

Facts Count

An Analysis of David Horowitz's
The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America

Free Exchange on Campus

May 2006

“It is more important to teach
students how to think
than what to think.”

-Professor Marc Becker, one
of the “101 Most Dangerous
Academics in America”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines David Horowitz's book, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America* (Regnery, 2006), which brings up 101 academics on charges of indoctrinating their students with their political views. Since Mr. Horowitz's charges are aimed at the core of professors' professional ethics, we believe that they are not to be taken lightly. For Mr. Horowitz to accuse a single person of these charges—let alone 101—a reasonable person might expect him to do three things: examine the facts objectively, support his conclusions with sound evidence, and make recommendations that are in students' best interests. We believe that Mr. Horowitz fails on all of these counts.

After conducting interviews with the professors in Mr. Horowitz's book and fact-checking Mr. Horowitz's evidence, the Free Exchange on Campus coalition has drawn the following conclusions:

- **Mr. Horowitz's book condemns professors for actions that are entirely within their rights and entirely appropriate in an atmosphere that promotes the free exchange of ideas.** Mr. Horowitz chiefly condemns professors for expressing their personal political views outside of the classroom. He provides scant evidence of professors' in-class behavior and fails to substantiate his charge that the professors in his book indoctrinate their students. What in-class evidence he does provide largely demonstrates nothing other than that the professors in his book emphasize critical, minority, or historically underrepresented viewpoints in their teaching.
- **Mr. Horowitz's research is sloppy in the extreme and, we believe, manipulated to fit his arguments.** Mr. Horowitz's book is characterized by inaccuracies, distortions, and manipulations of fact—including false statements, mischaracterizations of professors' views, broad claims unsupported by facts, and selective omissions of information that does not fit his argument.
- **In our view, Mr. Horowitz's conclusions are based on faulty premises.** Mr. Horowitz's conclusions are based on the premises that America's colleges and universities are failing to ensure students' academic freedom, and that students lack the critical thinking skills they need to engage with controversial ideas and decide what they believe for themselves. We believe both premises are false.

There are other troubling aspects of Mr. Horowitz's book. For example, in our view, the tone and format of *The Professors* strongly evokes a blacklist. While Mr. Horowitz does not call for the professors in his book to be fired, he does list them by their full names and places of business, he does condemn them for their political beliefs, he does (as this report will show) distort evidence in the service of leveling unsubstantiated allegations, and he does exclude any opposing points of view—all as part of a well-publicized and well-funded media campaign. In tactics we found to be eerily reminiscent of a bygone era, Mr. Horowitz's book also speaks approvingly of students who started a "Watch List," condemns professors for their associations with political organizations, and issues an apologia for Senator Joseph McCarthy.¹

However, in this report, we limit our focus to disproving Mr. Horowitz's allegations and conclusions on the basis of facts that can be verified by objective observers. As we hope readers will agree, *The Professors* provides more than enough fodder for concern on this score alone.

¹ For Mr. Horowitz's reference to the students who made a watch list, see David Horowitz, *The Professors*, Regnery Press: Washington, D.C., 2006; 239. For examples of professors who are condemned for their associations with left-leaning political organizations, see Horowitz, chapters on Professors Anton (11-12), Falk (160-63), and Estrada (152-55), among others. Mr. Horowitz's apologia for the tactics of Senator Joseph McCarthy appears in his chapter on Professor Victor Navasky (292-95). Mr. Horowitz writes, "It is now known, except for holdouts like Professor Navasky, that McCarthy underestimated the extent of Soviet infiltration in the American government and that virtually all individuals called before congressional committees were involved in a conspiratorial network controlled by the Kremlin" (294). Mr. Horowitz bases this statement on a book on Soviet intelligence by historians Harvey Klehr, John Earl Haynes, and Kyrill M. Anderson (Yale University Press, 1998) which does not make this claim. The Venona intercepts are a set of secret Soviet cables that were declassified in the mid-1990s. Many mainstream historians agree that they appear to provide further evidence implicating Alger Hiss and Julius and Ethel Rosenberg as Soviet spies. However, Mr. Horowitz's much broader claim that the intercepts implicate "virtually all individuals called before congressional committees" as being "involved in a conspiratorial network controlled by the Kremlin," is false.

PART ONE: FINDINGS

I. Lack of Evidence

In the introduction to *The Professors*, Mr. Horowitz claims that he is concerned with the “professorial task” of teaching—that his chief concern lies not with what professors teach or with their personal political beliefs, but with how they conduct themselves inside their classrooms. We believe that precisely the reverse is true. Throughout his book, Mr. Horowitz provides scant evidence of what goes on inside of professors’ classrooms, and instead focuses chiefly on the political opinions they express outside of their classrooms.² Without sound evidence of what goes on inside professors’ classrooms, we believe it is absurd for Mr. Horowitz to charge them with something as serious as indoctrinating their students.

Getting a handle on Mr. Horowitz’s definition of “indoctrination” is difficult, since he defines it in a number of ways throughout his book. “In the strictest lexicographical sense,” he writes in the introduction, indoctrination means “to imbue with a partisan or ideological point of view.”³ Elsewhere in his book, he portrays it as when professors “impose their biases on students as if they were scientific fact”; “use the authority of the classroom to force students to adopt their positions”; or engage in “the arbitrary imposition of personal opinions and prejudices on students, enforced through the power of the grading process and the authority of the institutions they represent.”⁴

For the purposes of this analysis, we created a working definition of indoctrination based on Mr. Horowitz’s various descriptions of the term. We assume that to be reasonably deemed as indoctrinating their students, professors would have to do two things: first, they must teach one side of an issue to the exclusion of all others, and second, they must treat students who disagree with their political views unfairly—by harassing them, or especially by giving them lower grades.

Not once in Mr. Horowitz’s book do we see proof that a single professor teaches his or her own political views to the exclusion of all others, and nowhere does Mr. Horowitz provide a single example of a student whose grade was lowered because of his or her political beliefs.

² Mr. Horowitz’s attitude towards in-class evidence was aptly revealed by a student reporter at Truman State University, who questioned Mr. Horowitz about how he knew what went on inside “dangerous” Professor Marc Becker’s classroom. Mr. Horowitz responded, “I don’t have to be in his class or interview somebody from his class to know that there’s something wrong here”; Ian Vickers, *Truman Index*, 3/2/06.

³ Horowitz, xxiv.

⁴ Horowitz, xxvi; xlv; xxvii.

Indeed, for a book that is ostensibly about students' rights, student voices are pointedly absent. Our analysis finds that student testimonials are absent from 87 of the 100 profiles (not 101, as the title and chapter heading indicate) in Mr. Horowitz's book.

Of the 13 that do appear, all are problematic as far as Mr. Horowitz's indoctrination argument is concerned. Two are irrelevant to this charge; two come from a website where students post dozens (sometimes hundreds) of anonymous opinions about their professors and where researchers can cherry-pick from the wide array of viewpoints expressed on any given professor.⁵ Three are allegations that were investigated and proven groundless by university officials well before *The Professors* was published; another was investigated and summarily dealt with by the university, and even this complaint did not allege that a professor taught one side of an issue to the exclusion of all others or downgraded a student based on his or her political views.⁶ One statement that negatively characterizes students' opinions of their professor is not supported by the evidence Mr. Horowitz cites, and another is not supported with any evidence at all.⁷

Of the three remaining testimonials, not a single one alleges that a professor taught one side of an issue to the exclusion of all others, or that a professor downgraded a student based on his or her political views, and in none of these instances did students attempt to address their grievances through existing university channels.

Overall, the majority of the profiles in Mr. Horowitz's book contain no evidence of professors' in-class conduct whatsoever. As an analysis by Media Matters shows, 52 of the 100 profiles in Mr. Horowitz's book are based exclusively on things professors have said or written outside of their classrooms. Our own count of Mr. Horowitz's footnotes

⁵ The first irrelevant charge appears in Mr. Horowitz's chapters on Professor Aptheker, where Mr. Horowitz quotes a student who complains that Aptheker focuses "way too much on personal history" (14); the second appears in the chapter on Professor Austin, where Mr. Horowitz quotes a student who said that one of Austin's courses "resonated personally with me especially as a Latina" (27). The two "website" allegations appear in the chapters on Professors Furr (188-89) and McCloud (264); both come from the website RateMyProfessors.com (RMP).

⁶ The three complaints that were investigated and proven groundless by university officials appear in the chapters on Professors Dunkley (128-31), Parmar (296-99), and Wolfe (354-57); for proof of the groundless nature of the claims against these professors, see the chapters on Parmar and Wolfe in this report; for Dunkley, see Scott Jaschik, "Tattered Poster Child," *InsideHigherEd.com*, 3/15/05. The complaint that was investigated by the university and found to have merit appears in the chapter on Professor Massad (271-76).

⁷ In his chapter on Professor Bell, Mr. Horowitz writes that "many" of Professor Bell's students "complained that he was not using his lecture time to teach principles of law, but rather as a platform from which to indoctrinate his captive audience to his left-wing theories and worldviews" (58). The citation for this statement refers to a webpage entitled, "The History of Critical Race Theory." The webpage provides a brief overview of critical race theory but makes no reference to Professor Bell's students' opinion of their professor, and does not provide any evidence that they complained that he was using his lectures "as a platform from which to indoctrinate his captive audience to his left-wing theories and worldviews," as Mr. Horowitz claims; the webpage is here: <http://www.edb.utexas.edu/faculty/scheurich/proj7/crthistory.htm>. The un-sourced statement appears in Mr. Horowitz's chapter on Professor Jeffries (235).

reveals that overall, approximately 80 percent of the evidence he presents relates to things professors have said or written outside of the classroom.⁸

To the extent that Mr. Horowitz cites anything at all about what goes on in the classrooms of the professors he profiles, his evidence usually amounts to materials that can be found on the internet, such as syllabi or short course descriptions—not accounts from people who have taken courses with the professors, or who have sat in on their lectures, or who have participated in class discussions. In short, eyewitness accounts of any kind are altogether absent from the overwhelming majority of the profiles in Mr. Horowitz’s book.

