Strategizing Control of the Academy

by Sara Roy

In 2004, at Harvard University where I am based, a Jewish student, posing under an assumed (gentile) name, began posting anti-Semitic statements on the Web log of the Harvard Initiative for Peace and Justice (HIPJ), an anti-war, pro-Palestinian group on campus. This student, it turned out, was secretary of Harvard Students for Israel (which dissociated itself from the incident), and had previously accused the HIPJ of being too tolerant of anti-Semitic sentiments appearing on its e-mail lists. He went undercover to see whether the HIPJ would tolerate such racism, as part of his self-appointed effort to monitor anti-Semitism on campus. He called himself Fabian Cooper and in one post referred to Israel as the “Ashkenazi state” playing off the Hebrew word for Jews of European descent. In another e-mail, he claimed that “only a great leader like Saddam Hussein would have had the guts to hit the Zionist imperial colonists with the scud missiles necessary to set the Zionist entity on edge.” Because the HIPJ responded quickly, removing both posts within minutes of their appearance, the undercover student felt satisfied that the HIPJ was not promoting anti-Semitism at Harvard.¹

While this incident may seem outrageous to some and humorous to others, such incidents are becoming increasingly commonplace on American campuses,
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and reflect a larger and more pronounced right-wing effort in American academia to monitor, report, defame, and punish those individuals and institutions whose views the right-wingers find objectionable. The attack is directed at academic freedom generally but the most specific and virulent is reserved for those of us—both Jewish and non-Jewish—in area studies, and notably, Middle Eastern studies whose ideas are considered anti-Israel, anti-Semitic or anti-American. Furthermore, and as important, this attack is occurring with government sanction, in the virtual absence of opposing forces and with little publicity or notoriety.

*Since 9/11, the tension between America’s conservative establishment and the ‘Arab professoriate,’ as we have been called, became extremely hostile.*

That Middle Eastern studies would be the first area program to come under scrutiny is not surprising. After 9/11, the long-standing tension between America’s conservative establishment and the “Arab professoriate,” as we have been called, became extremely hostile. The right accused Middle East academics in particular of extremist scholarship and intellectual treason and subterfuge. The accusation was put into writing in a November 2001 report entitled, *Defending Civilization: How Our Universities Are Failing America and What Can Be Done About It.* The report was published by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), a non-profit organization co-founded by Lynne Cheney, wife of the Vice-President, and Senator Joseph Lieberman who ran for the Democratic presidential nomination. Citing as evidence over 100 statements by academics (and others) calling for a more critical examination of the causes of 9/11 and the role of U.S. foreign policy therein, the ACTA report effectively accused the academy of being unpatriotic and anti-American, a fifth column in the ivory tower providing intellectual succor for global terrorism. Among those cited was the president of Wesleyan University who suggested that “disparities and injustices” in America and the world can lead to hatred and violence.

Administration, Paul Wolfowitz. Professor Kramer, who teaches Arab history at Tel Aviv University, claims that Middle East studies is a shameful waste of resources because it is dominated—indeed, crippled—by pro-Arab and anti-American sentiment. He claims that the academy failed to anticipate and may even have concealed—the growing Islamist threat that resulted in the attack against the World Trade Center.4,5

Dr. Kramer believes that Middle East studies has failed miserably by devoting too much attention to historical and cultural studies that are of no use to the state

‘I want Noam Chomsky to be taught at universities about as much as I want Hitler’s writing or Stalin’s writing.’—Daniel Pipes

and its national security imperatives, and in fact may harm them. In this, he attacks several prominent scholars, notably the late Edward Said and his 1979 book, *Orientalism,* whose intellectual impact, he argues, has been singularly damaging and baneful, setting a new standard for scholarship that emphasizes “ideology” over “proficiency.” Professor Kramer concludes by calling for a new, reconstituted approach to the study of the Middle East that has at its core “[t]he idea that the United States plays an essentially beneficent role in the world.”

