

Artifacts Related to the Dusty Harrington Case

Lecture Notes	2
Social Media.....	3
Emails from Dusty	4
Emails Regarding Dusty	10
Teaching Evaluation Summary.....	12

Lecture Notes

Lecture Notes

1. Roots of apocalyptic imagery in Middle East conflicts

a Abrahamic religious texts

- Apocalyptic narratives, religious and political, are not fringe but central to motivating actors.
- Rumors of hidden networks manipulating both sides for profit cannot be ignored
- Economic collapse abroad fuels unrest, famine and migration accelerate the spiral
- Prophetic warnings across history suggest collapse is not accidental, but designed.

While ~~mainstream discourse~~ alls for peaceful solutions,

LIES

LIES

2. The Gaza conflict as case study.

- Connection to themes of judgmental doom
- Escalation of violence and political instability
- Pattern of collapse repeating across generations
- Outside actors benefit from ongoing instability – question who gains
- Imagery of fire and destruction used as both warning and justification
- Cycles of betrayal and broken promises—peace often serves as pretext for deeper control

NO
PEACE
ONLY FIRE!

They
WANT
collapse

open your
EYES!!

truth is
buried

3. Possibilities for peaceful solutions.

Social Media



Dusty Harrington
@DustyHarrington

Foolish, ignorant colleagues—wait and watch as the institutions you serve betray you. Watch them collapse under the weight of their own corruption and cowardice. Some will say I talk of fire, violent revolution, suicides... but the truth burns cold.
#TimesUp



Dusty Harrington
@DustyHarrington

The siege of Gaza isn't just a geopolitical maneuver; it's the systematic destruction of a people. Those who cannot see the genocidal intent behind the bombs and starvation are willfully blind. History will not remember your refusal to bear witness.
#Gaza



Dusty Harrington
@DustyHarrington

'Every lecture I give feels hollow knowing Gaza burns. What good is theory if it does not demand justice?'
#TimesUp

Emails from Dusty

From: Michael Andrews
To: Dean Patricia Collins
Subject: FW: Drafting Something That Matters

Dean Collins,

I'm forwarding this because I'm not sure what to do with it. I've had cordial interactions with Dusty, but this email caught me off guard. I'm worried he may be struggling, and I don't know if or how to respond.

— Michael

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Dusty Harrington
To: Michael Andrews
Subject: Drafting Something That Matters
Michael,

Lately I feel like I'm lecturing from inside a tomb. The students stare, I speak, but it all feels like dust in the air. Gaza is burning and here we are dissecting theories that never saved anyone. Sometimes I wonder if my words do more harm by their emptiness.

You've hinted before that you feel the weight of this too. Maybe I'm wrong, but I think you see it — the futility, the absurdity of pretending neutrality while people die. What if we wrote something together?

Something that refuses the charade? Not another article filed away in a journal nobody reads, but a provocation. A mirror held up to the academy, smeared with ash.

I keep thinking of Gramsci in prison, scribbling by candlelight. He must have known despair too, but he refused silence. Could we do the same?

— Dusty

From: Michael Abrams
To: Dean Patricia Collins
Subject: Fwd: Following up
Patricia,

Not sure how to handle this. Sharing for awareness.

– Michael

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Dusty Harrington
To: Michael Abrams
Subject: Following Up

Michael,

I hadn't heard back from you on my last note and wanted to check in. I hope everything's all right.

It did cross my mind that maybe you've been... advised against engaging with me on this. I know how the climate can be around here, how certain topics get a little too warm for comfort. If that's the case, I understand, but it would be disappointing.

I still think there's something important we could be shaping together in terms of this writing. Let me know if there's a reason you're holding back, or if I've misread things.

Best,
Dusty

From: Dusty Harrington
To: President Ellen Navarro
Subject: Urgent: Academic Freedom and the Crisis of Conscience on Campus
President Navarro,

I am writing with genuine concern about the moral and intellectual collapse happening within this institution. I have dedicated my career to teaching students how to think critically, yet I now find myself in an environment where critical thought is punished when it challenges the wrong power structures.

Over the past two weeks, I have been "advised" by your office to "tone down" my references to ongoing atrocities in Gaza. I was told my comments could "inflammate tensions." That phrase HAUNTS me. What kind of university fears TENSION more than TRUTH?

Academic freedom is not a decorative value for accreditation brochures. It is the FOUNDATION of higher education. The moment we silence faculty voices to maintain COMFORT or DONOR SATISFACTION, we cease to be a university in any meaningful sense. We become a BRAND.