Furthermore, most of the syllabi, course descriptions and the few other teaching materials that Mr. Horowitz does present tend to show nothing other than that the professors teach what they claim to teach: courses in fields that Mr. Horowitz categorizes as “ideological,” such as ethnic studies, feminism, or peace studies; viewpoints that represent the perspectives of minority, oppressed, or historically underrepresented groups; or perspectives that are critical of certain policies of the United States government.⁹

Indeed, teaching these types of alternative viewpoints is a common thread uniting all of the professors in Mr. Horowitz’s book. Throughout his book, Mr. Horowitz condemns professors simply for teaching them. For example:

- Mr. Horowitz condemns Professor Bettina Aptheker for “inject[ing] a women-centered perspective” into her courses on feminism.¹⁰
- Mr. Horowitz condemns Professor Regina Austin for teaching her students “to analyze legal disputes ‘from the perspective of groups of subordinate status.’”¹¹
- Mr. Horowitz condemns Professor Matthew Evangelista for teaching foreign policy courses that are critical of certain policies of the United States government and which include concepts such as gender and nationalism in their analysis.¹²
- Mr. Horowitz condemns Professor Lewis Gordon for including “contributions from Africana and Eastern thought” in his course on existentialism because existentialism “was exclusively the creation of European thinkers from Kierkegaard to Sartre”—and therefore, according to Mr. Horowitz, Professor

⁸ <http://mediamatters.org/items/200604180011>. For examples of chapters containing only evidence of professors’ utterances and writings outside the classroom, see Mr. Horowitz’s chapters on Professors Foner (177-79), Hooks (223-26) and McChesney (260-62), along with 45 others. Our count of 80 percent probably underestimates the overall percentage of Mr. Horowitz’s evidence that relates solely to things professors have said or written outside of the classroom.

⁹ For Mr. Horowitz’s description of “ideological” fields of study, see Horowitz, xxv.

¹⁰ Horowitz, 14.

¹¹ Ibid., 26.

¹² Ibid., 156-59.

Gordon's inclusion of non-European perspectives is evidence of his unscholarly "Afro-centrist prejudices."¹³

- Mr. Horowitz condemns Professor Mari Matsuda for teaching a course that examines the questions, "How have lawyers participated in peace movements, from draft resistance to Constitutional challenges?" According to Mr. Horowitz, this amounts to "train[ing] a new generation of lawyer-activists in the fundamentals of opposing American military intervention."¹⁴

In our view, Mr. Horowitz's book strongly suggests that emphasizing alternative perspectives, discussing peace movements, or presenting perspectives critical of certain policies of the United States government are grounds for inclusion on his list of the 101 most dangerous academics in America.

II. Problems of Argumentation

Our analysis shows that throughout his book, Mr. Horowitz manipulates facts to make them fit his arguments. The pages that follow detail dozens of the inaccuracies that characterize Mr. Horowitz's research. As readers can see for themselves, Mr. Horowitz:

Misstates professors' intended meanings. For example, Mr. Horowitz bases this claim: "Professor Ensalaco regards the United States as responsible for the 9/11 attacks on itself," on this quote: "I'd like our students to understand the historical context of the attitudes that caused the attacks. If the students understand the complexities involved, perhaps they'll avoid the conception that all people of Islam or all Arabs are terrorists."¹⁵

Omits important facts that counter his arguments. For example, Mr. Horowitz states that Professor Sam Richards' class lessons "are reinforced with 'out-of-class' assignments that include the viewing of left-wing propaganda films."¹⁶ Mr. Horowitz fails to mention that Professor Richards' students also receive credit for attending conservative events, including a speech by Mr. Horowitz himself.¹⁷

Takes quotes wildly out of context and mischaracterizes their meaning. For example, Mr. Horowitz states that "Professor [Michael] Bérubé described the university as 'the final resting place of the New Left,' and the 'progressives' only bulwark against the New Right."¹⁸ In fact, these quotes are lifted from a sentence in which Professor Bérubé lists 11 ways that authors other than himself have described the modern university. Mr.

¹³ Ibid., 200.

¹⁴ Ibid., 279.

¹⁵ Ibid., 146.

¹⁶ Ibid., 305-06.

¹⁷ See this report's section on Professor Richards below.

¹⁸ Horowitz, 73.

Horowitz selects two and omits the other nine—including descriptions of the university as “the research wing of the corporate economy” and “the conservatives’ strongest bastion of antifeminist education.”¹⁹

Makes statements that are demonstrably untrue—especially with regard to professors’ academic credentials. For example, Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Kathleen Cleaver “has no qualifications to teach at a major law school.”²⁰ He fails to mention that Professor Cleaver is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, holds a law degree from Yale University and clerked for the late Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, senior judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom. In his book, Mr. Horowitz also makes untrue statements about the content of professors’ writings, the content of their public statements, the activities they participate in on campus, their body of scholarly work, their course offerings and the criteria they use for grading their students.²¹

Mr. Horowitz makes his cases against individual professors within the context of a larger argument about the representative nature of the professors in his book—an argument that we believe to be based on distorted facts as well.

Mr. Horowitz claims that the professors in his book are a representative sample of the 5 to 10 percent of all faculty teaching in America’s colleges and universities who are “radical.”²² Mr. Horowitz derives this estimate from a single incident that occurred at Harvard University, using a method we consider to be questionable at best. He starts by assuming that all 218 of the Harvard faculty who voted to censure Harvard President Larry Summers are radicals. He then calculates that since there are approximately 2,100 faculty members at Harvard, and since 218 is approximately 10 percent of all faculties at every college in America are radical. To “control for the possibility that Harvard may be a relatively radical institution,” Mr. Horowitz cuts that number in half, leaving him with a figure of 5 percent—although in writings and speeches, he usually cites the figure at 10 percent.²³

Quite simply, we consider a method of calculation that draws a sweeping conclusion about every college and university in America on the basis of a single incident at Harvard to be extremely suspect.

¹⁹ For the full quote, see this report’s section on Professor Michael Bérubé below.

²⁰ Horowitz, 91.

²¹ See, respectively, this report’s sections on Professors Barash, Aptheker, Evangelista, Meranto, Matsuda, and Fellman – among others.

²² Horowitz, xlv.

²³ Ibid., xlv-xlvi; for examples of Mr. Horowitz using the 10 percent figure, see Horowitz, “Close but no cigar,” *FrontPageMag.com*, 2/27/06; and Horowitz, speaking at Duke University, quoted by Neal SenGupta, *Duke Chronicle*, 3/8/06.

We also consider it suspect for Mr. Horowitz to make such sweeping and unsubstantiated statements as, “This sample is but the tip of an academic iceberg, and it would have been no problem to provide a thousand such profiles or even ten times the number”; or, “the dangers such individuals pose to the academic enterprise extend far beyond their own classrooms”; or, “the influence of radical attitudes is not confined to radicals on a given faculty, but has a tendency to spread throughout an institution,” or, that the “problems” Mr. Horowitz claims to have identified “appear to be increasingly widespread throughout the academic profession and at virtually every type of institution of higher learning.”²⁴

We find it difficult to reconcile Mr. Horowitz’s 5 percent figure with such sweeping statements about the pervasiveness of radical influence at America’s colleges and universities.

III. Faulty Premises

Colleges and Universities

In his book, Mr. Horowitz argues that America’s colleges and universities are failing to maintain standards that protect students from being indoctrinated by their professors. As our report finds, Mr. Horowitz provides no proof that this is true. Mr. Horowitz again bases his claim on a single incident at Harvard, the censure of President Larry Summers. The chapter in his book entitled “Why Administrators Fail to Maintain Academic Standards” is dedicated to Mr. Horowitz’s own retelling of the censure of President Summers; at the end, he concludes, “administrators challenge radical faculty at peril to themselves.”²⁵

Again, we consider it highly dubious at best to draw such a sweeping conclusion on the basis of a single incident at Harvard.

If anything, we believe Mr. Horowitz’s book is an unintentional testament to the fact that policies that are already in place to protect students’ academic freedom are working well. In his 300-plus page book, Mr. Horowitz and his team of 30 researchers do not provide a single example of a student who tried and failed to address an academic freedom-related grievance through existing university channels.

²⁴ Horowitz, xxv; xxiii; xxiv; 377.

²⁵ In the same paragraph as he draws this conclusion, Mr. Horowitz also acknowledges that the other marquee example in his book—the Ward Churchill affair, in which university administrators intervened to take action against Churchill—directly contradicts this conclusion; Horowitz, 377.

Students

In our view, the arguments in Mr. Horowitz's book are premised upon an unreasonably low assessment of students' intelligence, and suggest that students risk indoctrination simply by being exposed to new and controversial ideas.

In his book, Mr. Horowitz describes students as "hapless," and student points of view are absent from 87 of the 100 profiles in his book.²⁶ At a recent speech at Penn State, Mr. Horowitz "verbally assailed students who posed critical or repeated questions," according to the Pennsylvania *Centre Daily*. "'You do not have the mental capacity to understand,' he told one. To another, he said: 'You are deaf and brain-dead.'"²⁷ In short, we consider Mr. Horowitz's claim to represent students' interests to be highly suspect.

The authors of this report work extensively with students and faculty. We believe that engaging with new ideas and viewpoints is a critical part of the higher education experience—even if some of these ideas are controversial. We believe that students are intelligent people capable of engaging in the free exchange of ideas and having their assumptions challenged without becoming indoctrinated. Indeed, we believe that honing these kinds of critical thinking skills is one of the most valuable experiences a college can provide, and that the desire to engage in this experience is one of the main reasons why students go to college in the first place.

As Terry Christopher, a student at Millersville University, testified on behalf of Free Exchange at a recent hearing in Pennsylvania, "I have learned best in classes that are open to free debate." Christopher, a self-described active conservative and veteran of the Iraq War, continued, "Growing up in a traditional conservative Lancaster County family I had limited contact with different points of view. When I attended college for the first time I was surprised by the number of different ideas and opinions; however this diversity facilitated a well-rounded education."²⁸

²⁶ Horowitz, 226; we believe this shortage suggests a more significant shortcoming in Mr. Horowitz's arguments.

²⁷ Adam Smeltz, *CentreDaily.com*, 4/14/06.

²⁸ The full text of Christopher's testimony is available online at: http://www.freeexchangeoncampus.org/index.php?option=com_docman&Itemid=25&task=view_category&catid=8&order=dmdate_published&ascdesc=DESC.

