Jeremy Rabkin, Professor of Law at George Mason University addressed the topic, “Are we outsourcing the U.S. Constitution?,” at an Accuracy in Academia Constitution Day author’s night on September 17th.

Rabkin, who specializes in international law, asserted that “there is an evolving global norm” to which some people think the U.S. Constitution should be adapted. He stated his concern that “some people think that international treaties should be taken up by American courts,” which he said worries him because international treaties potentially affect how the U.S. defines its Constitution. According to Rabkin, international laws should be “agreements among states, which [the U.S. will] observe if the other signatories observe.” He then pointed out what he saw as potential treaties that are perhaps a bit too ambitious, such as the current push to stop global warming.

He complained about the International Criminal Court (ICC) saying that “these people are going to tell [the U.S] when we can and cannot use force” and claimed that members of the ICC are a bunch of people most citizens have never heard of.

Rabkin pointed to Europe as an example of how not to form a constitution, saying that the European Union Constitution was created by judges who did not consult the people and, consequently, “people in Europe are not attached” to it or each other. “They have a common constitution run by judges, but that is not enough,” he argued.

Rabkin noted the common bond that Americans feel, typified by the united reaction against the September 11th attacks. Adopting European Union cul-
"promise to shoot anyone who is a domestic enemy." Rabkin stated his conviction that it is "really important that the constitution begins with the words ‘We the People.’"

Sarah Carlsruh is an intern at the American Journalism Center, a training program run by Accuracy in Media and Accuracy in Academia.

---

**SQUEAKY CHALK**

*by Deborah Lambert*

**GLOBAL WARMING ACTIVIST BONANZA**

High school students are in for an unhealthy dose of global warming hype this year, thanks to the persistence of an activist group called the Alliance for Climate Education in Oakland, California.

Heartland Institute correspondent Paul Chesser reported that the group, put together by wind energy entrepreneur Michael Haas, has not only "targeted five metropolitan areas" but is now “opening a Washington D.C. office.”

His do-goodnik operation hasn’t hindered the entrepreneurial side of Haas, an Obama supporter, who “stands to reap millions of dollars in government subsidies that climate change-driven energy policies would bring.”

Meanwhile, high schoolers are being treated to high-budget, “hip” presentations “with slick animation that propagate the idea that everyone in their spheres of influence must modify their behaviors so as to stop global warming.”

But Paul Chesser if anyone knows enough to combat the lies in these presentations, like the whopper about the kids living through the ten hottest years on record. And what about the lie that “greenhouse gas emissions are cranking up the global thermostat ‘way too high’?”

Not surprisingly, any scientific, fact-based studies that show that we may be “entering a prolonged cooling period, due to an inactive sun, are left out of the climate discussion.”

If you live in the San Francisco, Chicago, L.A., Houston or Boston areas, your teens may have already been exposed to this claptrap. Washington area students are next. Stay tuned . . .

✦ ✦ ✦

**GEORGETOWN VS. THE CONSTITUTION**

Author/columnist John Leo posted the following comments regarding the Constitution on MindingtheCampus.com:

“Patrick Deneen, professor of government at Georgetown and founder of Georgetown’s Tocqueville Forum on the Roots of American Democracy, spoke September 23rd at a luncheon in New York sponsored by the Manhattan Institute’s Center for the American University. The following is an excerpt. The full text will appear in the winter issue of The New Atlantis:

‘Today many university students are taught little to nothing about the Constitution, much less its philosophical and even theological underpinnings. If anything, they are either taught to see its constraints as obstacles to be overcome, or simply to understand it as a “living” document that reflects the sentiments of the day. At Georgetown, where I teach, there is one course in American history—actually called “History of the Atlantic”—that can be taken to fulfill one of the core course requirements in History.

‘This course focuses primarily on issues of race, gender, and colonialism, briefly touching on the Atlantic Revolutions, and at no time on the American Founding. However a disproportionately large amount of time is spent exploring American exploitation. Im-
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explicitly our students are taught that the official claims of the Founders were so much deceptive rhetoric, that they employed rationalizations to cover their fundamental will to power.

