much money is available for Indian and other programs. Consequently, no one watches what the BIA bureaucracy does.

This brings us to the 20th century, a time – as I shall describe in the next instalment – when militant Indians began demanding that the government live up to the solemn promises it had made in the various treaties it signed. **CP**

To be continued.

James G. Abourezk is a lawyer practicing in South Dakota. He is a former United States senator and the author of Advise and Dissent, and a co-author of Through Different Eyes. Abourezk can be reached at georgepatton45@gmail.com.

COCKBURN CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

In this climate of conformism, conservatism and William Whyte's *Organization Man* – the campus had decided that students should not talk about "off campus issues" and should be protected from "outside agitators." Hence, Stiles Hall provided a meeting space for a wide variety of groups – socialists, libertarians, single-issue groups (farm workers, African studies, ACLU, SNCC support, student CORE, and so forth).

Walking into Stiles Hall, you'd find a large octagonal table covered with newspapers, the *Congressional Journal*, the *Catholic Worker*, the *Nation*, etc., and a contingent of people arguing politics over lunch. Bill Lockyer, currently treasurer of the state of California and formerly its attorney general, recalls that he "frequented Stiles Hall as a student to get radicalized during political discussions over lunch." Students were going to Quaker work camps on Indian reservations and migrant worker camps set up by Cecil Thomas, a life-long agitator for peace and justice. Joe Paff and some of his fellows went to the Central Valley to work with Catholic Worker priests and spend a few days with Dorothy Day.

Stiles Hall had been greatly shaped by the long-term influence of Harry Kingman – who had first worked there in 1916, leaving to fight in World War I, and in its aftermath spending six years in China. In China, Harry was a friend and teacher of some of the students arrested in the famous demonstrations at the international settlement over foreign companies exploiting (and shooting) workers. He wrote a letter defending the students that was translated and published throughout China, leading to his transfer from Shanghai to Tienstin. While a pariah to the westerners in China, he was quite famous with the Chinese. His *China Newsletter* of 1925 and 1926 was circulated worldwide, and letters of praise and requests for more information came from Senator Borah (the Idaho Republican and Senate chair of the Foreign Relations Committee), Mahatma Gandhi, Ramsay MacDonald, H.G. Wells, Lloyd George, and Bertrand Russell. At Tienstin, he met and became friend of then Lt. Col George Marshall.

Kingman finally returned to Stiles Hall in 1928. In the early 1930s, he made it his business to extend a welcoming and helpful hand to the 2,000 new students, many of them poor. All of them were invited to dinner by Stiles people, with Harry's wife, Ruth, cooking dinner for 500. Then Kingman looked around the area for jobs for them, and found just 25 available. A student came to him and said his father had been able to give him $3 for the entire semester, and after six weeks he'd already spent $1.50. This is when Harry organized the housing co-ops, where the students could live and cook. Clark Kerr and Robert McNamara were among those students. Stiles also provided meeting place for the Social Problems Club – accused by the campus administration of being a haunt of New Yorkers and Communists. Kingman also was active in creating a student minimum wage.

"Malcolm X was electric, the most extraordinary speaker I have ever heard. He changed everyone's life forever. You'd ask him a question, he'd look you in eye and repeat your question, then really go into it. Pretty soon people got scared of asking dumb questions."

These commitments to the First Amendment, equal housing, fair and equal wages were abiding principles. During the war, Harry Kingman and Stiles Hall were active and strong opponents of the internment of Japanese – not a common posture on the left, alas – and raised money to help the internees, make legal challenges and help to relocate released people. Older Japanese men in Joe's era in the late 1950s used to come in and beam and hail Kingman – who retired in 1957 – as a great man.

Kingman had to stand up to the Un-American Activities Committee, witch-hunting leftists. He fought back triumphantly. In 1946, when Harry was director of the Western Region of the Fair Employment Practices Committee, Ed Rutledge, whom he'd hired, had been called before one of the McCarthy committees. Kingman flew to Washington, stiffened Rutledge's resolve, and turned the tide. "We're going to fight this," he said, and they did.

Kingman retired from Stiles Hall in 1957 and went to Washington to form the Citizens Lobby for Freedom and Fair Play. He and his wife lobbied for 13 years – never raising more than $5,000 dollars to support this effort – living in one room and entertaining guests with food on paper plates.