THE IMPLICATIONS: A CAUTIONARY NOTE

The arguments and evidence presented in *The Professors* have been accompanied by Mr. Horowitz's efforts to promote his so-called "Academic Bill of Rights" (ABOR), a legislative effort to impose new standards on colleges and universities. Some version of ABOR, which is designed to correct the "problems" Mr. Horowitz claims to have identified in his book, has been introduced in over 20 states as well as in the United States Congress. Mr. Horowitz continues to testify in front of legislators in support of ABOR and speaks openly about his role in this effort.²⁹

In spite of his lobbying efforts, Mr. Horowitz claims that he is not seeking a government solution. He claims that he is not urging legislatures to pass "bills," only "resolutions"—and that resolutions do not qualify as government action. We find it difficult to reconcile this position with the fact that to date, most of the legislation to stem from ABOR has taken the form of bills, not resolutions.

One of the bills to stem from ABOR is Arizona Senate bill 1331, which would have allowed students to demand alternative assignments if they found the course material they were offered offensive in a wide array of possible ways.³⁰ Mr. Horowitz distanced himself from the Arizona bill, calling it "anti-intellectual."³¹ We agree with Mr. Horowitz's characterization, but we believe that bills like this are the logical outcome of his lobbying campaign, and we further believe that if one sounds a false alarm, one bears responsibility for the consequences.

We do not believe that legislation—whether in the form of bills or resolutions—is needed, and we encourage readers of Mr. Horowitz's book to think very carefully about his allegation that the individuals he profiles are "dangerous."

As Georgetown Constitutional Law Professor Mari Matsuda said in response to the charges Mr. Horowitz makes against her in his book, "the most dangerous falsehood in this book is the idea that social critics are somehow dangerous or anti-American." Professor Matsuda continues, "The greatest danger to democracy is the absence of broad participation and critical thought. As a lawyer I am sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The central premise of that Constitution is government by the people. This requires public inquiry and dissent, not group-think and blind deference to the State. This is what I teach, and it is standard constitutional interpretation."

²⁹ For an account of Mr. Horowitz's efforts at lobbying the U.S. Congress, see Horowitz, "Leading the Fight for Academic Freedom," *FrontPageMag.com*, 3/28/06; for an overview of his state-level lobbying efforts, see Nathaniel Popper, "Conservative 'Academic Bill of Rights' Picks up Steam," *Forward*, 4/1/05.

³⁰ "Academic freedom" bills have appeared in legislatures in Arizona, California, Florida, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, South Dakota, and Washington.

³¹ Horowitz, "An Academic Freedom Bill I Won't Support," *FrontPageMag.com*, 2/13/06.

PART TWO: "DANGEROUS" PROFESSORS RESPOND

Below are responses from 23 of the professors profiled in David Horowitz's book, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America*. We gathered these responses simply by emailing the professors a few weeks ago and giving them the opportunity to address the charges Mr. Horowitz makes against them. We received many responses, and they continue to arrive. The material below reflects submissions from professors who responded quickly and whose claims we were able to independently verify. We will continue to post additional responses on our website, www.freeexchangeoncampus.org.

In our view, Mr. Horowitz's research is sloppy in the extreme and manipulated to fit his arguments. His book is characterized by inaccuracies, distortions, and manipulations of fact—including false statements, mischaracterizations of professors' views, broad claims unsupported by facts and selective omissions of information that does not fit his argument. As we believe these pages demonstrate, in the debate over academic freedom, the facts do not favor Mr. Horowitz.

Professor Anatole Anton

Mr. Horowitz does not provide a single footnote in his chapter on Professor Anatole Anton, and nothing in this chapter addresses Professor Anton's research or teaching.

The majority of Mr. Horowitz's chapter on Professor Anton focuses not on Professor Anton himself but on an organization with which he is affiliated, the Radical Philosophy Association (RPA). Because this chapter is more about the RPA than it is about Professor Anton, the responses below are from Professor Richard Schmitt, who teaches philosophy at Brown University, is a member of the RPA and who, according to Professor Anton, "is very knowledgeable about the history and official stands of the organization. More so than I am."

Mr. Horowitz claims that the RPA "opposes U.S. economic and military aid to Israel, on grounds that such aid is 'perceived' as supporting 'the enem[y] of Muslim nations.'" (11)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Schmitt responds, the "RPA has no position on aid to Israel that I know of. I am quite certain that we have no position on supporting 'Muslim nations.'"

Mr. Horowitz claims, "the Radical Philosophy Association supports Cuba's Communist dictatorship." (11)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Schmitt responds, “Some people in RPA support Cuba; others do not.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that RPA members ‘believe that fundamental change requires broad social upheavals but also opposition to intellectual support for exploitative and dehumanizing social structures, [including] capitalism, racism, sexism, homophobia, disability discrimination, environmental ruin, and all other forms of domination.’ (11)

Mr. Horowitz only quotes half of the RPA’s mission statement. The full mission statement reads: **“Our efforts are guided by the vision of a society founded on cooperation instead of competition, in which all areas of society are, as far as possible, governed by democratic decision-making.** We believe that fundamental change requires broad social upheavals but also opposition to intellectual support for exploitative and dehumanizing social structures.” [emphasis added] The second half of Mr. Horowitz’s quote is spliced in from another section of the RPA website, through the use of the word “[including].”

Professor Bettina Aptheker

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker “deeply regretted” the fall of the Soviet system. (13)

Professor Aptheker responds, “When socialism ended in the Soviet Union and other European countries, I regretted that the movements to create a democratic and humane socialism had failed. I opposed the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, for example, in 1968 while a member of the National Committee of the U.S. Communist Party.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker was “expelled from the Communist Party in 1991 after the failed coup against Gorbachev.” (15)

Professor Aptheker responds, “I was a member of the Communist Party from 1962 to October 1981 (not 1991). I left the Party because of profound disagreements with it, most especially on the issue of women’s liberation.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker “informed [UCSC] students” that “our agenda should be to overthrow Bush.” (15)

Professor Aptheker responds, “I am inaccurately quoted: I called for the overthrow of George W. Bush ‘by all constitutional and democratic means up to and including impeachment.’” Mr. Horowitz fails to note that Professor Aptheker made these comments outside of the classroom.

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker “does not have a single work of reputable scholarship to her name,” dismissing her highly regarded work *Woman’s Legacy: Essays on Race, Sex, and Class in American History* as “ostensibly scholarly.” (14)

Aside from a quote from the poet Adrienne Rich,³² Mr. Horowitz does not cite any evidence to back up his dismissal of Professor Aptheker’s book *Woman’s Legacy* as “ostensibly scholarly.” (14)

Professor Aptheker responds, “this was a scholarly book. It was, in fact, my dissertation. The members of my dissertation committee at the University of California (Santa Cruz) were Hayden White, a world-renowned historian; Donna Haraway, a world-renowned scholar in the history of science; and Diane Lewis, a professor of medical anthropology with a particular emphasis on African American communities.

“The book was widely and favorably reviewed, including in the *Journal of American History* and the *American Historical Review* (although this reviewer was critical of some aspects of the book) ... It was published by the University of Massachusetts Press, and, of course, refereed by scholars in the field, as are all such university press books.”

Professor Aptheker adds, “I am also the author of another book called *Tapestries of Life: Women’s Work, Women’s Consciousness and the Meaning of Daily Existence* (University of Massachusetts Press, 1989), which is often used as a text in many women’s studies and critical gender studies courses, and remains in print.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker’s “introductory course at U.C. Santa Cruz on feminism, which she has taught since 1980, turns Marx’s ‘historical materialism—the idea that society progresses through successive stages from feudalism to capitalism to socialism into a theory of sexuality, and turns sexuality into a species of political consciousness-raising.” (13)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. As Professor Aptheker points out, “Mr. Horowitz’s review of my course ‘Introduction to Feminisms’ bears virtually no resemblance to it. The course is an introductory survey (lower division) of feminist studies. It is interdisciplinary and covers a range of issues including women’s history, immigration and the global economy, violence against women, reproductive rights, Jewish women and the legacy of anti-Semitism (not every year but often), women’s body image, women’s health, and so on. There is one lecture devoted to sexuality, which includes lesbians as well as transgendered people, and others not in the normative mainstream.”

³² Mr. Horowitz writes that Rich “hailed the book as ‘feminist to its core.’” (14)

Mr. Horowitz claims, “Aptheker’s course syllabus describes lesbianism as the ‘highest stage of feminism’ (an obvious homage to Lenin’s Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism).” (13)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Aptheker responds, “the course syllabus has never described lesbians as ‘the highest stage’ of anything.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker’s introductory course on feminism is “filmed at university expense.” (13)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Aptheker responds, “this course was filmed in its entirety, not with university funds but by private donations raised by alumni who initiated the request that it be filmed.”

Mr. Horowitz writes that “on the website RateMyProfessors.com, one of Aptheker’s less than happy students complains that she focuses ‘way too much on personal history—relied on pseudo celebrity status to entertain the class.’” (14)

Professor Aptheker responds, “Student reviews of the course have been very positive both online and in the official evaluations the university conducts. These too are available for public view. Some students are critical; most find the class very helpful. I received the Distinguished Teaching Award from the UCSC Alumni Association in 2001.”

Professor Aptheker adds, “and yes, I do share personal stories, and stories more generally as a method of teaching. I have also used poetry, music, and film.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aptheker “authored an article in The Wave pledging support for Palestinian terrorists, whom she euphemistically described as ‘anti-occupation activists.’” (16)

Professor Aptheker responds, “**I have never, ever supported or called for the support of terrorists, Palestinian or otherwise.** [emphasis added] The reference quoted was not to Palestinians but to Israelis active in the effort to end the occupation of Palestinian territories.

Professor Aptheker adds, “I am a member of Temple Beth El in my community, and I am a member of the Jewish Studies faculty at the University of California (Santa Cruz).”

Professor Regina Austin

Mr. Horowitz claims that, “Asked in a 1999 interview to describe how she views her role as a legal scholar, Professor [Regina] Austin answered that it ‘should start with the premise that black people are at the center of the universe and go on from there.’” (27)

Mr. Horowitz fails to note that the question Professor Austin was responding to was, “how do you believe the work of a minority feminist legal scholar should be different from other scholars?” In his retelling, Mr. Horowitz leaves out the words “feminist,” “minority,” and the fact that the Professor Austin was being asked a question specifically about how her work “should be different from other scholars.” Then, in Professor Austin’s answer, Mr. Horowitz leaves out her qualifying statement: “That’s not to say other people are excluded. It’s simply to say that we all start somewhere....”