‘By implication, will to power is the sole identifiable motivation of human beings, and to accept the notion that we are to be governed by a law above ourselves is simply to be a dupe or a patsy. They are not told that the Constitution lays out not only the basic structures of government, but does so in a manner that acknowledges our perpetual need for the lessons of self-restraint through the rule of law.’”

INTERNET GAYDAR

“Judge a man by the company he keeps” is a time-honored saying that’s becoming increasingly relevant on one of the Internet’s high-profile social networking sites.

“Using data from the social network Facebook,” a couple of MIT students designed a program they called Gaydar. They discovered that “just by looking at a person’s online friends, they could predict whether the person was gay,” according to Carolyn Y. Johnson in the Boston Globe.

By teaching their computer programs to make predictions from profiles of those who identified themselves as gay, straight or bisexual, the students performed the same analysis for others who didn’t report their sexuality. While there was no way to confirm the accuracy of their software’s conclusions, the students said they knew which ones were gay—and their judgments were apparently confirmed by the software.

The students concluded that “people may be effectively ‘outing’ themselves just by the virtual company they keep.”

NO BIG APPLE PIE

That time-honored fundraising staple—the school bake sale— is apparently getting the boot from the New York City Education Department.

“Not even zucchini bread makes the cut,” according to the New York Times.

One notable exception to the new health regs is that once a month, parents’ groups and PTAs are given free rein to “sell as many dark fudge brownies and lemon bars as they please, so long as lunch has ended.”

And after 6:00 pm, everyone who’s still on the premises can stuff their faces to the max.

Since public health and education are two of Mayor Bloomberg’s signature issues, the fact that 40 percent of the city’s elementary and middle school students are overweight has not escaped his notice.

So far, students are giving the new healthy food rules a thumbs-down. For example, many student athletes wonder how they’ll raise funds for new scoreboards and sports equipment in this new sugar and fat-free universe.

This is serious stuff, folks. School principals’ performance ratings will suffer if they don’t comply with the new regs.

Ideas are floating around concerning how to take up the slack. But so far, key chains and walkathons aren’t grabbing many converts.

DEPT. OF “TOO MUCH INFORMATION”

Terrence Kealey, vice-chancellor of the University of Buckingham, says he didn’t mean any harm by the comments in his lighthearted essay called “The Seven Deadly Sins of the Academy.”

But when politically correct readers caught sight of the comments in his “humor” column in the Times Higher Education Supplement, they caused quite a stir.

Kealey noted that “when an attractive female student ‘flashes her admiration,’ the male scholar should follow this advice: ‘Enjoy her! She’s a perk.’”

What really raised eyebrows was Kealey’s comment that occasionally, “a student will ‘flaunt you her curves . . . which you should admire daily to spice up your sex nightly, with the wife.’”

The National Union of Students condemned these remarks as “insulting and disrespectful to women,” while at least one reader noted that Kealey’s comments made him sound like an “old perv.”

Meanwhile, the vice-chancellor defends his remarks, saying they were couched by an overall “look but don’t touch” theme, stressing that “transgressional sex”—between middle-aged men and young female students—is inappropriate.
THE ORIGINAL COMEBACK KID
by Malcolm A. Kline

American presidents of both parties, all too often, need to be appreciated at a distance. Of the 20th century chief executives, perhaps only Ronald Reagan holds up well under scrutiny.

Truly, the more you know about him, the more there is to like. Even a few academics are starting to appreciate him.

“Political scientist Andrew Busch conducted a content analysis of major presidential speeches from Lyndon Johnson through Reagan and found that Reagan cited the Founders three to four times as often as his four predecessors,” Steven F. Hayward writes in his masterful The Age of Reagan. “Reagan mentions the Constitution ten times in his memoirs, often in a substantive way; Carter, Ford, Nixon and Johnson mention the Constitution a grand total of zero times.”

In this way, Reagan represented both a continuity of American tradition and a break with a series of, to put it charitably, failed presidencies. Reagan also marked a number of firsts in the Oval Office:

• The first divorced man elected president;
• The first Democrat-turned-Republican to serve as commander-in-chief; and
• The first labor union leader.