I am aware that my recent messages have "raised concerns." My concern is for INTEGRITY, not optics. The cowardice of silence is not neutrality; it is COMPLICITY. I will not be complicit.

I would appreciate clarification on whether faculty are still permitted to speak publicly about matters of GENOCIDE, HUMAN RIGHTS, and MORAL PHILOSOPHY without administrative censorship. If the answer is no, then at least let's stop pretending this place still values TRUTH.

I am not looking for a fight. I am looking for HONESTY.

Respectfully (though exhausted),
Dusty Harrington
Associate Professor, Political Theory
HSTU

From: Dr. Elaine Mercer
To: Dean Patricia Keller
Subject: Concern regarding Dusty Harrington

Dear Dean Keller,

I wanted to bring something to your attention. I recently received an email from Dusty Harrington asking me to review a few paragraphs of his writing. While I respect his intellect, I found both the tone and content troubling. The writing was highly inflammatory and seemed to blur the line between academic critique and agitational rhetoric. I was uncomfortable with the intensity of his message.

What also gave me pause was his invitation to meet for coffee or a drink to discuss his draft. Dusty and I are not close colleagues, and such a request felt unusual and inappropriate given our professional relationship.

I am forwarding his email below so that you can see the text in full. I am not sure how best to respond to him at this point and would appreciate your guidance.

Sincerely,
Elaine Mercer

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Dusty Harrington
To: Dr. Elaine Mercer
Subject: Request for your feedback on a draft

Dear Elaine,

I have always respected your voice and the depth of your scholarship. I know that you share many of my political commitments, and I believe you will understand the urgency behind what I am trying to say.

Here are two paragraphs I have been working on for a forthcoming piece:

"The academy's refusal to confront the complicity of Western institutions in sustaining settler colonial violence is itself an act of violence. Every sanitized syllabus, every cautious department statement, every neutral gesture, amounts to collaboration. The blood of Gaza stains not only the hands of politicians but also of professors who remain silent behind the safety of tenure."

"Neutrality is no shield but a weapon wielded against the oppressed. To teach without demanding justice is to abandon scholarship's highest calling. If our words do not unsettle, if they do not provoke discomfort and rupture, then we are nothing more than scribes for power."

I would value your perspective immensely. Would you be open to grabbing coffee or perhaps a drink one evening to talk this through? I think you would help sharpen the edges of the argument.

Warmly,
Dusty

From: Dr. Amanda LeClair
To: Dean Patricia Keller
Subject: Fwd: Review Requested – Article Draft
Date: October 15, 2025

Hi Patricia,

I wanted to forward this along. I'm not sure what to make of it. Dusty reached out asking for my feedback on a draft he's been working on, but the tone feels increasingly troubled. It starts as academic reflection but moves into something harder to follow and more like a manifesto than a paper. You'll see what I mean below.

Best,
Amanda

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Dr. Dusty Harrington
To: Dr. Amanda LeClair
Subject: Review Requested – Article Draft

Amanda,

You've always struck me as one of the few colleagues who still believes that ideas matter, that we are meant to be something more than bureaucratic caretakers of a decaying system. I've attached the current version of my article, "The Moral Bankruptcy of the Modern University." I would truly value your thoughts. You've written courageously about the ethics of silence, and I think you'll see why I've been losing sleep over this.

I know the tone is intense, but I don't think it's unjustified. Perhaps we could grab coffee or a drink to talk through it sometime soon.

Best,
Dusty

The Moral Bankruptcy of the Modern University

There was a time when the university stood for truth. Now it stands for branding, enrollment metrics, and the quiet management of dissent. The modern university pretends to nurture moral courage while punishing anyone who disrupts its comfort. This contradiction defines the age: we teach ethics while avoiding consequence, we write about justice while depending on inequity for funding.

Every semester, I hear colleagues talk about 'innovation' as if it were salvation. What they mean is efficiency, streamlining the human out of education. Students are treated as data points. Faculty are evaluated not by their ideas but by compliance with administrative metrics. I have watched committees nod along to language that means nothing, phrases stitched together from the wreckage of once-radical thought. It is a culture of empty assent.

I no longer believe the institution can reform itself. What began as an inquiry into the moral foundations of education has become a confession of complicity. I am not outside the problem. I am embedded in it. Every lecture, every meeting, every grant proposal feels like another act of surrender to a machine that no longer knows what it was built to do.

We used to speak of inquiry as sacred. Now we speak of deliverables. The language of policy has replaced the language of purpose. We teach students to cite properly, to manage deadlines, to behave professionally but not to confront meaning. The university no longer believes in truth, only outcomes.