Here is the full exchange:

“[Interviewer]: In other words, how do you believe the work of a minority feminist legal scholar should be different from other scholars?”

AUSTIN: Well, it should start...it should start with the premise that black people are at the center of the universe and go on from there. **That’s not to say that other people are excluded from the universe. It’s simply to say that we all start somewhere** and that it makes sense for black female scholars, when it’s relevant to the topic that they’re dealing with, start from a base point that puts black women first, and you go on from there.”³³
[emphasis added]

Professor David Barash

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor David Barash’s co-author, Professor Charles Webel, teaches at the University of California-Berkeley. (40)

Professor Webel is not now and has never been a professor at the University of California at Berkeley. As his co-author Professor David Barash points out, this is “a fact Mr. Horowitz could have learned had he bothered to read the ‘about the authors’ page.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor David Barash “is not a trained historian, economist, or sociologist but a psychologist, while his co-author Professor Webel is a philosopher. Consequently, the text they have written is not only ideologically one-sided, it is professionally incompetent.” (41)

³³ http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/oralhistory/biddle-rev-oral-history/interviews/video_index/austin_index.html.

Professor Barash responds, “There is nothing whatsoever inappropriate about a psychologist and a philosopher writing a text on peace studies, especially since there are virtually no Ph.D. programs in the field; hence, there are very few people with doctoral degrees in Peace Studies. The book’s legitimacy can be judged, at least in part, by the fact—acknowledged by Mr. Horowitz—that it is widely used throughout the country.

“Moreover, I have written 25 books relevant to peace studies, including *Understanding Violence* (Allyn & Bacon), *Approaches to Peace* (Oxford), *Introduction to Peace Studies* (Wadsworth), and *The Arms Race and Nuclear War* (Wadsworth). I’d guess that most academics – regardless of their politics – have if anything fewer professional qualifications to teach their subjects.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that in Professor David Barash’s book *Peace and Conflict Studies*, “No indication is provided to the uninformed student that these might be extreme views, nor is there any indication that there are other possible ways to view these issues.” (41)

Professor Barash responds that to the contrary, “We [the authors] make a conscious effort to provide alternative views throughout the book.” The authors are frank about their own perspective; in the introduction, they write, “we wish to be up front about our own values, which are frankly anti-war, anti-violence, anti-nuclear, anti-authoritarian, anti-establishment, pro-environment, pro-human rights, pro-social justice, pro-peace and politically progressive.”³⁴

Mr. Horowitz claims that, in Professor David Barash’s book *Peace and Conflict Studies*, “the Cuban Missile Crisis is discussed without the authors ever mentioning the cause of the crisis—the Soviet missiles.” (44)

To the contrary, Professor Barash points out, “the first mention of the Cuban Missile Crisis in the book begins, ‘The most dramatic example of nuclear chicken occurred during the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, when the Soviet Union attempted to install medium-range nuclear missiles in Cuba.’”³⁵

Mr. Horowitz quotes Professor Barash as writing, “To a very large extent, the problem of world hunger is not so much a production problem, so much as it is a distribution problem.” Mr. Horowitz then writes, “What the authors mean by this is that poverty is caused by the private property system and free market capitalism which results in economic inequality and that its cure is socialism which redistributes income.” (41)

Mr. Horowitz cites no authorities or quotations to back up his interpretation of “what the authors mean.”

³⁴ Barash and Webel, x.

³⁵ Ibid., 101.

Mr. Horowitz quotes Professor David Barash as writing that terrorism is “a contemporary variant of what has been described as guerrilla warfare, dating back at least to the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist struggles for national liberation conducted in North America and Western Europe during the late 18th and early 19th centuries against the British and French Empires.” Mr. Horowitz then writes, “In other words, the American Founders were terrorists, and the terrorists in Iraq can be viewed as patriots (as radicals like Michael Moore have actually described them).” (45)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence, his own opinions notwithstanding, that Professor Barash views the Founding Fathers as “terrorists” and the terrorists in Iraq as “patriots.” Professor Barash affirms, “We don’t say that the ‘insurgents’ in Iraq can be viewed as patriots ... although in fact, we suspect that many of them do view themselves that way.”

Mr. Horowitz quotes Professor David Barash, “For many frustrated, impoverished, infuriated people—who view the United States as a terrorist country—attacks on American civilians were justified in precisely this way: making no distinction between a “terrorist state” and the citizens who aid and abet the state.” Mr. Horowitz then writes, “In other words, America is a terrorist state and the terrorists are liberators of the world’s oppressed.” (46)

Again, Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence, other than his own opinion, that Professor Barash actually believes “America is a terrorist state and the terrorists are liberators of the world’s oppressed.” Professor Barash responds, “again, note his ‘in other words’ ploy. We said that ‘For many frustrated, impoverished, infuriated people—who view the United States as a terrorist country,’ not that the U.S. *is* a terrorist country!

“We stand by what we said: many people around the world do in fact view the U.S. as a terrorist country. That’s a big problem for us, and one that Mr. Horowitz not only refuses to confront (his right), but one that he would deny our students the opportunity to confront ...and to this he has no right.”

Professor Marc Becker

Mr. Horowitz criticizes Professor Marc Becker for making “numerous trips to condemn ‘Western intrusion’ in Ecuador,” because, according to Mr. Horowitz, Ecuador is “one of Latin America’s most stable democracies.” (50)

Professor Becker responds, “next to Haiti and Bolivia, Ecuador is the *least* stable democracy in Latin America. Since Independence from Spain in 1822, Ecuador has only nine constitutionally elected presidents who have successfully completed their terms in office and passed the banner on to a duly elected successor. In the last 10 years not one chief executive has completed an elected term in office, and there have been at least three extra-constitutional changes of power.”

Professor Becker adds, “Facts are a fundamental building block of our discipline, but Mr. Horowitz discards them when inconvenient or when they do not fit his ideology.”

Mr. Horowitz accuses Professor Marc Becker of harboring “antipathy toward the United States.” (50)

Professor Becker responds, “Although I am clearly and unequivocally opposed to the current Bush administration’s policies of imperial aggression and violations of constitutional and international law, it is unclear how that translates into an antipathy toward the United States itself.... I value an active and engaged citizenship, and through my words and actions attempt to model behaviors to realize Truman State University’s goal of cultivating students who aspire ‘toward the best for oneself, one’s family, one’s society, and the world.’”³⁶

Mr. Horowitz accuses Professor Becker and the other professors he profiles of “the explicit introduction of political agendas into the classroom.” (377)

As an article in the *Truman Index* reported, when asked how he knew what went on in Professor Becker’s classroom, “Horowitz said he has not talked to any students of Becker, but he thinks it isn’t necessary because Becker makes his views and questions very clear on his website.” Mr. Horowitz continued: “I don’t have to be in his class or interview somebody from his class to know that there’s something wrong here.”³⁷

A closing thought from Professor Becker...

“As I note in my statement of teaching philosophy, ‘it is more important to teach students *how* to think than *what* to think.’ I maintain that it is important for professors to engage students ‘with alternative viewpoints that challenge existing assumptions and encourage critical thinking.’³⁸ But I also provide students with tools and space to draw their own conclusions, even if it leads a student to the conclusion that Mr. Horowitz is right and my classrooms are indoctrination sessions.”

Professor Michael Berube

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Berube believes that “religious people were to be regarded simply as irrational.” (72)

³⁶ <http://www.truman.edu/pages/17.asp>.

³⁷ Ian Vickers, *Truman Index*, 3/2/06.

³⁸ Marc Becker, “Teaching Philosophy,” <http://www2.truman.edu/~marc/philosophy.html>.

The only evidence Mr. Horowitz cites to back up this claim is this quote from Professor Berube: “In [my] class...we talk about what it means to be an anti-foundationalist—that is, one of those sane, secular people who believe that it’s best to operate as if our moral and epistemological principles derive not from divine will or uniform moral law, but from ordinary social practices.” (72) As Professor Berube points out, “the fact that most secularists are sane does not mean that people of faith are not.”

Mr. Horowitz states that “Professor Berube described the university as ‘the final resting place of the New Left,’ and the ‘progressives’ only bulwark against the New Right.” (73)

These quotes come from an essay in which Professor Berube reviews four different books. In the sentence where the quotes appear, Professor Berube is explaining the multiple ways that the four books describe higher education, and he cites eleven different ways to describe the modern university. Out of these eleven, Mr. Horowitz selects two descriptions and omits the other nine – including Berube’s description of the modern university as “the research wing of the corporate economy” and “the conservatives’ strongest bastion of antifeminist education.”

Here is the full quote, from the introduction to Professor Berube’s essay, “The Abuses of the University,” which appeared in the journal *American Literary History*:

“Four new books on the state of the academy, and not one of them elaborates a line of argument that bisects any of the others. One gets the eerie feeling that this kind of intellectual noncoincidence is no coincidence, that one could review twenty new books on the state of the academy (if one could take the necessary time away from one’s ‘normal’ academic work) and discover the same result: The contemporary university is so amorphous that it can be described as the research wing of the corporate economy, the final resting place of the New Left, the last best hope for critical thinking, the engine room of global technological advance, the agent of secularization and the advance of reason, the training ground for the labor force, the conservatives’ strongest bastion of antifeminist education, the progressives’ only bulwark against the New Right, the natural home of intellectual isolates, the natural home of goosestepping groupthinkers, and the locus of postmodern skepticism and fragmentation.”

Mr. Horowitz goes on to claim that Professor Berube believes “Critics of this definition—in particular those who failed to regard ‘feminist or queer theory as a legitimate area of scholarship’—were only perpetuating ‘ignorance and injustice.’” (73)

The two quotes above appear in separate paragraphs; Mr. Horowitz splices them together. In the first quote, Professor Berube is reviewing a book of essays and summarizing the work of other authors, not describing his own views. Here is the full context:

“The picture is complicated still further by Greta Gaard’s account of antilebian intellectual harassment, Mary Wilson Carpenter’s essay on ageism and antifeminism, and Elaine Ginsberg and Sara Lennox’s analysis of antifeminism in scholarship and publishing. For one thing, the perpetrators of antifeminist intellectual harassment in each of these contexts can be women: whether it’s a senior female administrator who refuses to regard feminist or queer theory as a legitimate area of scholarship, or the Sommers-Paglia-Roiphe crew dismissing nearly every kind of feminism since 1848.”