An interesting Harry anecdote: when Joe McCarthy died, the flags were flying at half- staff. As Harry walked the streets of Washington, D.C., till he got to the Supreme Court, he saw that above the Court there was no half-staff flag. Harry found Justice Earl Warren to go to lunch and asked about it. A sly smile was the response.

Joe Paff went to Berkeley in 1957, then took 18 months off to avoid ROTC, came back to Berkeley from Europe and got an apartment in Stiles Hall, with duties that included opening and shutting the building and setting out chairs for meetings, a duty that often required nice judgment. One would not, for example, embarrass the score or so turning up for the Berkeley-Bulgaria Friendship Society by setting out 200 chairs. Sometimes, no one would show up. Norman Thomas drew 10 people, and Joe took him out and bought him pie by way of consolation.

By 1960, Joe was on the student council, running a weekly coffee hour with a speaker.

"I invited Dizzy Gillespie twice, Ralph Gleeson, Jean Renoir, the movie director who'd been sitting in his office with nothing to do. His son taught at Cal. I invited Linus Pauling and Martin Luther King Jr. I invited Mrs. Sobel when her husband Morton was in prison as a spy. Anti-communists came and made her cry. Young Caspar Weinberger running for state assembly drew no one to the meeting, so we went out and had lunch. John X came from the Open Temple, the first time any Black Muslim spoke in the Bay Area."

Joe invited Gus Hall, general secretary of the CPUSA, and Eric Hoffer. He got into trouble when he invited Vincent Hallinan to discuss the Gary Powers trial, which Vincent had attended in Moscow. Sheldon Wolin had given a lecture on Richard Hooker "coveting eccentricity."

A student who'd attended Wolin's lecture accused Joe of "coveting eccentricity" by inviting Hallinan, and the majority agreed with him.

Malcolm X was supposed to speak on campus in May of 1961, Joe reminisces, "but the University high command rejected him, saying he was a minister who might convert people to Islam. So Stiles Hall offered him a venue at the last minute, with no time for publicity and room for only 160. He was electric, the most extraordinary speaker I have ever heard. He changed everyone's life forever. You'd ask him a question, he'd look you in eye and repeat your question, then really go into it. All blacks sat together and not one of them acknowledged you when they left. Within a month, half the blacks were giving Malcolm's speech."

The 1960s rolled into motion. Stiles had long had a concept of incubating groups and activities that could soon stand alone and form independent groups. Berkeley's residential co-ops were a good example. Student activists soon followed the same policy. Fired by the gatherings in Stiles Hall, campus meetings became more politically conscious, more boisterous. Protests against bans on collecting money became more vigorous. It was not long before the Free Speech Movement was under way.

Many Stiles members became active in the civil rights movement – going to Mississippi, getting arrested, beaten. Many had been hosed off the steps of the San Francisco City Hall as the House Un-American Activities Committee held hearings inside. Thelton Henderson went south for the Justice Department – he was the first African American in the Civil Rights division – for two years until he was fired for loaning his car to Martin Luther King Jr. to drive to Selma. Henderson has remained all these years on the Stiles Board and was honored at the 125th anniversary. At 76, Henderson is senior judge in the federal Northern California division. It was Henderson who, in 2005, found that substandard medical care in the California prison system had violated prisoners' rights. In 2006, he appointed Robert Sillen as receiver to take over the health care system of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; he replaced Sillen with J. Clark Kelso in 2008. The Internal Affairs Division of the Oakland Police Department remains under his supervision.

"One could say that going to lunch at Stiles from 1957 to 1963," Joe concludes, "and going to the events, if combined with going to Pauline Kael's little movie theater and reading her extensive program notes, was a complete education. A carefully chosen small set of classes at UC would do the rest."

In the main ceremony celebrating the 125th anniversary, the mayor of Berkeley, Lonnie Hancock, and Chancellor Birgenau praised the Stiles (now directed by David Stark) programs replacing the affirmative action policies eliminated by proposition 209, responding to the great decline in minority students at Berkeley and the wide perception among them that they are not welcome. Students receive long-term tutoring starting in fifth or sixth grade and continuing for eight years to college admission. It's an expensive but effective program.

At the celebration, there was also the announcement of a large bequest for $750,000. No one recognized the benefactor's name, but investigation revealed he was someone passing through Berkeley circa World War II an having miraculously survived a horrendous battle, he recalled having only ever felt comfortable at Stiles Hall while a student at Berkeley. **CP**

Dickson