It was this last part of his résumé that led to Reagan’s success as presidential negotiator at home and abroad where others before, and, for that matter, after, him failed. In the words of a Kenny Rogers’ song, he knew when to hold ‘em, knew when to fold ‘em, although did much better than break even.

Contrary to expectations, it was in high stakes international talks, where he was least experienced, that he was, arguably most effective. Paul Nitze, arms control negotiator for every president since Harry Truman, found the Gipper’s approach to disarmament discussions with the Soviet Union a sharp break with the methods of other presidents.

Hayward recounts what happened when Reagan gave Nitze instructions on how to proceed with missile reduction proposals. “If the United States could give up Pershings, he asked Nitze, why shouldn’t the Soviets give up their SS-20s?” Hayward writes. “Nitze said that he didn’t think it realistic to go back to the zero option position in Geneva.” Reagan said, “Well, Paul, you just tell them you’re working for one tough son of a bitch.” Paul was at that, and not just because the oldest president ever elected had recently survived a near fatal assassination attempt.

“As he had long wanted to, Reagan had said n[italicics the author’s]yet to a weak arms deal—but to his own people, not face-to-face with a Soviet leader,” Hayward notes. With the Soviets, President Reagan did walk away from a bad deal at Reykjavik in 1986 but later signed onto extensive disarmament pacts with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Those agreements alarmed conservatives at the time but Hayward, a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) shows that they need not have worried. With the benefit of declassified data from both the
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U. S. and Russian governments, we can now see that President Reagan entered and left those discussions in a position of strength.

Meanwhile, of course, the Cold War ended with communism in retreat. In his thorough examination of the Reagan years, Hayward pretty much lays waste to the media myth of President Reagan as scripted and staff-driven.

For one thing, the 40th president penned more of his own speeches than other presidents, so there is a good chance that when Reagan worked from a script, he also wrote it. Also, Reagan would overrule the advice of his advisors.

One notable example was his use of the phrase “Tear down this wall” in front of the Berlin barricade that separated the communist half of the city from the Western part despite pleas from his advisors not to include it in the speech. Indeed, Hayward shows that one staffer who advised tearing out that reference was none other than Colin Powell.

By the way, during the Reagan years, the media pumped out stories of people who lost either their jobs or their homes. The press corps never ceased trying to tie these unfortunate's misfortune to Reagan Administration policies, even though the country's economic woes preceded him and, to a large degree, ended during his first term.

Nevertheless, when some of these hard luck stories wrote to Reagan personally, the president would frequently respond with personal checks, Hayward reports.

9/11-101

by Sarah Carlsruh

September 11th, 2001 is now a part of U.S. history, and the issue of how to teach about it in high school history classes is necessary, albeit controversial.

The Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI) and the American Institute for History Education (AIHE) hosted a Summer Institute for Teachers in Philadelphia this June. Mary Habeck, associate professor of strategic studies at John Hopkins University and author of Knowing Your Enemy: Jihadist Ideology and the War on Terror, spoke on the topic, “Teaching the Long War and Jihadism.”

In an essay based on her presentation, Habeck explained that the “long war” she is referring to is the war on terror.

She began by giving a quick and superficial background of Muslims, explaining the plurality of viewpoints within Islam, saying that “It is important to first introduce students to the ideology of the people who attacked us on 9/11, so that they can differentiate them from ordinary Muslims and ordinary Islamic beliefs.” There are approximately 1.5 billion Muslims worldwide, and, of those, perhaps a few thousand subscribe to the global jihadist belief system held by the perpetrators of the 9/11 attacks, argued Habeck.

Islamists—which she alternatively referred to as fundamentalists—believe in political Islam, said...
Habeck; they make up perhaps 15-20% of Muslims and the fastest growing Islamic sect. Islamists vary in their beliefs and some are even open to democracy, claimed Habeck. Whether Muslims would agree with that statement, of course, depends on whom you ask. Ayatollah Khomeini, former Supreme Leader of Iran, in his *Islamic Government or Islamic Government: Authority of the Jurist*, not surprisingly makes an argument that Shari’a law is the only law for Muslims, while scholar Ahmad Moussalli, a researcher of Islamic fundamentalism, argues in his book *The Islamic Quest for Democracy, Pluralism, and Human Rights* that Islam is compatible with democracy.