The second quote (“ignorance and injustice”) comes from the paragraph preceding the one above:

“‘What I truly believe,’ Shaw said in 1994, ‘is that second-rate traditionalist scholarship is ultimately more valuable to the country than first-rate feminist works’ (5). Now, does this qualify as behavior that creates an environment in which feminist work is devalued? Absolutely. Is there anything we can do about it except to protest its ignorance and injustice? In a free society, absolutely not.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that “As Professor Berube himself acknowledges, his literature classes often have little to do with literature. For instance, a class he has taught for years, ‘Postmodernism and American Fiction,’ is merely a forum for the professor to dilate on the ‘anti-foundationalist philosophy’ of radical philosopher Richard Rorty.” (72)

First, Mr. Horowitz has never sat in on Professor Berube’s class, nor does not he cite any evidence from anyone who has to back up his claim. Second, Professor Berube has not acknowledged that “his literature classes often have little to do with literature,” as Mr. Horowitz claims. The only evidence Mr. Horowitz cites to back up his claim is an essay by Professor Berube that appeared in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Contrary to Mr. Horowitz’s claim, in the third sentence of this essay, Professor Berube states, “I usually assign a range of contemporary novelists, from well-known figures like Thomas Pynchon, Kathy Acker, and Toni Morrison to relatively unsung writers like Richard Grossman (author of *The Alphabet Man* and *The Book of Lazarus*) and Randall Kenan (*A Visitation of Spirits*). I also assign a packet or two of contemporary critical theorists—the authors of postmodernism’s greatest hits (Fredric Jameson, Jean Baudrillard, Jean-Francois Lyotard), as well as some of its more trenchant critics (Nancy Fraser, Andreas Huyssen).”³⁹

A few closing thoughts from Professor Berube...

“[Mr. Horowitz] knows nothing about my classroom demeanor or my record as a faculty member; he simply cherry-picked a few phrases from a couple of my essays, and did it incompetently.... If he were a college student and tried to get away with this garbage, he would indeed be flunked—not for his conservatism, but for his mendacity.”

³⁹ Michael Berube, “Teaching Postmodern Fiction Without Being Sure the Genre Exists,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5/19/00.

Professor Elizabeth Brumfiel

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Elizabeth Brumfiel “called on anthropology scholars to take a leading role as anthropologists against the Iraq War.” (77)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Brumfiel responds, “I have not ‘called on anthropology scholars to take a leading role as anthropologists against the Iraq War.’”

Mr. Horowitz claims, “As a self-conscious leftist working within the tradition of political Marxism, Brumfiel obviously has no problem with blurring the distinction between scholarship and politics.” (80)

The only evidence Mr. Horowitz cites to back up this characterization is this quote from Professor Brumfiel, which does not seem to support his claim:

“In what contexts will scientists be willing to develop weapons of mass destruction and to test them on human subjects without their knowledge or consent, as they did during the Cold War? And how do economic pressures, political pressures and a climate of patriotism discourage scientists from engaging in anti-war and anti-weapons advocacy? The contextual nature of human action and the impact of politics and economics on science are important messages for anthropologists to communicate to scientists and to the public. With increased participation by anthropologists... these messages can reach a wider audience, which would benefit science, public policy, and anthropology.” (80)

Professor Kathleen Cleaver

After listing several articles whose content Mr. Horowitz believes disqualifies Professor Cleaver from holding her position, Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Kathleen Cleaver “has no qualifications to teach at a major law school.” (91)

As Professor Cleaver points out, she is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, holds a law degree from Yale University, and has clerked for the late Judge A. Leon Higginbotham, senior judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (and recipient of the Presidential Medal of Freedom). These types of qualifications—a degree from a top law school and an appellate court clerkship—are the same as those of scores of professors at major law schools across the country, but Mr. Horowitz fails to mention them.

Professor Cleaver adds, “[Mr. Horowitz] does not in any way deal with what I teach, which happens to be ‘American Legal History: The Law of Slavery and Anti-Slavery,’ and has absolutely no information from my course, my classes, etc.”

Professor Dana Cloud

Mr. Horowitz portrays Professor Dana Cloud as an “anti-American radical” who “routinely repeats the propaganda of the Saddam regime”; along with all the other professors in his book, Mr. Horowitz accuses her of the “explicit introduction of political agendas into the classroom.” (93, 377)

For another perspective on Professor Cloud, here is a letter written by one of her students:

To the Editor:

Let's get two things straight before we begin. I am a fervent capitalist and extremely conservative, so no one can say I'm writing this for any reason except out of my absolute admiration for Dr. Cloud. And before anyone dismisses me as a young, easily impressionable college kid, I'm 43 years old and the mother of children older than many of you reading this. With that said, I would like to go on record in saying that Dana Cloud is one of the finest teachers I have had the joy to encounter during my college experience.

It is painfully and pathetically obvious that Mr. Horowitz did not have the intellectual honesty nor the journalistic integrity to interview any of Dr. Cloud's students before writing his hit piece. I rather strongly disagree with some of Dr. Cloud's positions, but while I was her student, I felt completely comfortable stating my opinions in class, regardless of whether I agreed with her or not. [emphasis added]

Dr. Cloud did what a good educator is supposed to do: she provided a forum for an open and lively debate of ideas. She encouraged everyone to give their opinions. She provided materials that were thought-provoking, which, as far as I understand it, is the very point of going to college. As a person, I find Dr. Cloud delightful. As an educator, I find Dr. Cloud exemplary. One of the 101 most dangerous professors? Only if you think a professor who is unfailingly open and honest is dangerous.

I may not agree or even like some of Dr. Cloud's political positions. But she is my fellow American and has the right to express her beliefs. And I point out again, that as an educator, she never forced her beliefs on anyone, never tried to “indoctrinate” in the classroom. She is an intelligent, vibrant, and wonderfully effective educator, and I pray that this situation serves as a springboard for people to discuss the vital issues of civil rights and freedom of speech.

I will be horrified if Dr. Cloud is damaged by the obviously slanted piece done by Mr. Horowitz. With all honesty, there are only four professors I have had who truly stand out in my mind as wonderful teachers after 122 hours of college. Dr. Cloud, without one second's hesitation, is the top of those four and I consider it an honor to speak for her publicly. [emphasis added]

“PH”

Senior, Corporate Communication

Professor Mark Ensalaco

Mr. Horowitz quotes Professor Mark Ensalaco as saying, “I see that our students are angry and hurt about what happened in New York and Washington [on 9/11], and as important as it is for us to promote learning here at the University, I think it’s also important to promote tolerance.” Mr. Horowitz then writes, “By tolerance, Professor Ensalaco meant tolerance for those who appear to be America’s enemies.” (146)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up his claim that what Professor Ensalaco is truly advocating in the quote above is “tolerance for those who appear to be America’s enemies.”

Mr. Horowitz goes on to claim, “Professor Ensalaco regards the United States as responsible for the 9/11 attacks on itself.” (146)

Mr. Horowitz bases this claim on this quote from Professor Ensalaco: “I’d like our students to understand the historical context of the attitudes that caused the attacks. If the students understand the complexities involved, perhaps they’ll avoid the conception that all people of Islam or all Arabs are terrorists.” (146) Mr. Horowitz seems to provide no evidence, other than his own interpretation, that what Professor Ensalaco actually meant is that the United States is “responsible for the 9/11 attacks on itself.”

Professor Larry Estrada

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Larry Estrada “believes that ‘Aztlán’ should secede from the United States,” based on Professor Estrada’s membership in the group MEChA. (154)

As Professor Estrada responds, “I’ve never advocated secession. Certain right-wingers accuse people of that, because if you’re a member of MEChA, they throw the Aztlán thing at you. MEChA doesn’t advocate secession.... the bulk of MEChA members are proud to be both Latino and Americans.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Estrada “used his position as the National Association of Ethnic Studies head to defend Colorado professor Ward Churchill.” (154)

Professor Estrada responds, “I do not condone [Churchill’s] words on 9/11. I defend his right to say what he wants to say as an academic. The inference that I agree with his analogy is totally fallacious.”

Mr. Horowitz calls Professor Larry Estrada a “radical ethnic separatist.” (154)

Professor Estrada responds, “Most would consider me a moderate in terms of my political viewpoints...I have held public elected and appointed positions (mayor, councilmember, commissioner, directorships and precinct officer) in different areas—Los Angeles, Colorado, Washington. I have even received a tribute from the state senate of Colorado, which at the time was composed of a Republican majority, for my work related to municipal governance and economic development. I have received letters of commendation for my civic and community work from two different governors. I later became a marine during the Vietnam era and served my country, unlike Mr. Horowitz.”

Professor Matthew Evangelista

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Matthew Evangelista “has predicated an entire course around his idiosyncratic account of the Cold War’s end.” (156)

The only evidence Mr. Horowitz offers for this characterization is the course description below. Readers can decide for themselves whether this course represents an “idiosyncratic account of the Cold War’s end.”

This class examines the origins, course, and ultimate demise of this conflict that pitted the United States and NATO against the Soviet Union and its allies. It seeks to evaluate the competing explanations that political scientists and historians have put forward to explain the Cold War by drawing on the new evidence that has become available. The course considers political, economic, and strategic aspects of the Cold War, including the nuclear arms race, with particular focus on the link between domestic and foreign policy in the United States and the Soviet Union. The course emphasizes writing, and includes a final research paper for which students will use original archival materials.⁴⁰

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Matthew Evangelista “published an article blaming the United States for Saddam’s criminal regime: ‘If Saddam Hussein is a monster ... then the United States is in many respects his Dr. Frankenstein.’” (157)

⁴⁰ <http://falcon.arts.cornell.edu/Govt/courses/S04/courses.html#383>.

The full quote is:

“If Saddam Hussein is a monster, as hardly anyone would doubt, the United States is in many respects his Dr. Frankenstein.”