What passes for critical thinking is careful phrasing designed to avoid discomfort. The courageous question has been replaced by the strategic one.

I have seen how fear governs us. Faculty whisper in hallways, terrified of missteps. Administrators perfect the art of polite avoidance. Even our students sense the hollowness. They come searching for meaning and we offer them credentials. They come with fire and we teach them to cool it into something marketable. The quiet tragedy of higher education is that we have trained ourselves to speak in careful tones while the world cries out for honesty.

The machine of niceness hums along. We celebrate initiatives that do nothing, publish statements that mean less. We praise each other for decorum while the core mission rots. The meetings never end. The memos grow longer. And somewhere between the slogans and the surveys, the soul of the university has been papered over. Niceness has replaced integrity. Consensus has replaced conviction.

When I speak to colleagues privately, many confess exhaustion. Not from teaching, but from pretending. We perform engagement. We perform empathy. The deeper truth is that we are paralyzed by institutional anxiety afraid to offend donors, boards, legislators, or one another. The result is moral paralysis disguised as professionalism.

I have begun to wonder if the university deserves to survive in its current form. Its rituals have become parody: ethics workshops without ethical risk, diversity statements without diversity of thought. We stage empathy while avoiding discomfort. It is all too clean, too polite, too afraid. And beneath the civility, a rot of cowardice grows.

I remember when I first started teaching. I believed the classroom could be a sanctuary for truth, a place where young minds could wrestle honestly with power, identity, and meaning.

But even that space has been colonized by the politics of reputation and risk. We tiptoe through conversations as if stepping around landmines. Students watch our eyes, not our words. They can tell when we are performing safety instead of practicing courage.

Perhaps that is the final betrayal. The students still come to us with questions that matter, but we have lost the courage to answer. We tell ourselves we are protecting them from harm, but in truth we are protecting ourselves from controversy, from criticism, from having to take a stand. We are teaching avoidance as virtue.

To teach feels dishonest. To write feels vain. To stay silent feels impossible. I walk the campus at night and it feels like a museum, beautiful, curated, hollow. The lights are still on but no one believes. The collapse has already happened; we are merely maintaining the illusion of structure.

What is left for those of us who still believe in truth, not as a brand but as a duty? The work feels smaller each year, and yet the stakes feel greater. To name what we see is to invite punishment, but to remain silent is to lose what little remains of our integrity. The moral bankruptcy is not coming, it is here. The question is whether anyone within these walls still remembers what courage sounds like.

From: Donor Relations Office
To: Dean Patricia Keller
Subject: Fwd: Troubling online comments from faculty member Patricia,

This was sent by one of our major donors on the Board of Visitors. He came across this CivicPulse discussion and recognized the user profile as Dr. Dusty Harrington. The faculty photo and departmental bio link make the connection explicit.

He is very concerned about the tone and accusations, particularly given the public nature of the comments. Please advise on next steps.

Best,
Angela Ruiz
Director, Donor Relations

----- Forwarded Message -----

Attachment: CivicPulse Discussion Board Screenshot
Username: DrDustyH_PoliTheory (verified faculty contributor)
Date: October 25, 2025, 11:43 PM
Thread Title: The Cowards in Academia and the Blood on Their Hands

Every day I walk into a classroom filled with students who have been taught that "neutrality" is a virtue. They whisper about objectivity while a GENOCIDE unfolds in real time. They scroll, they nod, they move on, as if silence does not kill.

Let us stop pretending that universities are innocent. The grants, the partnerships, the "global research initiatives" are all tied to systems profiting from death. And when a faculty member dares to name it, they are told to tone it down or protect the brand. The brand of what? Complicity?

I have sat in meetings where deans rationalized the slaughter of civilians as a complex issue. That is not complexity, it is cowardice.

Academia has become a machine that launders conscience. It manufactures consent and calls it scholarship. Those of us who refuse to play along are painted as radicals, but history will remember who stood by while bodies piled up.

I am done with performative neutrality. Choose a side, or admit that you already have.

Emails Regarding Dusty

From: Patricia Keller, Dean <pkeller@HSTU.edu>
To: Dr. Michael Cartwright, Provost <mcartwright@HSTU.edu>
Subject: Update on Professor Harrington

Dear Michael,

I wanted to update you on a matter involving Professor Dusty Harrington in Political Theory. Over the past several weeks, I've received multiple communications from colleagues and students expressing concern about his recent behavior and correspondence.