The assault continued with the establishment of Campus Watch, a Web site with the primary purpose of identifying and monitoring Middle Eastern studies faculty in departments across the United States for signs of anti-American and anti-Israel bias. Campus Watch was the invention of Daniel Pipes, a colleague of Martin Kramer’s and director of the Middle East Forum, a think tank devoted to promoting American interests in the Middle East.

Campus Watch is a logical extension of Dr. Pipes’ thinking. He bluntly told an interviewer, “I want Noam Chomsky to be taught at universities about as much as I want Hitler’s writing or Stalin’s writing. These are wild and extremist ideas that I believe have no place in a university.” Not only does Campus Watch monitor universities for signs of “sedition,”—i.e., views on U.S. foreign policy, Islam, Israeli policy, Palestinian rights, and the Palestinian-Israeli conflict that Dr. Pipes considers unacceptable—it encourages students to inform on professors whose views they find offensive.8 For a time, the Web site used information obtained from students to help compile online dossiers on several Middle Eastern scholars
documenting their political “extremism.”

In 2003, President Bush appointed Daniel Pipes to the Board of Directors of the United States Institute of Peace (USIP), “an independent, nonpartisan federal institution created by Congress to promote the prevention, management, and peaceful resolution of international conflicts.” Since the completion of his tenure on the USIP Board at the end of 2004, Mr. Pipes, through the Middle East Forum, has proposed the establishment of an Anti-Islamist Institute, whose goal

**Given the political climate in the United States since 9/11, the attack against area studies easily moved into the legislative realm.**

is to expose the legal activities of Islamist groups, which “pose as much or even a greater set of challenges than the illegal ones.”

In a similar vein, the U.S. Treasury Department mandated in February 2004 that “American publishers cannot edit works authored in nations under trade embargoes, which include Iran, Iraq, Sudan, Libya, and Cuba.” Violations could result in fines of up to a million dollars and as much as 10 years in jail.

Given the political climate in the United States since 9/11, the attack against area studies easily moved into the legislative realm. On October 21, 2003, the U.S. House of Representatives—though not the Senate—passed the International Studies in Higher Education Act, H.R. 3077. This $95 million bill would have been part of the Higher Education Act reauthorization known as Title VI, which mandates federal funding of international studies and foreign languages. While H.R. 3077 renews critical international education programs and makes other improvements, it also contains provisions that could impinge on if not impede decisions about curriculum, faculty hiring, course materials, and outreach programs for those institutions accepting federal funding.

A key figure behind H.R. 3077 is Dr. Stanley Kurtz, a research fellow at the Hoover Institution, a conservative think tank, and an associate of Drs. Kramer and Pipes. Mr. Kurtz’s testimony before the House on June 19, 2003, accused scholars of the Middle East and other areas of abusing Title VI monies with their “extreme and one-sided criticism of American foreign policy.” He, like Martin Kramer, cites Edward Said’s work on post-colonial theory as the most pernicious.
He argues that the core premise of post-colonial theory is that “it is immoral for a scholar to put his knowledge of foreign languages and cultures at the service of American power.” This distortion and several others contained in Dr. Kurtz’s testimony were accepted by Congress without debate and many of his recommendations for “repairing” the damage were adopted by the House.

Potentially the most onerous of these recommendations is the establishment of an international higher education advisory board to ensure that government funded programs “will reflect diverse perspectives and the full range of views on

[T]he advisory board will ‘increase accountability by providing advice, counsel, and recommendations to Congress on international education issues for higher education.’

world religions, foreign language, and international affairs.”

The advisory board would have seven members: three would be appointed by the Secretary of Education, two of whom would “represent Federal agencies that have national security responsibilities” (which could include the Department of Defense, National Security Agency, CIA, and FBI); two by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and two by the president pro tempore of the Senate. According to Congressman John Boehner, a Republican from Ohio, the advisory board will “increase accountability by providing advice, counsel, and recommendations to Congress on international education issues for higher education.” Indeed, the many functions of the advisory board include making recommendations “to improve the programs under [Title VI] to better reflect the national needs related to the homeland security, international education, and international affairs. . .” (emphasis added).