As Professor Evangelista goes on to explain, this metaphor is based on the widely-accepted knowledge that the United States government provided critical financial and military assistance to Iraq during the Iran-Iraq war, much of which helped strengthen Saddam’s regime.⁴¹

Mr. Horowitz claims that “In February 2003, Professor Evangelista played a key role in organizing a series of anti-war events called ‘Week against War.’” (157)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Evangelista responds, “I have, in fact, not played an organizing role in any of Cornell’s anti-war events, but I have accepted invitations to speak at them. I do organize weekly seminars for the Peace Studies program, but these are of an academic rather than activist character, contrary to Mr. Horowitz’s insinuations.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Evangelista once “suggested that the terrorists were avenging the grievances of the oppressed.” (157)

His claim is based entirely on this quote from Professor Evangelista: “We should separate those who sympathize with some of the same concerns as the terrorists from those who are actually willing to carry it out.” Professor Evangelista responds, Mr. Horowitz’s characterization is “a view that I have never expressed in language that I would never use.”

Mr. Horowitz states that “during a discussion of Iraq with Cornell faculty members, Professor Evangelista declared that the planned American bombing attacks [on Iraq] would make American forces look like “war criminals.”” (158)

Professor Evangelista’s full statement contains and important qualifiers that Mr. Horowitz leaves out. What Professor Evangelista actually said is that if the United States were to proceed specifically with Operation Shock and Awe, “we are more likely to be viewed by the Iraqi people as war criminals, not liberators.”⁴²

Mr. Horowitz refers to the “overtly one-sided character of his [Professor Matthew Evangelista’s] teaching.” (159)

⁴¹ http://www.einaudi.cornell.edu/PeaceProgram/publications/occasional_papers/Iraq-and-Beyond.pdf; see, for example, Bruce Jentleson, *With Friends Like These: Reagan, Bush and Saddam*, Norton: New York, 1994.

⁴² Franklin Crawford, *Cornell Chronicle*, 2/20/03.

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Mr. Horowitz has never sat in on any of Professor Evangelista's classes, nor does he cite any evidence from anyone who has.

Professor Evangelista responds, "If anything, my students become rather frustrated with my unwillingness to tell them 'the right answer.' Instead, my teaching style emphasizes contending explanations for political phenomena and my courses air a wide range of views, including presentations by guest speakers. Several of my students and advisees over the years have been members of Cornell's ROTC program or serving military officers and none has ever complained about any political bias on my part."

Mr. Horowitz claims that "Evangelista's opinion will naturally carry great weight within his faculty, both regarding the hiring and the promotion of future scholars, for decades to come." (159)

Mr. Horowitz appears to base this claim entirely on his own knowledge of universities' hiring and promotion practices. From Mr. Horowitz's credentials, it appears that he is neither an expert on academia nor an academic himself, nor does he explain why his opinion on these matters merits his readers' credence.

Professor Evangelista responds, "This contention reflects a naïve and uninformed perspective on how such decisions are made in academic departments. In my case, for example, I am one of several dozen people contributing to the department's decisions. Even if I judged colleagues or potential colleagues on the basis of their adherence to my own political views—a charge for which Mr. Horowitz would be hard pressed to find the slightest evidence—I have only one vote and there are several subsequent evaluations above the level of our department that help assure that such decisions are made according to the faculty members' teaching and research qualifications, not their political affiliations."

Professor Richard Falk

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Richard Falk was once "an enthusiastic supporter of the Islamic radical, the Ayatollah Khomeini whom he hailed as a 'liberator' of Iran." (160)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Falk responds, "I never described Khomeini as a 'liberator' of Iran...In fact, I was chair of a committee that was seeking to protect human rights in Iran against the excesses of the Khomeini leadership."

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Falk "is a longtime prominent member of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers (IADL)—a Communist front group." (160)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Falk responds, "I never was a member of the IADL, although I gave some talks under their auspices." Mr. Horowitz fails to make this distinction.

Professor Gordon Fellman

Mr. Horowitz quotes Professor Gordon Fellman as writing, "Making war is for the imagination challenged, it only reasserts masculinity," and draws the conclusion, "Apparently Professor Fellman views masculinity as an undesirable trait." (172)

Professor Fellman responds, "Mr. Horowitz has my comment about war and masculinity exactly wrong. My claim is that a certain kind of masculinity expresses itself in violence, including war. There are other kinds of masculinity out there. Think of Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela and the Dalai Lama. I prefer masculinity that is life-affirming, as that of those great leaders was, to that which is life-denying. I meant my remark to refer to the most common or traditional form of masculinity. There are others."

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Fellman "is notorious for grading his students subjectively." (173)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Fellman responds, "That criticism never appeared in any of the course evaluations I've seen."

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Fellman "mak[es] 'personal evolution' in class, i.e., the assimilation of his perspective on the world, count for one-third of the grade." (173)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Fellman responds, "The [above quote] is pure lie. I go out of my way in all my classes, as I have for forty-three years at Brandeis, to make clear that students need to come to terms with the course materials as best they can and that where they wind up is their concern, not mine."

Professor Fellman adds:

"Mr. Horowitz understands so little about what higher education is about. It is not about going to college to have every assumption you brought there confirmed by the college process. Being challenged in one's basic assumptions about just about everything is a classic function of higher education. It is ironic that Horowitz criticizes the procedures of an institution about whose purposes and traditions he seems to grasp so little."

Professor Eric Foner

Mr. Horowitz claims, "Professor Foner participated in an anti-war 'teach in' at Columbia University, where he invoked Communist Party icon Paul Robeson as a model of patriotism." (178)

The Robeson quote Professor Foner used is, “The patriot is the person who is never satisfied with his country.” Professor Foner responds, “I wonder how Mr. Horowitz explains that if Robeson is an enemy of America, the postal service recently issued a stamp in his honor.”

Referring to the same teach-in at Columbia, Mr. Horowitz writes, “Professor Foner had been preceded on the podium by fellow Columbia professor Nicholas DeGenova, who told the 3,000 students and faculty in attendance, ‘The only true heroes are those who would find ways that help defeat the U.S. military. I personally would like to see a million Mogadishus.’” (178)

Mr. Horowitz fails to mention that Professor Foner “publicly reprimanded De Genova, calling his statements idiotic.”⁴³ Professor Foner’s reaction and those of other Columbia faculty members were reported by the media at the time. A *New York Times* article appearing days after the teach-in contained the following passage:

“‘Professor De Genova’s speech did not represent the views of the organizers,’ said Eric Foner, a history professor who was one of the teach-in’s organizers. ‘I personally found it quite reprehensible. The anti-war movement does not desire the death of American soldiers. We do not accept his view of what it means to be a patriot. I began my talk, which came later, by repudiating his definition of patriotism, saying the teach-in was a patriotic act, that I believe patriots are those who seek to improve their country.’”⁴⁴

Columbia University President Lee Bollinger also condemned the content of DeGenova’s remarks, as did numerous other members of Columbia’s faculty.⁴⁵

Mr. Horowitz quotes a negative review of Professor Eric Foner’s work by the intellectual historian John Patrick Diggins, in which Diggins describes Foner as “an unabashed apologist for the Soviet system and an unforgiving historian of America.” (178)

Mr. Horowitz fails to mention that in the same article, Diggins writes, “Professor Foner himself, I happily hasten to add, has been willing to hire and support teachers of differing ideological loyalties, and in his remarkable academic career he has been more professional than political, a gentleman scholar rather than an academic apparatchik.”⁴⁶

⁴³ Margaret Hunt Gram, *Columbia Spectator*, 3/31/03.

⁴⁴ Tamar Lewin, *New York Times*, 3/29/03.

⁴⁵ Margaret Hunt Gram, *Columbia Spectator*, 3/31/03.

⁴⁶ John Patrick Diggins, *The National Interest*, 9/1/02.

Mr. Horowitz claims that following the 9/11 attacks, “Professor Foner focused not on the atrocity itself but on what he perceived to be the threat of an American response” – based on an essay that someone else wrote but which Mr. Horowitz attributes to Professor Foner. (177)

Mr. Horowitz bases his claim on this quote, which he attributes to Professor Foner:

I write this in an ominous lull between the talk of vengeance and vengeance itself. The moment any such retribution is sought with bombs and guns will be the moment for the mobilisation of anti-war forces all over the world ... [Terror] merely enhances and exaggerates the feeling among exploited people that the matter of protest has to be left to a few martyrs. And just as the signs were growing of a renewed confidence in the world anti-capitalist movement, the attention of the world’s leaders is focused on a single, dreadful act that gives them the excuse they need to gun the engines of oppression.⁴⁷

However, this quote comes from an essay written by Paul Foot, not Professor Foner.

Confronted with this error, Mr. Horowitz blamed it on the fact that his book was “the work of 30 researchers” and stated that it did not change the content of his profile on Professor Foner.⁴⁸

Professor Todd Gitlin

Mr. Horowitz writes, “In an article titled ‘Varieties of Patriotism,’ Professor Gitlin recently reflected upon the decades he has spent harboring the belief that his country is ultimately unworthy of his respect and even allegiance.” (195)

As Professor Gitlin responds, the argument of his essay was “exactly the contrary.” In the essay in question, Professor Gitlin writes, “I distinguish between the *country* that is worthy of respect and allegiance and the *government policies* that are not.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Todd Gitlin, “immerses students in the obscurantist texts of leftist icons like Jurgen Habermas so that they understand the oppressive nature of capitalist media.” (194)

Professor Gitlin points out that while he has indeed assigned works by Habermas to students in a graduate seminar, he has “also, to take only the last few years, ‘immersed’ students in texts by Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Hobbes, Locke, Burke, Adam Smith, and, for that matter, the Gospels.”

⁴⁷ Paul Foot, *London Review of Books*, Vol. 23 No.19, 10/4/01.

⁴⁸ <http://www.frontpagemag.com/blog/BlogEntry.asp?ID=625>.

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Todd Gitlin “participated in the infamous March 2003 Columbia University ‘teach-in,’ at which his colleague Professor Nicholas DeGenova expressed his wish that American soldiers might be slaughtered en masse in ‘a million Mogadishus.’” (195)

Professor Gitlin points out that while he did participate in the teach-in, he “was not present for the statement of—and did not hear, nor have I ever knowingly laid eyes on—Professor DeGenova, who at another session of the teach-in ‘idiotically’ (to quote my fellow dangerous colleague Eric Foner) called for ‘a million Mogadishus.’ Had I been present when Professor De Genova made his remark, or heard that he had done so, I would have expressed my disgust.”

