

Invasion of the mind-snatchers

By Bill Steigerwald TRIBUNE-REVIEW Saturday, March 18, 2006

David Horowitz's new book, "The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America," will make him no new friends in academia. Not that the conservative commentator and former Marxist has many friends left at American universities.





Horowitz, the author of three New York Times best-sellers, earns his daily bread blasting the left-liberal radicals he says have corrupted higher education from coast to coast and turned some college departments into "political parties that would give the Communist Party a run for its radical money." I talked to Horowitz Thursday by telephone from his offices in Los Angeles, where he is president of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture (www.cspc.org):

Q: We've known for a long time that many campuses are dominated by left-liberals. Is it worse than people think?

A: It's worse than I thought and I thought it was worse than most people think. What's happened is that a generation of radicals got tenure and carried their political agendas into the university. Not only have they introduced a blacklist that has excluded conservatives, libertarians and believing Christians from faculty positions but they have actually transformed whole fields and departments and made them into ideological and indoctrination and recruitment centers for the radical left.

Usually the fields end in "studies": women's studies, black studies, religious studies -- one of the worst fields in the country -- whiteness studies, queer studies, peace studies, global studies, cultural studies, all different forms of Marxism and various derivative radical doctrines.

They've destroyed the field of cultural anthropology (the study of other cultures). What they've turned it into is, well, Marxism again. You can go to Guatemala and hang out with terrorists and other quote "progressive" unquote groups, write up your experiences and publish them as a book, throw in a few Frenchified words like "imbrication" and invent some other nonwords like "fluidarity" -- which is kind of solidarity but across borders -- refer to yourself as a "gringa," and you'll become a tenured professor at Duke, like Diane Nelson, who is a director of undergraduate studies in the cultural anthropology department with a degree from Stanford.

This woman is a blooming idiot. Yet she has a \$130,000-a-year job for six hours a week in class, four months paid vacation every year and the ability to run around the Duke campus recruiting children for communist causes. Does anybody out there think this could be possible?

Q: Give us a quick synopsis of your book.

A: It's about Diane Nelson -- and 50,000 professors like her. My book is a collection of profiles to show a pattern that exists in the universities: the pattern of hiring radical extremists to faculties, the pattern in which they are powers in the profession -- department chairs, heads of professional associations, like the American Historical Association and, of course, the American Anthropological Association.

Another pattern I show is professors who are promoted beyond their scholarly output; they don't have the credentials for teaching what they teach -- a professor of saxophone who's the director of peace studies at Ball State; an animal biologist, who has written the most widely used text in peace studies, on war and peace; people who are just completely unqualified. If you have the right politics, you get promoted.

Also there are bigots -- professors who are anti-Semites. I have a professor in there who told an Armenian student the Armenians deserved to be massacred ... professors who hate Christians and who violate all the sensitivity rules of the university but have no repercussions because the groups they are attacking are groups that it's OK to attack.

Q: What's the typical ideological profile of one of your 101 professors?

A: A professor who believes the terrorists are freedom fighters and America is the Great Satan. They all believe in some version of Marxism, though they call it feminism, post-structuralism, post-modernism. They believe private property is evil. War is caused by corporations and American generals. America is an oppressive, racist, homophobic, imperialist society and the reason we are being attacked is because of what we do to other people. Jews are monsters who have turned Palestinians into suicide bombers because Palestinians have no other choice.

That's your fundamental creed of the tenured radical.

Q: You say as many as 60,000 of the country's 617,000 professors are radicals. What's the worst damage they are doing?

A: I estimate that maybe 3 million students a year will go through their classes, where they will hear anti-American propaganda, or libels, as I would call them. ... (I)t's mainly that they are indoctrinating students and recruiting them to radical causes.

Q: You say you are exposing these professors not because they have biases but because they have decided to preach and not teach.

A: The indictment in the book is of professors who abuse the university system

for political agendas. In some of the profiles, the book does take on some of their misrepresentations. Grover Furr, of Montclair State, thinks that Stalin was a democrat and the collapse of the Soviet Union was a moral catastrophe. He's a medievalist, but he's managed to get a course -- and this is part of what I call the consumer fraud that is going on -- in which he can teach his ridiculous opinions. I do think that when you see the 100 professors strung together, it makes a deep impression on you with the problem we have in this country with a Fifth Column.

Q: Are non-liberals being discriminated against?