The advisory board, furthermore, would be under the purview of no one. Its functions, powers, duties, and recommendations shall not be subject to review or approval by any officer of the federal government including the Secretary of Education. And, although the bill does state that the advisory board is not authorized to “mandate, direct, or control an institution of higher education’s specific instructional content, curriculum, or program of instruction,” the board is authorized “to study, monitor, apprise and evaluate a sample of activities supported under [the] title,” which amounts to the same thing: unprecedented federeal
mandated interference into the conduct and content of university-based area studies programs.

There is a great deal at stake for American higher education and academic freedom. If this legislation becomes law, it will create a board that will monitor how effectively universities reflect and represent official (largely foreign) policy and impact national security. Since the legislation assumes that the flaw lies “with the experts, not the policy,” the government could be given the power to insert politically sympathetic voices—i.e., supporters of U.S. foreign policy—into the academic mainstream, reshaping the boundaries for academic investigation.

Under H.R. 3077 any institutional resistance would most likely be punished by the withdrawal of funds—although repercussions for noncompliance remain unclear—which would be extremely damaging to Middle East centers especially. Although Title VI monies make up only 0.005 percent of the federal budget, they constitute a large percentage of area centers’ budgets and are often crucial to their survival (there are 118 area centers in the U.S. that receive Title VI monies, and approximately 16 are in Middle East studies). Middle East and other area centers would either be forced to adopt government dictates, which would seriously erode the quality of instruction or, by refusing funds, would have to reduce and possibly end their programs altogether.

H.R. 3077 contains other provisions that are equally outrageous and dangerous. It requires Title VI institutions to provide government recruiters with access to students and student recruiting information, and exerts pressure on area studies programs to encourage students to work for government agencies. The bill further directs the Secretary of Education and the advisory board to study “foreign language heritage communities” within the United States (i.e., communities of U.S. citizens and residents who speak a foreign language), “particularly such communities that include speakers of languages that are critical to the national security of the United States.” This constitutes nothing less than surveillance and spying.

After passing in the House of Representatives in October 2003, H.R. 3077 was never heard by the Senate for largely bureaucratic reasons. However, H.R.
3077 has been reintroduced in the 109th Congress with essentially identical language in two separate bills: H.R. 509, the “International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2005,” which reauthorizes only Title VI, and H.R. 609, a larger bill reauthorizing all of the Higher Education Act (of which Title VI is a part). In June 2005, H.R. 509 was passed by the House Select Education Subcommittee, which unanimously agreed to specific bipartisan amendments. These amendments, if passed, represent improvements to the bill, particularly with regard to the functions of the advisory board, but they do not eliminate many of the bill’s most worrisome features. The independence of the advisory board, its functions and operations, for example, remain essentially unchanged.

The bill must now pass the full Education Committee and the full House. The Senate must then pass its own version of the Higher Education Act reauthorization, and this is followed by a conference to iron out the inevitable differences between the House and Senate versions. The conference report then goes to both houses for final passage, and on to the President for signature.

The use of the legislation to control academic content has become a prominent part of the campaign against area studies and academic freedom, which has intensified over the last year. The debate continues to be fuelled by the neo-conservative belief that American universities are dominated by left-wing faculty who use the classroom to promote political agenda over rigorous scholarship, a belief that is gaining currency and legitimacy within America’s political culture. The primary charge continues to be anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism, but increasingly it is First Amendment rights that are being directly threatened. The slow but steady silencing of American academia can be viewed at two levels: changes in university
policies and campus politics, and in state and national legislation.

