Providing a perspective of the Arab spring not often covered by the mainstream media, female political activist Cynthia Farahat delivered an informative and thoroughly interesting account of her time growing up and living in Egypt.

Speaking to a group consisting largely of D.C. area interns on May 30, 2013, Farahat told of her journey to becoming a political activist during in Accuracy in Academia’s first author’s night this year.

Her new book, *Cognac* is part fictional and part autobiographical: it includes some of Farahat’s real-life stories and experiences living under a repressive government, first under President Mubarak and then under the Muslim Brotherhood as a result of the 2011 Arab Spring.

Farahat, heavily critical of both government regimes, said she first began to realize the dangers of Egypt’s government at a young age. She shared with the audience two stories told in *Cognac* that are “similar to what happens to actual people in Egypt under Mubarak and Sharia law.”

First, Farahat told the audience about an incident that is typical of the Egyptian police. When a woman asked for help for fear her abusive husband would kill her small children, the police officer simply smirked and responded, “We might look into it if he does,” Farahat said. Farahat reminded the audience that under Sharia law, husbands legally can beat their wives.

Then, Farahat described how at age 17 she realized the impossibility of her dream: to study art. Because the Egyptian government decides what each citizen studies at school, Farahat was forced to study law. But using this in a positive way, she “decided to study religious law to understand the reasons behind the tyranny,” Farahat said.

*continued on page 3*
Dear Reader,

We hope that your summer is going well. As you can see, much of this issue is devoted to stories on our authors’ night speakers. We produce these events for the benefit of Capitol Hill interns and have been encouraged by the responses we have been getting. Truly, the idealistic youth we’ve had the chance to meet have a good base of knowledge and hunger for more.

These events are part of the annual The Frank A. Fusco Conservative University Lecture, made possible by a generous grant from The Frank A. Fusco and Nelly Goletti Fusco Foundation.

For too long, we’ve been encountering 20-somethings who say things like, “My generation doesn’t care about communism.” Well, there’s 100 million reasons and counting why it should.

Yet and still, some of the cynicism is predictable: They’ve spent 16 years regurgitating what teachers and professors really care about, which is superficial at best. You may find that assessment harsh: We think that it’s charitable.

When you cover academic conferences, as we do, where courses and curricula are showcased you get to realize how vacuous an education most students get, if they’re lucky.

This fall:

- Teachers 4 Social Justice will be having their 13th annual conference in San Francisco on “The Politics of Pedagogy;” and

- The Curriculum & Pedagogy Group will be having its annual conference in New Orleans featuring “Practitioners & Academics promoting social justice.”

As we showed in the May issue, this is a term that academics frequently like to use to dog whistle what they really mean. “Conveniently, the manner in which the moderns define ‘social justice’ usually entails a subsidy to the party seeking justification,” I wrote. Joseph F. Johnston, Jr., of the law firm, Drinker, Biddle and Reath, characterizes this approach as “bogus philanthropy.” Echoing Frederic Bastiat, he argues that in this transfer of resources, “some live at the expense of others.” “Politicians giving taxpayers money to groups is not charity,” he said.

Because we agree wholeheartedly, we keep up our decoding project here at Accuracy in Academia in order to give you, our readers, the scoop on what is really happening to the higher education we are all paying for, directly or indirectly. We could not, in turn, continue this effort without your support, for which we are most grateful.

All the best,

Mal Kline,
Executive Director
“My life goals changed from art to trying to change the law that was challenging my identity,” she said. And so Farahat’s career in challenging the Egyptian government’s repressive policies began.

But dedicating her life to challenging Egyptian Sharia law meant being closely watched by the government, Farahat said. She pretended to hate her family so the government would not persecute them, and one friend was even kidnapped and questioned for several hours.

Yet despite the dangers in speaking out against her country, Farahat, who now lives in the United States, continues to report the dangers of Sharia law and the new Muslim Brotherhood regime.

She urged the audience to also challenge freedom-depleting policies: “Submission is so much more dangerous than rebellion,” she said. “The only current super power in the world right now is the individual,” she added. “That is the only reason I’m alive right now.”

And when one audience member asked what lessons could be learned from Egypt’s repressive state, Farahat warned Americans to be cautious of the United States’ path towards arguably oppressive policies.

“Start with America,” she said. “I’m beginning to feel the same feelings of being watched in Egypt now in America,” Farahat warned.

And if the United States continues down the road toward nontraditional, anti-West philosophy, she said, “[America] is not just going to be the United Kingdom – it’s going to be the Soviet Union – and we all need to do something about it.”

Isabel Mittelstadt is an intern at the American Journalism Center, a training program run jointly by Accuracy in Academia and its sister organization, Accuracy in Media. If you would like to comment on this article, e-mail mal.kline@academia.org.
OBAMA ON RUSHMORE?