The more militant Islamists, or jihadists, “argue that violence is necessary in order to achieve a perfect Islamic state,” and the global jihadist (salafi jihadiyya) sect, she argued, believe that such violence should be directed at the U.S.

According to a 2007 Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) article by U.S. Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Sarah Zabel, “Al-Qaeda plays a leading role in the larger movement of global jihad, a splinter faction of militant Islamism intent on establishing its vision of strict Islamic rule in the Muslim world through armed action.”

Rebutting a common interpretation of jihad, which defines the term as “holy war,” Habeck argued that “Jihad actually means struggle, not war or killing.” She explained that Muhammad preached peace to his people but “then something terrible happened. He and his small group of followers were persecuted,” causing them to flee to Medina where “Muhammad began to receive revelations that struggling was more than just struggling to understand how to follow God—it was about self-defense.” While based in fact, this interpretation is perhaps a bit too simplistic since nowhere does Professor Habeck explain that the history and founding of Islam, while certainly spiritual and religious, was also a militarily expansion.

Richard Gabriel, professor at the Army War College, wrote *Muhammad: Islam’s First Great General (Campaigns and Commanders)*, and tells the story of Muhammad as a successful military and political leader. In it, he describes Muhammad’s “transformation of the Arab armies and their manner of warfare” and said that Muhammad’s military legacy “provided his successors with the means to conquer the rest of pagan Arabia…embark on the great Arab conquests.”

The purpose of Habeck’s lecture was, she said, to “help students place this evolution of global jihadi thinking into some kind of framework, within Islam in general and within jihadism.” She argued that Al Qaeda’s justification for the 9/11 attack was that it “regards America as the ‘greater unbelief,’ the eternal enemy.” Habeck expressed her opinion that it is important for students to see that “the global jihadists achieved none of their strategic goals [for the U.S. to leave Islamic lands and to convince Muslims to join al Qaeda] on 9/11.” Notice here that she appears to conflate “jihadis” with “al Qaeda.” In contrast, Dr. M. Zuhdi Jasser, President of the American Islamic Forum for Democracy, said in the Washington Times on August 13th that “Al Qaeda had nothing to do with the string of radical Islamists arrested across the country” and that “The only thing these radicals have in common is their belief in a militant version of political Islam.”
Dear Reader,

We’ve had a busy month since our last exchange with you. In addition to three author’s nights this Fall, the economics textbook that Accuracy in Academia has published—*Voodoo Anyone? How to understand economics without really trying*—has gone off to the printers and we expect the first copies soon.

As anyone who reads it will see, its author, the late Christopher T. Warden, was infinitely more knowledgeable about a host of topics with an economic dimension than the majority of the talking heads asked to declaim on such subjects on television, even on Fox News. The notable exception to this trend is Steve Moore, a Greta Van Susteren regular. While he was alive, Chris never even made these shows to offer his considerable insights, despite an impressive career that included his last job as a tenured professor of journalism at Troy University, service as the editorial page editor at Investor’s Business Daily and a tour as editor of the National Journalism Center.

Fortunately, he left behind an excellent text that generations can learn from. Not so incidentally, AIA and its sister organization, Accuracy in Media, pride themselves on showcasing speakers at events who don’t show up on the TV chat show or college lecture circuits.

Indeed, AIM’s 40th anniversary conference showcased an array of speakers in a series of panels recorded by C-SPAN. At its author’s nights, AIA is trying to emulate that example. For instance, at the September 17, 2009 Constitution Day author’s night that Sarah Carlsruh wrote up in this issue of the newsletter, law professor Jeremy Rabkin noted that, despite its indelible association with real life angel of mercy Florence Nightingale, the International Red Cross has a long history of acquiescence of some pretty unsavory regimes around the world.

Indeed, the ICRC’s current complaints about a handful of abuses at the Gitmo and Abu Ghraib detention facilities look somewhat hypocritical in light of the organization’s past silence on Nazi concentration camps and Soviet prisons. AIA is able to sponsor public meetings such as the one which featured Dr. Rabkin, thanks to a generous grant from the Fusco Foundation.

All the best,

Mal Kline
Executive Director