

SPEECH, FROM PAGE 68

academics, was that universities might well have a First Amendment right to keep collecting millions of federal tax dollars despite a law cutting off those that do not give military recruiters the same access to students as they give other potential employers.

SILENCING SUMMERS

Now to the West Coast. Perhaps you haven't read about how UC's Board of Regents rescinded Larry Summers' invitation to speak at a Sept. 19 dinner in Sacramento. The decision was a cave-in to pressure from 300 professors at UC Davis who protested that Summers "has come to symbolize gender and racial prejudice in academia."

The silencing of Summers was easy to miss. *The Washington Post* did not report it. *The New York Times* gave it three sentences. *The Los Angeles Times* ignored it, except for one nonstaff op-ed.

By contrast, the briefly martyred Chemerinsky—who was hired, fired (based on conservative complaints about his political views), and rehired (thanks in part to free-speech conservative support) as founding dean of a new law school at UC Irvine—inspired 17 articles and editorials in *The Los Angeles Times*, two articles and an outraged editorial in *The New York Times*, and one article in *The Washington Post*.

The notion that Summers stands for "gender"—let alone "racial"—prejudice is a fantasy espoused by loopy radicals and people ignorant of what he actually said about women and certain sciences. (For more, see my Feb. 7, 2005, and Feb. 28, 2005, columns in *Legal Times*.)

squashed so-called affirmative-action bake sales, which charge white male customers more than women and minorities to satirize the racial preferences that pervade selective college admissions.

Where were the liberal champions of free speech then? And where were they when faculty members and journalists were clamoring for Duke University to censor members of its women's lacrosse team for taking the field in May 2006 wearing signs of their (subsequently vindicated) belief that their friends on the men's team were innocent of rape?

Where, for that matter, was Chemerinsky? Then and now a Duke Law School professor, he has long championed civil liberties. But he was very, very quiet—as were all of his colleagues, save one—while some of the worst pro-ecutorial conduct in memory unfolded under his nose. This amid a mob assault by scores of other Duke professors and journalists against innocent Duke students and the presumption of innocence itself.

In the words of George Mason's Bernstein, "The Chemerinsky episode, disturbing though it was, should not distract us from the primary challenge facing academic freedom in American universities: the rise of an academic far-left establishment that seeks to use universities as a base for political activism and is perfectly willing to violate accepted standards of academic freedom to achieve that goal."

Stuart Taylor Jr. is a senior writer with National Journal magazine and a contributing editor at Newsweek. His e-mail address is staylor@nationaljournal.com. ©2007 National Journal. Reprinted by

Letters

Militant Islam Seeks Only Victory

To the editor:

In his commentary "It's Not Just al-Qaida" (Sept. 17, Page 68), Stuart Taylor Jr.'s reference to the Islamic Republic of Iran as a "lunatic" regime was very much appreciated. It was quite refreshing, given the number of articles that are written daily by the appeasers and apologists of that theocratic dictatorship.

However, I disagree with his thought that *all* rogue regimes would actually follow our leadership in abolition of nuclear weapons. Our most serious foreign threat today is Islamofascism. Islamofascists or militant Islamists are not interested in cooperation and understanding. They are not interested in bribes and threats. Rather, they are interested in one thing—religious victory. Radical Islamists believe non-Muslims are infidels. They believe they have a duty to conquer the infidels.

As much as I admired the late President Ronald Reagan, he was not dealing with Islamofascists. The 1979 Iranian hostage crisis did not even begin to give people a clue as to what would come 20-some years later. And Bill Clinton was, of course, clueless despite numerous attacks on American interests by militant Islamists during his watch. So the suggestion that

Islamofascist governments such as the regime in Tehran could be grouped with and treated like nontheocratic dictatorships is erroneous.

History has shown that militant Islamists will form alliances with other groups based on mutual hatred of secular democracies. After the political/cultural "revolution," however, the Islamofascists will slaughter their nonreligious allies—the leftists, communists, socialists, and the like. Their alliances with these groups are temporary and based on their belief that it is not immoral to be deceitful to further their religious goals. The 1979 Islamic revolution in Iran is the perfect example: After the shah was toppled, the militant Islamists slaughtered their communist and National Front allies.

Islamofascists are a different type of enemy than the United States and its allies have encountered in the past. They are ready to die for their fanatical beliefs and to destroy countries in the process because they believe in martyrdom, not nationalism. It is imperative that we understand the nature of the threat we are facing before we choose a strategy for its defeat.

Sheda Vasseghi
Azadegan Foundation
Washington, D.C.