An early example comes from the University of North Carolina (UNC) where incoming students were required to read Michael Sells’s *Approaching the Qur’an: The Early Revelations* before arriving on campus. This book—a translation into English of 35 of the early suras or chapters of the Islamic holy book (each followed by a commentary and explanation)—is considered one of the finest scholarly studies of the Koran available. Yet, three students—one Jewish and two Christian—in addition to a UNC alumna, a number of Fundamentalist Christian

organizations, and two North Carolina citizens, argued that they were being discriminated against. In 2002, they sued UNC through the conservative Christian organization, the American Family Association, and received support from one committee of the North Carolina state legislature, which voted to end funding for the course. Although the case was lost, the university no longer requires this book to be read by incoming students. This example and others suggest that some students are trying to control what they are taught, immunizing themselves to ideas that might challenge or offend them, or better inform them about the contemporary world and how to participate intelligently within it.

The movement to ensure “diversity” on campus and free students from the threat of political indoctrination by faculty continues to be led by Campus Watch-type organizations. A prominent example is called Students for Academic Freedom (SAF), which has branches on 135 campuses (including Brown, Cornell, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale), and is allied with David Horowitz, a well-known conservative pundit. (A similar organization known as the Israel Academia Monitor has recently been established in Israel to monitor “abuses of academic freedom and politicalization of Israeli campuses by extremists and radicals in Israeli academia”). Like Campus Watch, SAF monitors professors for alleged bias, as they define it. Its Web site prominently displays an “Academic Freedom Abuse Center” which states, “If you have your rights abused in a college course (e.g., unfair grading, one-sided lectures, stacked reading lists), please report this abuse.” It also asks, “Is Your Professor Using the Classroom as a Platform for Political Agendas?” If so,
it encourages students to place an announcement in their college newspaper.21

Horowitz runs an online journal, *FrontPage Magazine*, which claims 1.7 million visits a month. He has devoted considerable attention to Ball State University in Indiana and its Peace Studies program, which has been accused of promoting views that are anti-American and pro-terrorist. Horowitz says of the Ball State controversy: “There are 250 peace studies programs in America like the one at Ball State. They 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. . . . The question is: how long can a nation at war with ruthless enemies like bin Laden and Zarqawi survive if its educational institutions continue to be suborned in this way?”22

More importantly, Horowitz has authored an Academic Bill of Rights (ABR), which he claims is intended to eliminate partisan politics from the classroom, and is informed by the belief that “the rights of students to not be indoctrinated or otherwise assaulted by political propagandists in the classroom or any educational setting”23 are profoundly under-protected by colleges and universities. Indeed, argues Horowitz, “[e]specially recently with the growing partisan activities of some faculty members and the consequent politicization of some aspects of the curriculum, that lack of support has become one of the most pressing issues in the academy.”24

Echoing in objective and content the House of Representatives legislation (H.R. 3077) calling for the establishment of an advisory board to “oversee” area studies, the ABR contains eight guiding principles.25 Some appear perfectly reasonable. Others, like the principle stating that “[f]aculty will not use their courses for the purpose of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination” are clearly open to interpretation, allowing for significant intrusion into the educational process by those outside the academy. The core objective of the ABR appears the same as H.R. 3077: to legislate and mandate official interference into the content and conduct of university classrooms, monitoring and regulating what is taught and by whom.

Horowitz’s Academic Bill of Rights is not to be taken lightly. No doubt aware
that his ability to litigate cases against individual universities is limited, Horowitz is pursuing a strategy of getting the ABR adopted legally, particularly by state legislatures. For example, although the provost of Ball State University defended the Peace Studies program and its professor, Horowitz now hopes to get his Bill of Rights adopted in the Indiana state legislature. Furthermore, in a letter to the Indiana state legislature, SAF’s national director revealed that the ABR has become “the education policy of the State of Colorado and . . . has been adopted as model legislation by the Association of Legislative Exchange Commissions (ALEC), a bi-partisan organiza-