A: The longest, most extensive blacklist in the history of America, which goes together with the biggest witch-hunt in the history of America, is the blacklisting of conservatives within university environments. By witch-hunt, I mean if you laugh at the wrong joke, or you use the wrong phrase, you are a racist, a homophobe or a sexist -- "Gotchya!" And if you are tarred enough, and it doesn't take more than a few shots, your career comes to an end. So you have a large group of people on university faculties who are just intimidated.

There are actual liberals -- I don't like to apply the term "liberal" to people who are intolerant, malicious and who are witch-hunters and blacklisters. There are a lot of people in the university who are not that, but they are pretty much a silent majority out of fear of being censured.

In the public sphere, the dominant ideology of the university is left. Otherwise, a Diane Nelson could not have gotten tenure, could not be the director of undergraduate studies and would have been fired a long time ago by her peers. But they are afraid of her.

Q: What advice do you give to nonliberal parents?

A: When your student goes to college, get him connected with a sensible group. If you're a sensible liberal, um, jeez, I don't know what the heck

Q: The Democrat Party?

A: Well, no. The Democrat Party has suffered tremendously. That's why it's lurching so far to the left. College Democrats are a dangerous political group for a true liberal. You won't find many Joe Lieberman supporters among university faculty, so I don't really know what groups they would join. But conservative students should get connected with college Republicans and read regularly a conservative Web site or journal. That would be helpful. You can tell from my book that you don't want your student going into any cultural anthropology course or department. Stay out of them. Economics departments are the best in the liberal arts schools, without question -- except for the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. It's a Marxist department.

Bill Steigerwald can be reached at or .



Images and text copyright © 2004 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from <u>PittsburghLIVE</u>.

Pittsburgh Pittsburgh Pittsburgh Tribune-Review

Re-educating Comrade Horowitz

Tuesday, March 21, 2006

David Horowitz, author of "The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America," makes misleading statements about me in his interview with Bill Steigerwald (<u>"Invasion of the mind snatchers"</u> Q&A, March 18 and TribLIVE.com). I'd like to reply.

Horowitz says that I "think Stalin was a democrat." That's what the best evidence and research, including my own, demonstrate (<u>"Stalin and the</u> Struggle for Democratic Reform"). Horowitz disagrees? Where is *his* evidence?

 Frools

 Print this article

 E-mail this article

 Subscribe to this

 paper

 Larger / Smaller Text



He says I think "the collapse of the Soviet Union was a moral catastrophe," but omits <u>my reason</u> for thinking so: It led to a catastrophic plunge in the standard of living for most of its people.

He says that I have "managed to get a course ... in which he can teach his ridiculous opinions." This is a lie, and Horowitz knows it. His researcher read all my course Web pages and homework assignments, and knows that I do not even mention the Soviet Union in any of them.

In my courses I teach not "opinions," but what the best research demonstrates. Scholarship, research, evidence, logic -- this is the only way to approximate the truth.

If he were honest, he would have said: "Professor Furr disagrees with *me*, David Horowitz!" To which my answer would be: "Sure I do! So what?"

Grover Furr Montclair, N.J.

The writer is an English professor at Montclair State University.



Images and text copyright © 2004 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from <u>PittsburghLIVE.</u>



Professor, meet Killer Joe

Sunday, April 16, 2006

Montclair State Professor Grover Furr's response to the interview with David Horowitz by Bill Steigerwald ("<u>Invasion of the mind-snatchers</u>," March 18 and TribLIVE.com) makes a mockery of history ("<u>Re-educating Comrade Horowitz</u>," Letters, March 21 and TribLIVE.com).





Contrary to the universally accepted view that Joseph Stalin was one of the most vicious and bloodthirsty dictators of the 20th century, in his article "Stalin and the Struggle for Democratic Reform," Furr makes this Caucasian brigand into an advocate of democracy. It's like making Hitler into a humanitarian just in the process of being canonized.

Apparently, Professor Furr has not heard of the gulag slave labor camps, where millions died as innocent victims of Stalinism; nor of the artificially induced famine in Ukraine, which resulted in the death of six to seven million and produced even manifestations of cannibalism among people driven insane by hunger; nor of the show trials of the 1930s, which led to the execution of tens of thousands, including many of the founders of the Soviet Union.

Stalin's personal responsibility for these events is undeniable. Stalin's official biographer, Soviet historian Dimitri Volkogonov, claims that directly or indirectly Stalin was responsible for the death of 45 million people.