Shortly after Obamacare was enacted, media persona Eleanor Clift made the following suggestion: “Now that “health care reform has passed and conservatism is in the dustbin of history, I propose the commemoration on Rushmore of none other than Barack Obama.”

A recent informal survey by The College Fix showed that a handful of professors at George Washington University felt the same way, sort of.

“Historical judgments take time to form and Obama is still in office,” said history professor Edward Berkowitz. “It could be that he will be one of the great presidents, worthy of having his likeness carved on a mountain, but certainly not yet.”

Professor Paul Wahlbeck, a professor and chairman of the political science department, said in an email to The College Fix that “History undoubtedly will accord President Obama a special place by virtue of being the first African American President.”

However, the profs appeared to agree that any special honor conferred upon the Prez should not be decided upon too quickly.

Political Science Professor Robert Stoker, “who specializes in social policy and authored an article in January claiming that Social Security does not add to the nation’s debt, voiced skepticism about venerating Obama’s legacy too soon.”

“I recall how unseemly it was when Republicans started a premature campaign to cement President Reagan’s legacy by naming everything they could find after him,” Stoker said, referring to the campaign to name the national airport in DC after President Reagan.

“At least the Republicans waited until Reagan was no longer in office.”

It is hardly surprising that some GWU profs are outspoken about their political beliefs. After all, this is the school “where two gay students took aim at a campus priest, a law professor taught students how to lobby for Obama policies, and an abortionist practices on campus grounds next to a residence hall.”

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: ZERO REPUBLICAN ATTORNEYS BUT AT LEAST 47 DEMOCRAT ONES

“Robert Anderson, an associate professor at Pepperdine University School of Law, discovered that among the 47 attorneys at the U.S. Department of Education who donated money to a candidate during last year’s presidential election campaign, 47 of them donated to Barack Obama – or all of them,” according to The College Fix.

Anderson used the Federal Election Commission database to uncover the fact that there were NO Republican attorneys at DOE.
However, “other federal government agencies offered similar findings — including the IRS, where its attorneys gave to Obama at a ratio of 20-to-1, with about 32 times as much money going to Obama as to Romney from IRS lawyers,” Anderson found.

“The data show, however, that the partisanship of the lawyers in the IRS is not unusual or even particularly extreme among federal agencies,” Anderson wrote. “In fact, the lawyers in every single federal government agency—from the Department of Education to the Department of Defense—contributed overwhelmingly to Obama compared to Romney.”

“As Anderson points out, this is a concern because it’s the lawyers who make policy, they are the ones taking the lead in writing regulations, litigating cases, and making delicate legal judgment calls in borderline cases.”

“Anderson argued his data indicates either there are no Republican lawyers in the federal government, or they do not contribute to presidential campaigns, at least in ways that reveal their identities,” adding that political contribution numbers of government lawyers show that the IRS controversy is really a symptom of a larger disease—the rule by career bureaucrat lawyers.”

A search of political contributors who are also lawyers in the Federal Election Commission database “produced a list of 20 federal agencies with at least 20 employees contributing to either Barack Obama or Mitt Romney in the 2012 election.”

While the results for the IRS showed that 95% contributed to Obama rather than to Romney — a ratio of 20-to-1, this was not unusual compared to other agencies. The Department of Justice, for example, “had the largest number of lawyer contributors of any federal agency, and 84% of those employees contributed to Obama.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>NUMBER OF LAWYERS CONTRIBUTING TO OBAMA</th>
<th>PERCENT OBAMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NLRB</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED NATIONS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF LABOR</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>97.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINRA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMM.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>95.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDIC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>94.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF HOMELAND SECURITY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>94.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>92.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>88.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF THE INTERIOR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF JUSTICE</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>83.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SECURITY ADMIN.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL GOVT (UNSPECIFIED)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>79.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. ARMY</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT. OF DEFENSE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Some categories overlap. I generally coded the employer at the level of specificity the reporting person disclosed the information even if it could fall within a broader category (e.g., U.S. Attorney versus Department of Justice). Because of wide variations in spelling and terminology, some contributors were undoubtedly left out of the data.
When you compare meticulously researched commercial histories with the extended blogs that pass for academic ones, you come to a startling revelation: Just about everything we've been taught about our history is wrong.

In the former category, we have Diana West’s epic American Betrayal: The Secret Assault on Our Nation’s Character. In the latter group, you have just about everything assigned on a syllabus.

Do yourself a favor. Read American Betrayal first. The “just about” qualifier in the first paragraph pretty much extends to key dates and events, eg., “Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.”