Professor Mari Matsuda

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Mari Matsuda is a “leading legal architect of politically correct speech codes in universities” and that the speech codes at Georgetown University are a “mark that Professor Matsuda has left on the Georgetown campus.” (277-78)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Matsuda responds, “I have never, not once, at any university, participated in the drafting, debate over, or implementation of a speech code. I had absolutely nothing to do with the code at Georgetown and I have never read it. I joined the Georgetown faculty in 1992, and would not have been in a position to influence the administration as a newcomer, and I have no idea when they adopted a code. The codes I am supposedly the architect of were largely written before my book, *Words That Wound*, was ever published.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that “Arbitrary censorship of hate speech, according to Professor Matsuda, was therefore preferable to the potentially devastating effects it might otherwise have on its ostensibly defensive targets.” (277)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. As Professor Matsuda responds, “[Mr. Horowitz’s] statement is untrue. I have never advocated censorship, nor arbitrariness. My first amendment work—which I am sure the researcher, who relied on Web sources, has not read—responds to 100 years of first amendment scholarship, suggesting non-arbitrary ways to distinguish among different kinds of assaultive speech. The law already provides penalties for speech constituting libel, fighting words, threats, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. My book argued that there are non-arbitrary ways to add assaultive racist speech to the list, but cautioned against doing this broadly or without limits.”

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Mari Matsuda only teaches “one course with a discernible connection to law.” (280)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up his claim. Contrary to Mr. Horowitz's claim, Professor Matsuda responds, "most of my teaching is in a strictly traditional, doctrinal course: Torts."

"This semester I have one hundred and twenty-five students in 'Torts' and fifteen in 'Organizing for Social Change.' This has been the ratio for my entire teaching career, and if I were not teaching my students the common law of torts, and teaching it well, I would not have been hired to teach at major law schools."

Moreover, Professor Matsuda continues, "my students' evaluations for Torts are among the highest in the law school, and I am known as an outstanding teacher of the basic law for first year students. (This can be confirmed by evaluations records and with Dean Carol O'Neill—Horowitz never checked) This means an entire section of students, including many conservative students, randomly assigned to take a traditional law course from me, feel they are learning 'the law' well."

Professor Aminah Beverly McCloud

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Aminah Beverly McCloud is "[a] member of the Nation of Islam." (263)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor McCloud responds, "I am not and never have been" a member of the Nation of Islam.

Professor Oneida "Zia" Meranto

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Oneida Meranto is an associate professor of political science. (284)

Professor Meranto is a full professor.

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Meranto "has served as faculty advisor to Students for Social and Economic Justice." (284)

Mr. Horowitz cites no evidence to back up this claim. Professor Meranto responds, "I do not recall ever being a faculty advisor for Students for Social and Economic Justice."

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Meranto "currently advises the Metropolitan American Indian Students for Empowerment (originally called 'Native American Students for Un-American Values')." (284)

No such group is listed in the Metropolitan State Student Organizations Directory.⁴⁹

Professor Meranto responds, “I have never advised a group called the Native American Students for Un-American Values. In my fourteen years at [Metro State College] there has never been such a student group with that name.” For two years now, Professor Meranto has advised the Native American Student Alliance.

Mr. Horowitz claims that “A perusal of the Department of Political Science website for Metro State College reveals the vast difference between [Professor] Meranto’s negligible scholarly accomplishments and those of the other members of her department.” (287)

As Professor Meranto responds, Mr. Horowitz’s claim is a “total fabrication. Anyone can open up the faculty website and see that I have more publications than the six full-time faculty combined, with the exception of Dr. Provizer.”⁵⁰

Mr. Horowitz claims that a book written by Professor Meranto’s late husband Phil Meranto (who died in 1985 before Professor Meranto was in graduate school) “embodies the Merantos’ belief that ‘progressive’ professors are entitled to use the classroom to foment social rebellion against capitalist, Anglo-Saxon America.” (284-85)

Professor Meranto responds, “the book my husband wrote and I published after his death has nothing to do with what I do in the classroom, nor does it embody what Mr. Horowitz states.”

Mr. Horowitz does not mention that three student grievances were, in fact, filed against Professor Meranto, charging her with political bias in the classroom.

These grievances were investigated and dismissed following due process. As the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reported, Metropolitan State College President Raymond Kieft’s decision on the grievances stated: “You [Professor Meranto] are entirely within your legal rights to hold and express views contrary to your students’ on Latin American politics, current public issues like the ‘student bill of rights,’ and the proper responsibilities of student organizations you advise and its members. . . The College cannot and will not presume that your treatment of students reflects ideological bias or prejudice merely because you express your point of view.”

President Kieft wrote that students have the same rights to freedom of expression and association that Professor Meranto does, and that the college requires that she grade students on their academic performance and not their point of view. “This investigation gave me substantial reason to believe that you acted at all times consistently with this standard,” he said.

⁴⁹ <http://studentactivities.mscd.edu/modules/org/>

⁵⁰ The webpage listing Professor Meranto’s publications can be found at: <http://www.mscd.edu/~polisci/faculty/Meranto.html> .

President Kieft concluded that **“‘watchdogs’ for ‘political bias’ who seek to remove professors holding a point of view will inhibit the rich dialogue that must take place in the classroom and destroy the expressive freedom that is essential to the search for truth.”**⁵¹ [emphasis added]

Finally, Professor Meranto points out that in his entire profile on her, “not once did [Mr. Horowitz] state or demonstrate what I do in the classroom, which is what I thought was his concern.”

Professor Priya Parmar

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Parmar “[r]equired students to view Michael Moore’s ‘Fahrenheit 9/11’ on the eve of the presidential election.” (296)

Professor Parmar points out that to the contrary, “the viewing was not required,” and moreover, “this particular film was chosen by a majority vote of the students for a lesson on critical media literacy... The film was chosen for analysis, as it was a well-known current example of the use of electronic media for political purposes.”

Mr. Horowitz bases half of his profile on Professor Parmar on the unsubstantiated allegations of one student, who claimed that Professor Parmar discriminated against white students. (297-99)

This student’s allegations first appeared in an article in the *New York Sun*.⁵² When the article was published, Professor Parmar, her students and most of her colleagues in the Brooklyn College of Education disputed the students’ allegations. More than thirty of her students sent a letter of support to the administration that provided a fuller picture of Professor Parmar’s teaching style. Here is an excerpt:

We contend that our voices in this classroom were heard and encouraged, regardless if Professor Parmar agreed or disagreed with us; class participation was worth 10 percent of our overall grade as indicated in the syllabus, and verbally conveyed by Professor Parmar throughout the course as a reminder. We also feel that the grades we received were the grades that we deserved based on our intellectual performance of what was required of us; we were not slighted in our grades because of any contradictory political views. Professor Parmar challenged our views and sought further inquiry regardless of where she personally stood on our positions.

⁵¹ Jennifer Jacobson, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, issue dated 11/26/04.

⁵² Jacob Gershman, *New York Sun*, 5/31/05.

Also, thirty-five of Professor Parmar's colleagues in the Brooklyn College School of Education sent an open letter to a professor who was quoted in the *New York Sun* article attacking Professor Parmar and the college. The letter condemned the professor for defaming Professor Parmar's character and the School of Education. The authors cc'd the CUNY chief administrators and board of trustees.

Here is an excerpt from the letter:

[W]e want to express publicly our contempt for your attacks on a colleague, for the unsubstantiated claims and innuendoes you have made that the School of Education is imposing an ideological litmus test on students, and for your failure to engage any of us, other than in an adversarial role, in discussions about the issues.

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Parmar "teaches...that proper English is the language of white 'oppressors.'" (296)

This claim is also based on the allegations of the student in the *New York Sun* article. The student is quoted as saying that Parmar "repeatedly referred to English as a language of oppressors and in particular denounced white people as the oppressors."⁵³

Not only were the claims of that student never verified, "that student and another one were subsequently accused by the dean of the education school of plagiarism and were given lower grades as a result," as the *New York Sun* article notes.⁵⁴

Moreover, the phrase "denounced white people as the oppressors" is taken from a piece by bell hooks, an award-winning, and highly respected scholar on educational issues, who was the author of one of many assigned readings for the course. It comes from hooks' response to a poem by Adrienne Rich, in which hooks writes: "One line of this poem that moved and disturbed something within me: 'This is the oppressor's language yet I need it to talk to you.'"⁵⁵

Professor Sam Richards

Mr. Horowitz claims, "Dr. Richards' class lessons are reinforced with 'out-of-class' assignments that include the viewing of left-wing propaganda films." (305-06)

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ hooks, b., 2004, "Teaching New Worlds/New Words," in *Tongue-Tied: The Lives of Multilingual Children in Public Education*, Santa Ana, O. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

As Professor Richards points out, Mr. Horowitz “disingenuously fails to note that students also receive credit for attending ‘conservative’ events—including a talk by none other than David Horowitz! In fact, when Mr. Horowitz visited Penn State, I strongly encouraged my liberal students to attend. Similarly, the three times that [anti-affirmative action activist] Ward Connerly has visited [Penn State] I implored my students to attend his talks against affirmative action because I knew he would challenge them to think and, for those who supported affirmative action, defend their views.”

Mr. Horowitz claims, Professor Richards’ “lecture notes for the first class of each semester inform students that, ‘It is not possible to keep our ideologies out of the classroom or any other place where ideas are shared. SO I’M OPEN ABOUT BRINGING MY IDEOLOGY INTO THIS CLASSROOM BECAUSE I SEE THAT ALL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS ARE IDEOLOGICAL TO THE CORE.’ [emphasis in original]”(306)

Mr. Horowitz goes on, “This is a pretty frank admission that his agenda is to indoctrinate students, not educate them.” (306)

First, the two sentences in the quote above are spliced together – the first sentence appears at the beginning of Professor Richards’ lecture notes, and the second sentence (the one in all caps) appears at the end. Mr. Horowitz does not indicate to the reader that he has merged these quotes.

Second, the message of Professor Richards’ lecture is precisely the opposite of what Mr. Horowitz claims it to be. It is specifically designed to encourage Professor Richards’ students to think critically and decide for themselves what they believe. Mr. Horowitz leaves out the parts of Professor Richards’ notes demonstrating that Richards’ true objective is to encourage “thinking that attempts to account for all sides of an argument and tries to go beyond simple answers to complex questions.” Professor Richards’ full lecture notes are below; readers can judge his message for themselves.

As Professor Richards responds, “this assignment demonstrates my mission as a teacher, which has always been to introduce students to a panoply of contradictory ideas and then to encourage them to sort out the mess themselves and arrive at their own conclusions.”