Parents and Students for Academic Freedom is designed to address ‘the one-sided teaching and parti-san indoctrination in our nation’s secondary schools.’

tion of 2,400 state legislators. [It] . . . also passed the Georgia senate by a vote of 41-5 and is being introduced in 19 state legislatures.”26 In 2004, four state universities in Colorado also adopted ABR principles under legislative pressure.27

The Republican-controlled legislature in Ohio is also considering a version of the ABR that “would prohibit public and private college professors from presenting opinions as fact or penalizing students for expressing their views. Professors would not be allowed to introduce controversial material unrelated to the course.”28 The bill’s sponsor, Senator Larry Mumper, argued, “I see students coming out having gone in without any ideological leanings one way or another, coming out with an indoctrination of a lot of left-wing issues.”29 Furthermore, “why should we, as fairly moderate to conservative legislators, continue to support universities that turn out students who rail against the very policies their parents voted us in for?”30 Apparently, backers of Florida’s version of the ABR “would like to empower students to sue professors with whom they disagree on the theory of evolution.”31

Additionally, the SAF is working to get the ABR adopted by university administrations on 105 member campuses across the country. Perhaps most alarmingly, the U.S. House of Representatives has introduced a mirror version of the ABR—House Concurrent Resolution 318. Although it did not reach the Senate before the end of the last session, it was reintroduced in the current Congress.

It should also be noted that the SAF considers the K-12 level an important battleground as well. At this level, both parents and children joined in August
2004 to form Parents and Students for Academic Freedom (PSAF), a forum designed to address “the one-sided teaching and partisan indoctrination in our nation’s secondary schools.” PSAF “urges school boards and legislatures to adopt the same speech-restricting principles that its parent organization (Students for Academic Freedom) urges at the college level.”

There are several organizations that are operating at the high school level: ProtestWarrior.com, which has given its 160 high school chapters and 100

**The film consists of interviews with student supporters of Israel who allege intimidation and harassment from faculty who are portrayed as hostile to the Jewish state.**

individual students materials to expose any teacher who would try “to shove his ideology down someone’s throat.” Others include Christian Copts of California, which, this year, distributed 5,000 booklets in California and Florida “denouncing a seventh-grade world history section as an ‘attempt to engrave Islam in the minds of . . . children;’” and Republicanvoices.org, which solicits “testimony from K-12 students about political bias in the classroom.” The latter has its own blog and “Public School Batteline Correspondent” who aims to inform his readership about “liberal indoctrination in public schools.”

On July 5, 2005, Mr. Horowitz and his supporters won an important victory in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, which passed a resolution creating a special committee “charged with investigating—at public colleges in the state—how faculty members are hired and promoted, whether students are fairly evaluated, and whether students have the right to express their views without fear of being punished . . .” The vote of 108-90, with largely Republican support, mirrors the language and objectives of the ABR. According to the faculty union at Temple University, the resolution clearly “open[s] the door to the kind of political presence in higher education that we haven’t seen in Pennsylvania for 50 years.”

The mounting sense of siege that is increasingly felt on American campuses has found further expression at Columbia University, which is currently embroiled in a controversy involving its Middle East and Asian Languages and Culture Department (MEALAC). The controversy centers around a documentary film, *Columbia Unbecoming*, produced by the David Project, a pro-Israel advocacy group.
based in Boston whose stated aim in making the film was to “make a change at Columbia” and make the Middle Eastern studies department “diverse.” The film consists of interviews with student supporters of Israel who allege instances of intimidation and harassment from MEALAC faculty who are portrayed as hostile to the Jewish state. After hearing of the film, New York’s Democratic congressman Anthony Weiner, who recently ran for mayor of New York in the Democratic primary, immediately called upon Columbia’s President Bollinger to dismiss assistant professor Joseph Massad, a target of the documentary who is accused of verbally abusing Israeli and Jewish students among other charges including anti-Semitism, and who has long been the target of an intimidation campaign against professors who criticize Israeli policies. Massad, deluged by hate mail and defiled as a “camel jockey” and “pathetic typical Arab liar,” decided not to teach his course, “Palestinian and Israeli Politics and Societies,” last semester.