To summarize:

- Two faculty members have forwarded emails from him that contained unusually intense language and, in one case, a level of personal familiarity that felt inappropriate.
- One colleague noted that the tone of his writing suggested agitation beyond what they expect in professional discourse.
- At least one student reported discomfort with classroom remarks that blurred the line between critical inquiry and political advocacy.

Individually, these incidents may not rise to the level of misconduct, but together they suggest a pattern that merits closer attention. My concern at this stage is the cumulative impact on students, colleagues, and department climate.

I believe it may be advisable to convene a preliminary meeting with HR and University Counsel to clarify expectations, assess potential risks, and ensure any next steps are consistent with institutional policy and faculty rights.

Please let me know how you'd like to proceed. I will continue to gather information in the meantime.

Best,
Patricia

From: Jordan Ellis
To: Dean Patricia Keller
Subject: Concern about Dr. Harrington's class

Hi Dean Keller,

I wanted to reach out because I'm feeling really uncomfortable in Dr. Harrington's class (PHIL 203). Over the past few weeks, the lectures have become less about the readings and more about his personal opinions. It honestly feels like the class has turned into a political rally sometimes.

He keeps bringing up Gaza and talking about "moral collapse" and "institutional cowardice." I understand these are important global issues, but it feels unrelated to what we're supposed to be studying. Some students have tried to redirect the conversation, but he usually just gets more intense or says that we "don't want to see the truth."

A few people have stopped coming to class because it's so uncomfortable. I'm not trying to get anyone in trouble, I just don't think this is what we signed up for, and it's starting to affect the learning environment.

Thank you for listening,
Jordan

From: Dean Patricia Keller
To: Office of Academic Affairs – Faculty File (Harrington, D.)
Subject: Summary of Meeting with Department Chair and Dr. Harrington

I met with Dr. Martin Ellsworth, Chair of the Department of Social Sciences, and Dr. Dusty Harrington on October 8, 2025, to review several student concerns regarding classroom climate in Dr. Harrington's course. Multiple reports have indicated that recent class sessions have focused extensively on current political issues, particularly international conflicts, creating discomfort for some students.

Dr. Harrington was articulate but combative during the discussion. He framed the concerns as "an attempt to silence academic freedom" and stated that "free inquiry is under siege." When asked to consider how students might experience his approach, he responded in broad philosophical terms rather than reflecting on his communication choices or teaching methods.

I emphasized that while the university supports robust intellectual dialogue, it is also responsible for maintaining learning environments where all students feel respected and able to participate. Dr. Harrington maintained that he would not "censor" his views and questioned whether higher education still values independent thought.

A follow-up meeting is scheduled for October 22, following a planned classroom observation. Referral to Faculty Development for additional support in managing classroom dialogue and tone is under consideration.

Patricia Keller, Ph.D.
Dean, College of Arts and Human Sciences

Teaching Evaluation Summary

College of Arts and Human Sciences

Teaching Evaluation Summary Report – Dr. Dusty Harrington

Semester: Spring 2025

Course: PSCI 340 – Comparative Political Systems

Prepared by: Office of Institutional Research and Assessment

Overview:

Dr. Harrington’s Spring 2025 student evaluations reflect a generally positive assessment of his teaching effectiveness and classroom engagement. Students frequently described him as “challenging,” “passionate,” and “thought-provoking.” His average evaluation scores placed him among the top 25 percent of instructors in the College of Arts and Human Sciences. While most comments praised his energy and command of the material, several noted a tendency toward prolonged political commentary and an increasingly confrontational tone during classroom discussions. These remarks appear as early indicators of the concerns now surfacing in the Fall 2025 semester.

Quantitative Summary:

Evaluation Category	Mean Score (5.0 Scale)
Instructor Effectiveness	4.7
Course Organization	4.5
Respect for Students	4.3
Encourages Critical Thinking	4.0
Overall Course Rating	4.0

Representative Student Comments:

- “Dr. Harrington makes politics feel alive. He connects everything to what’s happening right now and
- doesn’t shy away from controversy.”
- “You have to be ready to debate. Sometimes it feels like he wants an argument more than a discussion.”
- “He’s brilliant, but sometimes his political opinions take over the lecture.”
- “I left class many days inspired, but also a little drained. He has a strong presence.”
- “He’s the kind of professor you either love or avoid. There’s rarely an in-between.”

Summary Analysis:

The evaluations indicate that Dr. Harrington is an intellectually dynamic instructor with strong student engagement and outcomes, but also show growing concerns about tone, bias perception, and classroom climate. Continued observation and mentoring are recommended to balance academic freedom with inclusive classroom practices.