In addition, Professor Richards points out that the application for teaching assistants for his class states, “We welcome applications from students of all cultures, faiths, sexual and political orientations, and ability levels. The more diverse we are in ideologies, backgrounds, and experiences, the more we will have to teach one another.”

CRITICAL THINKING

DISCUSS IDEOLOGY

- Beliefs about how the world is, has been, or should be organized
- This includes our beliefs about morality (right and wrong) & ethics (good and bad)
- It is not possible to keep our ideologies out of the classroom or any other place where ideas are shared. Every thought and feeling that we have is shaped in some way by our ideological belief systems.
- So when professors say that they practice “value free science” or that they are “value free” in their classroom you should challenge them on it.
- The clothing I wear, the films I select, the books I choose, the type of exams I give, my grading scale—are all rooted in how I think the world is or should be organized (i.e., my ideology).
- How is it possible to keep every one of my moral and ethnical opinions out of my classroom? It's not.
- This doesn't mean that we all think at all times by drawing on “uninformed” opinion.
- My thoughts, for example, are rooted in my interpretation of how the world is organized AFTER years of serious study. Granted, some of my study is flawed in differing ways, but much of it is not—it is grounded in data that I have analyzed in one way or another, as well as my experience of the world. SO I'M OPEN ABOUT BRINGING MY IDEOLOGY INTO THIS CLASSROOM BECAUSE I SEE THAT ALL EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS ARE IDEOLOGICAL TO THE CORE.

CRITICAL THINKING – What I stress in this class:

- Thinking that attempts to account for all sides of an argument and tries to go beyond simple answers to complex questions
- Acceptance of two or more seemingly contradictory ideas as compatible (i.e., ability to understand and accept paradox).

- Example: Minority groups must band together to get ahead. However, when minority groups band together this creates obstacles to their getting ahead.
 - Thinking in the gray area (the realm of “not knowing”)
 - The world is not black or white. Truth does not come easy—it requires careful and critical wrestling with complex ideas...and it requires a willingness to engage in the mystery of life and to embrace the fact that we’ll never know the answers to the perennial questions.
-

Professor Dean Saitta

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Dean Saitta is the “chair of the Anthropology Department at the University of Denver and director of the university’s Museum of Anthropology.” (312)

Professor Saitta ended his museum directorship in 2000 and has not been the chair of the Anthropology Department since 2003.

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Dean Saitta is an “editorial board member of the journal Rethinking Marxism.” (312)

Professor Saitta has not been on this board for years.

Mr. Horowitz writes that Professor Dean Saitta “defended the beliefs and actions of Ward Churchill.” The evidence Mr. Horowitz cites to support his claim is this quote from Professor Saitta: “My main concern about the Churchill affair is what it portends for the future of informed, provocative speech in classrooms that are already being monitored by conservative thought police.” (312)

As Professor Saitta responds, “I believe that what Churchill said on 9/12—like the *many* outrageous and inflammatory things that people across the political spectrum said on 9/12—is covered by every American’s right to free speech. I’ve never defended the specific beliefs of Ward Churchill. ... My ‘Thoughts on Academic Free Speech’ offers no support at all for Churchill’s specific beliefs. ... Readers of my statement on academic freedom will also note that I’m as critical of the Left as I am of the Right.”⁵⁶

⁵⁶ <http://64.233.179.104/search?q=cache:qPy1SR3-24kJ:https://portfolio.du.edu/portfolio/getportfoliofile%3Fuid%3D39678+thoughts+on+academic+free+speech+saitta&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=1&client=firefox-a> .

Professor George Wolfe

In his chapter on Professor George Wolfe, Mr. Horowitz describes Ambassador Phillip C. Wilcox as an “anti-Israel speaker.” (355)

Ambassador Phillip C. Wilcox is a graduate of the National War College and has been awarded the State Department’s Meritorious, Superior, and Presidential Honor Awards. Ambassador Wilcox spent thirty-one years in the foreign service. His last overseas assignment was as Chief of Mission and U.S. Consul General in Jerusalem. In the State Department, Wilcox held a variety of assignments, including Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Middle Eastern Affairs.

Ambassador Wilcox is not “anti-Israel,” as Mr. Horowitz describes him. He supports the two-state solution that is widely advocated by Middle Eastern experts and policymakers and which is the official policy of the Bush administration.

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Wolfe is a “fierce critic of Israel.” (355)

Mr. Horowitz does not cite any evidence to support this characterization. As Professor Wolfe responds, “I have never been a critic of Israel, let alone a ‘fierce critic.’”

Mr. Horowitz claims that the Ball State University student organization Peaceworkers “receives its funds from the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies,” which Professor Wolfe directs. (356)

Professor Wolfe responds, “on the contrary, Peaceworkers is not funded in any way by the Peace Center. The students have always been responsible for their own fundraising efforts and have a separate student organization account.”

Mr. Horowitz cites the allegations of one of Professor Wolfe’s students, Brett Mock, who accused Professor Wolfe of giving credit to students who “traveled to Washington, D.C., to take part in anti-war demonstrations.” (356)

Mr. Mock’s allegations were investigated by the university and found to be groundless in 2004, well before *The Professors* was published. Yet Mr. Horowitz fails to mention this fact, and repeats Mr. Mock’s allegations as if they still had merit.

In 2004, Ball State’s Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Beverley Pitts, wrote a letter of support for Professor Wolfe which explains:

Mr. Mock's assertion that students received extra credit for a university-sponsored trip to Washington, D.C., for the purpose of protesting the war in Iraq is incorrect. Rather, three students in the course last spring chose to attend a lobbying workshop in Washington to learn the protocol for lobbying Congress. This opportunity, which was made available to all students, developed skills pertaining to lobbying that apply to all issues, independent of position. This experience fulfilled the field assignment, and travel support was provided to encourage attendance.

Provost Pitts also notes, "as part of fulfilling his field assignment, Mr. Mock received credit for attending a meeting in Indianapolis at which Vice President Dick Cheney spoke."⁵⁷ Mr. Horowitz does not mention this fact in his book.

When representatives of Mr. Horowitz's organization Students for Academic Freedom responded to Provost Pitt's letter, Ball State University President Jo Ann M. Gora sent a letter to the *Muncie Star Press* headlined "Ball State's critics ignore facts, policies." Her letter states:

[Professor Wolfe's] course not only encouraged the discussion of differing viewpoints but also allowed students to fulfill a field assignment course requirement by participating in activities outside the classroom in ways that best fit their own personal beliefs.

It should also be noted that the course was evaluated by students that semester—as it has been each time it has been taught—and there were no negative evaluations. In fact, Mr. Mock has never made a direct complaint to the university—formal or informal—and he waited until months after the course had concluded before first making claims in an article published by Mr. Horowitz's online magazine. The only complaint the university received was a letter from Sara Dogan of the national Students for Academic Freedom organization. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Beverley Pitts responded promptly to Ms. Dogan after looking into Mr. Mock's claims as stated in her letter.

Ball State is merely one target in an unfair and outrageous smear campaign by Mr. Horowitz and his organization. Mr. Horowitz has stated that all "250 peace studies programs in America...teach students to identify with America's terrorist enemies and to identify America as a Great Satan oppressing the world's poor and causing them to go hungry." Clearly, his problem isn't with Ball State or even with our Peace Studies program. I wonder if Mr. Horowitz is aware that a third of the course Brett Mock took focuses on domestic violence and another third on

⁵⁷ Provost Pitt's letter is available online at: <http://www.bsu.edu/president/article/0,1370,53748-5961-28396,00.html>.

mediation, while only one third deals with the history of peace movements and nonviolence.⁵⁸

Mr. Horowitz fails to mention either of these letters in his chapter on Professor Wolfe.

One of the students who traveled to Washington, D.C., also refuted Mr. Mock's charges in another letter of support for Professor Wolfe:

"If Brett [Mock] would've attended the class in which we reported on what we actually did there, he would know that the trip had NOTHING to do with protesting the war in Iraq. [emphasis in original] The title of the seminar that we attended [in Washington, D.C.] was 'Spring Lobby Weekend 2004.' At the seminar, we learned how to lobby our senators and representatives about ANY issue, not necessarily one having to do with peace."

Mr. Horowitz claims that Professor Wolfe "showed 'no tolerance whatsoever for any disagreement and said that he would never support the use of force as an instrument of peace,' an ideological disposition reflected in the required readings for the course." (356)

Again, the only evidence Mr. Horowitz cites for these claims are the allegations of Mr. Mock. In response, Professor Wolfe points out that the required readings for his course "include sections in the Barash and Webel text [*Peace and Conflict Studies*] covering the topics of peace through strength, criticisms of peace movements, apparent failures of nonviolence, and rebuttals to the Leninist/Marxist argument that capitalism promotes imperialism which in turn, leads to war."

In addition to these readings, Professor Wolfe states that his students are exposed to multiple sides of pertinent issues in class discussions and on course examinations. Finally, Professor Wolfe points out, "[any] Ball State student who has a complaint can appeal their grade to a board comprised of both students and faculty as outlined in the BSU 'Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities.' In my 22 years of teaching at Ball State University, I have yet to have a student formally appeal a grade, including Brett Mock."

⁵⁸ President Gora's letter is available online at: <http://www.bsu.edu/academicaffairs/article/0,1384,53748-5961-28590,00.html>.

ABOUT FREE EXCHANGE ON CAMPUS

Who we are

We are a coalition of groups that has come together to protect the free exchange of speech and ideas on campus.

Why we care

Because the free exchange of ideas on a college or university campus is central to the learning process. Today, this freedom is being threatened by ideological agendas.

Our Mission

Free Exchange on Campus is committed to advocating for the rights of students and faculty to hear and express a full range of ideas unencumbered by political or ideological interference.

Free Exchange on Campus coalition members:

American Association of University Professors
American Civil Liberties Union
American Federation of Teachers
Campus Progress / Center for American Progress
Center for Campus Free Speech
Free Press
National Association of State PIRGs
National Education Association / NEA Student Program
People for the American Way Foundation / Young People For
United States Student Association

Press Inquiries

General inquiries about Free Exchange on Campus, this report or our positions should be directed to Jamie Horwitz at 202-879-4447 or Trevor Kincaid at 202-682-1611. You may also email inquiries to press@freeexchangeoncampus.org.