Columbia Unbecoming, which has at least six versions and has never been screened for the public, is aimed at frightening and silencing critics of Israel. As such, the film represents an assault upon academic freedom and on the classroom “as a site of engaged reflection and unsettling debate.” Yet, at their core, such defamatory campaigns are not really aimed as much at individual professors as they are at university administrations, which may feel pressured to respond in some conciliatory way as the University of North Carolina did.

In Columbia’s case the response was more dramatic. According to the minutes of an October 2004 faculty meeting, President Bollinger—who has been criticized by some faculty for his administrative silence on the matter—first asked Columbia’s provost to “look into the implications of these charges and into charges that there is a climate of intimidation on campus. . . . We will not allow our faculty to be tried and convicted in the press, we will not launch a witch-hunt, but we will deal responsibly with accusations as they arise. . . . We also do not allow intimidation of students, or political indoctrination in the classroom. . . .”

But President Bollinger—himself a First Amendment scholar—went on to
say “that the First Amendment does not apply to the university because it is a private institution. It can choose its policies for how to treat faculty utterances.” On the other hand, the minutes reported that Bollinger had “tried to articulate” the views of the faculty, “and the position he has taken seems to have support on campus. But this position is not uncontested, and it could be changed.”

Some Columbia faculty interpreted President Bollinger’s statements as a threat. By explaining that the First Amendment was something that Columbia had chosen to maintain, Mr. Bollinger was heard to say that it was a right that could be revoked.

The attack on area studies specifically and academic freedom generally is an attempt to end all disagreement with the neo-conservative agenda.

As a private institution Columbia supports the First Amendment and freedom of expression but this freedom does not guarantee that an academic would remain employed by the university if he or she expressed views that were objectionable, for example, to individual students who might solicit support of the state. In a recent interview with the New York Times, Bollinger also said that the “university has more work to do in enriching the curriculum and adding to the scholarship in the Middle East department.”

A subsequent assault against Columbia’s Middle East department came from the New York City Department of Education, which announced that it will prohibit Professor Rashid Khalidi from appearing in a training program for secondary school teachers (in which he had successfully participated in the past) because of Khalidi’s “criticism of Israel.” Dr. Khalidi is the director of Columbia’s Middle East Institute and is the Edward W. Said Professor of Arab Studies. In an e-mail message to the New York Sun newspaper, the office of the chancellor of schools, wrote, “Considering his past statements, Rashid Khalidi should not have been included in a program that provided professional development for DOE teachers, and he won’t be participating in the future.”

The attack on area studies specifically and academic freedom generally is, at its core, an attempt to silence criticism of U.S. policy and end all disagreement with the neo-conservative agenda. It is not diversity that is sought but conformity. This battle by the right wing is being fought with great determination, and is pri-
marily directed at legislating government control of the academy at both the state and federal levels. The degree of their success can be measured by the normalization of their discourse within government and the media. More dangerously, there is little if any real opposition\(^5\) save the academy itself, which, it seems, remains largely unmobilized in this increasingly intolerant time.

American higher education has long had a system that works. The federal government has funded programs and research as defined by the academy, understanding their value and research and the importance of academic autonomy. “In this scheme of things, professional academic standards and norms constitute the shield that protects [academic] freedom while internally regulating and constraining it.”\(^6\) If this system is transformed into a form of government intrusion into, and censorship of, the classroom as it now has in Pennsylvania’s public colleges—where faculty and curricula are decided according to political rather than intellectual criteria, and where faculty are monitored and vulnerable to sanctions for how and what they teach—then the academy risks free and critical thought and the right of dissent; if they are lost, so are we. \(^6\)
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