

From: Sam Harris <sam@samharris.org> (Add as Preferred Sender) <https://>

Date: Mon, Oct 21, 2013 9:24 am

To: cj@cjwerleman.com

Interesting, CJ. Did you actually read my blog post, or just the Salon hit piece?

Sam

Date: Mon, Oct 21, 2013 9:46 am

To: "Sam Harris" <sam@samharris.org>

Hi Sam,

No, I didn't read your blog. Having said that, I actually disagreed with much of the Salon piece. In fact, I think it spun your words to serve its own agenda.

My disagreement is with your broader position on Islamic terrorism. I believe it's motivated purely by political objective. You believe it starts and ends with religious fundamentalism, and whether you intend to or not, it makes us atheists sound eerily similar to those who speak from the right wing echo chamber.

Obviously, that's harsh criticism given your service to atheism. You have liberated millions of minds, and I count myself as one of your fans. But on the subject of Islam, I believe you miss the point. It's a travesty, because you have the influence to change minds and foreign policy....but your comments get used to justify neo-conservatism.

I appreciate your note.

Cheers

CJ

From: Sam Harris (Add as Preferred Sender) <https://email05.secureserver.net/search.php>
<sam@samharris.org>

Date: Mon, Oct 21, 2013 11:05 am

To: <cj@cjwerleman.com>

Incredible... You brand me the "Pat Robertson of atheism," linking to this drivel on Salon and forwarding to thousands of people, without ever checking to see if the writer has misrepresented my views (which he has, in every relevant respect).

And then you want me to debate you?

To: "Sam Harris" <sam@samharris.org>

Bcc:

Ha, I see your point :)

I often err on the side of extreme rhetoric to make a point. Do I think you're the PR of atheism? No. And I owe you an apology on that, and I have deleted that tweet. But the rhetoric that comes from those who lean towards an anti-Islam position over an anti-foreign policy position sounds a little PR/FOX/Coulter like, which ultimately serves to keep the country making poor errors of judgment when it comes to our use of the military.

CJ

: Sam Harris (Add as
<sam@samharris.org> Preferred <https://email05.secureserver.net/search.php>
Sender)

Date: Sat, Oct 26, 2013 11:06 pm

To: "<cj@cjwerleman.com>" <cj@cjwerleman.com>

So I've been oblivious to the problem of
wealth inequality? Really?

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sam-harris/a-new-years-resolution-fo_b_802480.html

<http://www.samharris.org/blog/item/how-rich-is-too-rich>

<http://www.samharris.org/blog/item/how-to-lose-readers-without-even-trying>

From: <cj@cjwerleman.com> (Add as
Preferred <https://email05.secureserver.net/search.php>
Sender)

Date: Sun, Oct 27, 2013 4:31 pm

To: "Sam Harris" <sam@samharris.org>

Hi Sam,

If you read the piece again, you will see I was specifically referring to the atheist movement's lack of attention given to wealth inequality. Moreover, I defined the atheist movement not as individuals, authors or thought leaders, but rather as the 2,000+ atheist groups/organizations.

Cheers

CJ

From: Sam Harris (Add as Preferred Sender) <sam@samharris.org> <https://email05.secureserver.net/search.php>

Date: Sun, Oct 27, 2013 7:14 pm

To: <cj@cjwerleman.com> <cj@cjwerleman.com>

It's remarkable that you think I'm being prickly and self-absorbed here. First, you retweet a libelous attack on me and brand me the Pat Robertson of atheism. When I confront you about this, you admit that you never took the time to read my original blog post. You then write an astonishingly self-serving piece in which you divulge the contents of my private email to you without my permission (do you really not know how uncool that is?) titled, "Atheist Authors Feud Over Islamic Extremism." We're feuding? I never heard of you until I read your tweet. And we're not debating Islamic extremism--we're talking about how callously you've been sniping at me. (From what I can tell, you are completely deluded about Islamic extremism.) You then write another piece in which you again attack me by name, "honoring" me as one of the founders of the movement that has so scandalously ignored the problem of wealth inequality. When I show you that I've written three long articles on the topic, you dodge and put the onus on me: "Mate, the piece wasn't about you." Oh, I'm sorry. There goes my narcissism again.

My only purpose in engaging you has been to try to get you to recognize how unprofessional your behavior has been. This is a lesson you don't seem willing to learn.

In any case, I'm done. Good luck. At this rate, you will need a lot of it.

Sam

From: <cj@cjwerleman.com> (Add as Preferred Sender) <https://email05.secureserver.net/search.php>

[Sender\)](#)

Date: Sun, Oct 27, 2013 7:42 pm

To: "Sam Harris" <sam@samharris.org>

From: cj@cjwerleman.com [\(Add as Preferred Sender\)](#) <https://email05.secureserver.net/search.php>

Date: Sun, Oct 27, 2013 7:42 pm

To: "Sam Harris" <sam@samharris.org>

I may know a little more about Islamic extremism than you give me credit for. Some of my best friends are Muslims. Ok, that's me being a smart arse. But not only did I reside in the most populous Muslim nation, Indonesia, for the 10 decade starting 2002 - having narrowly escaped the Sari night club bomb on 02, and then not only witnessing the 2005 bombs at Jimbaran but being one of the first responders - I have also spent significant time in Mid East.

You're an academic (I am not), so what I find troubling is that you've produced no peer-reviewed articles on terrorism, nor have you accumulated data on terrorism. Moreover, there is absolutey no interest from intelligence communities or governments agencies for your writings on terrorism. Yet you not only present yourself as an expert, but also proceed to smear real experts like Robert Pape and Scott Atran. In fact, from reading your critiques of Pape and Atran, three conclusions can be drawn: 1) You have not read their work 2) You read their work but did not understand it 3) You have misrepresented them.

Sam, you're far higher up the intellectual rung than I am. It should embarrass you to be even debating someone of my modest journalistic/wring standings. But I think it's helpful for the atheist movement to hear/have this debate. Nay, it's important that America/UK has this Islamic terrorism debate because too many think the "terrorists hate us for our freedumbs."

Yes, it was grabby of me to declare our email exchange a feud for the purpose of a hack headline. But you need to understand where I'm coming from: As an Australian living in the U.S., I am incredibly frustrated by the lack of meaningful debate when it comes to foreign policy, especially by the mainstream media. Obviously guys like Jeremy Scahill and Greenwald are doing a great job but they're marginalized here in Dumbfuckistan.

So, with that in mind - I think a public spat over Islamic terrorism between two atheist authors has the potential to get this debate in the public square. It's a win-win. You win the argument, then you will awaken more minds to the dangers of Islam. I win, then I awaken minds to the retardness of our

foreign policy and wasteful spending on the military industrial complex.

P.S: I'm actually a pretty good bloke :)

Cheers mate

CJ