As West shows, the rest of Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s four terms in office were equally infamous. For example, here’s another quote from FDR that you don’t hear nearly as frequently as the last one, this one also relating to World War II: “I would rather lose New Zealand, Australia or anything else than have the Russian front collapse.” This odd loyalty to a difficult ally may have had something to do with the advisors FDR surrounded himself with. “Several of the best friends I have are communists,” FDR told U. S. Rep. Martin Dies, D-Texas, the first chairman of the House Committee on UnAmerican Activities.

“Expert estimates now peg the number of Americans assisting Soviet intelligence agencies during the 1930s and 1940s as exceeding five hundred,” West claims. Neither FDR nor his successors could even admit there was one.

“What do you do with the disturbing evidence, brought forward by Jerrold and Leona Schecter and reinvestigated and affirmed by the late Robert Novak, that Harry S. Truman, for example, was informed as early as 1950 that findings from the Venona Project confirmed both Assistant Treasury Secretary Harry Dexter White and former State Department official Alger Hiss as Soviet agents?” West asks. As she shows, Truman continued to call such cases “red herrings.”

Nonetheless, the denial of the threat posed by the Soviet Union, not to mention its acolytes in influential government jobs in this country, as documented by the FBI Venona intercepts of Soviet cable traffic, had real world consequences.

“I’m thinking of one crew from the famous Doolittle Raid, who, after their stunning bombing run over Tokyo on April 18, 1942, landed their B-25 at a Red Army Air Force base in Vladivostok,” West writes. “Dangerously low on fuel, having had to launch prematurely from the USS Hornet after the aircraft carrier had been sighted by a Japanese fishing craft, this crew, under Capt. Edward J. York, hoped to refuel and continue on to their designated Chinese base to reunite with the rest of the raiders as planned.”

“For the next miserable year, this American crew was interned by the Soviet government.” Yet, they were lucky: They got out.

“When political advantage is of greater concern than national security, the restorative action is reconcealment to try to make it all go away,” West avers. Tens of thousands of American troops found this out the hard way.

“There is the May 30, 1945, Kenner Memorandum, named for Gen. Albert Kenner, Eisenhower’s surgeon general at SHAEF headquarters,” West writes of just one of the multitude of primary sources she drew on in writing this book. “This memo states that twenty thousand Americans remained under Red Army control.”
Disturbingly, Ike himself fired off a cable on June 1, 1945 that read, “It is now estimated that only small numbers of U. S. prisoners of war still remain in Russian hands.” The evidence behind this rosy estimate that followed his advisor’s definite assertion 24 hours earlier remains a mystery to this day.

Where did they actually go? Flash forward to June 16, 1992. Russia’s first non-communist president Boris Yeltsin, in a White House visit, said, “Many things have been revealed after the examination of the archives of the KGB and the Central Committee of the Communist Party but that work is continuing both in the archives and in the places where the POWs were.” Note the use of the past tense.

*Malcolm A. Kline* is the Executive Director of Accuracy in Academia.

If you would like to comment on this article, e-mail mal.kline@academia.org.

---

**The Chattering Classes**

**An actual Department!**

Bob Meister, Professor of Political and Social Thought in the Department of the History of Consciousness, UC Santa Cruz

**Safe For Student Visas**


**Giving back**

George Washington University School of Business Hosted its 3rd Annual “Business Gives Back” on April 20. What did they take?

**Staying on Message**

“The lesson of the Left’s sustained commitment to ‘social justice’ is that sustained commitment to a message, no matter how flawed, will eventually win out.”—Samuel Gregg of the Acton Institute at the Philadelphia Society meeting in Indianapolis, April 5, 2013.

**High Rolling on the Hudson**

St. John’s University President “describes himself as a ‘Brooklyn guy,’ suggesting a naivete about the high-rolling lives of Saudi princes and other money men who have given prolifically to St. John’s over the years.”—Chronicle of Higher Education, March 29, 2013.

**Administer Me**

“Our universities are employing as many administrators as full-time faculty.”—John McNay, president, Ohio Conference of the American Association of University Professors, before the Ohio House Finance Subcommittee on Higher Education, March 6, 2013.

---

*Diana West* will speak at the Accuracy in Academia author’s night on July 17, 2013. This event is part of The Frank A. Fusco Conservative University Lecture Series this year, made possible by a generous grant from The Frank A. Fusco and Nelly Goletti Fusco Foundation.
To show what college and university English Departments are really teaching, Accuracy in Academia compiled *The REAL MLA Stylebook*, filled with quotes from a recent convention of the Modern Language Association (MLA) where thousands of English professors gather to push their politically correct, radical agenda. Outsiders who attend this event expecting to learn more about Chaucer, Milton and Shakespeare are in for a rude awakening when they discover that panels are more likely to focus on topics such as “Marxism and Globalization;” “What’s the Matter with Whiteness,” and “Queering Faulkner.”

This book is must-reading for anyone interested in learning more about the mindset of faculty members who are tasked with teaching the great works of the English language to our nation’s students.