Moreover, in one afternoon, on Dec. 12, 1938, while preparing for a private showing of a new film, he personally signed the death warrants of 3,182 victims, who had been accused of various dreamt-up political crimes.

If this is a manifestation of a "struggle for democratic reform," then Professor Furr must be living on a different planet.

Steven B. Vardy Squirrel Hill

The writer is a history professor at Duquesne University.



Images and text copyright © 2006 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from PittsburghLIVE.

PITTSBURGH TRIBUNE-REVIEW

Standing by Stalin

Monday, May 1, 2006

Professor Steven Vardy of Duquesne University criticized my response to David Horowitz ("<u>Re-educating Comrade Horowitz</u>," Letters, March 21 and TribLIVE.com), but he is wrong on each of his statements ("<u>Professor, meet Killer Joe</u>," Letters, April 16 and TribLIVE.com).

For example: "Millions" did not "die as innocent victims" in the gulag. The famine of 1932-33 was not "artificially induced" nor confined to the Ukraine; nor did "six to seven million" die in it.

All evidence points to the guilt of the defendants in the Moscow Trials. And there is no evidence for his absurd claim that Stalin "was responsible for the death of 45 million people." Stalin did not sign "death warrants" at all, much less for "3,182 victims on Dec. 12, 1938."

Soviet history has been falsified for over a half-century. In my own research, I am simply popularizing a little of the exciting new research on the Soviet Union that recently has been produced in Russia. There is much more to come.

Grover Furr Montclair, N.J.

The writer is an English professor at Montclair State University.

Images and text copyright © 2006 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from <u>PittsburghLIVE.com</u>

PITTSBURGH TRIBUNE-REVIEW

http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/opinion/letters/s_452913.html

Stalin's crimes

Friday, May 12, 2006

Montclair State University professor Grover Furr's letter ("<u>Standing by Stalin</u>," Letters, May 1 and TribLIVE.com) claims that Stalin is innocent of the murder of millions and that the defendants in the purge trials were all guilty as charged.

I would ask Furr about hundreds of murdered communists who were politically rehabilitated and reinstated in party honors after Stalin's death. And what about Khrushchev's revelations at the 20th party congress about Stalin's crimes against party members?

Alexander Yakovlev was highly placed in the Communist Party Soviet Union and he has read the Stalin archives, which he reported in "A Century of Violence in Soviet Russia." Dmitri Volkogonov, a retired a general in the Red Army, reported numerous details of Stalin's and Lenin's crimes in his biographies. They were important Communist insiders and they have cited facts and dates about Stalin's murderous purges.

Walter Slack New Castle

Images and text copyright © 2006 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from <u>PittsburghLIVE.com</u>

PITTSBURGH TRIBUNE-REVIEW

Rehabilitating Stalin

Thursday, May 18, 2006

Regarding two of the questions letter-writer Walter Slack raises concerning recent research on Joseph Stalin ("<u>Stalin's crimes</u>," May 12 and TribLIVE.com):

- Virtually every "revelation" about Stalin's crimes against party members made by Khrushchev in his famous 1956 "Secret Speech" turns out to have been not simply incorrect but a deliberate lie. I'm concluding a lengthy study of this very issue.
- Neither Alexander Yakovlev's nor Dmitri Volkogonov's works are objective. They tailored their mendacious books -- "research" is not the proper word here -- to Gorbachev's and Yeltsin's political needs.

As my earlier letter explained ("<u>Standing by Stalin</u>," May 1 and TribLIVE.com), my conclusions reflect new research on the Stalin period being done now in Russia. This research is based on documents from formerly secret Soviet archives. It shatters what we have all been taught for a half-century.

It is exciting and important stuff, and there's much more to come.

Grover Furr Montclair, N.J.

The writer is an English professor at Montclair State University.

Images and text copyright © 2006 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from $\underline{\mathsf{PittsburghLIVE.com}}$



Rehabilitating Stalin II

Thursday, May 18, 2006

If there were a law against "Gulag deniers" as there is a law against "Holocaust deniers," then professor Grover Furr would be siting in an Austrian jail like author David Irving, instead of "misteaching" and misleading his students at Montclair State University.

Steven B. Vardy Squirrel Hill

The writer is a history professor at Duquesne University.

Images and text copyright © 2006 by The Tribune-Review Publishing Co. Reproduction or reuse prohibited without written consent from <u>PittsburghLIVE.com</u>