Believe it or not, a Republican president may be benefiting from some revisionist history. Indeed, the academic literature on George Herbert Walker Bush, although brief, like his presidency, is mostly, so far, laudatory.

“That the United States avoided another great power conflict from 1945-1992 is a testament to the stewardship of Presidents from Truman through George H. W. Bush,” Berkeley law professor John Yoo writes in Crisis and Command: A History of Executive Power from George Washington to George W. Bush. “Nine American Presidents from different parties, over half a century, patiently pursued a policy that contained, and ultimately exhausted, an enemy that outmatched the United States in land power.”

“They had to follow a moderate course that sometimes required active challenges to the Soviets, at other times, restraint.” Actually, the first president to abandon containment was Jimmy Carter, who showed that he did not have “an inordinate fear of communism” by letting the Soviet takeover of Afghanistan and Nicaragua stand.

The first president to embrace the liberation, or rollback, of the Soviet Empire was Ronald Reagan, whose vice-president got to preside over its dismantling. “Bush made his more lasting, though less noticed, contribution to the national security in managing the peaceful end of the Soviet empire,” Yoo claims. “Bush successfully pressed for the reunification of Germany, the enlargement of NATO to include former Warsaw Pact nations, and the recognition of Russia and the former Soviet republics.”

“These diplomatic initiatives were conceived and executed by the executive branch.” In the footnote to this last quoted passage, Yoo reveals that “The events and Bush’s perspective are retold in George H. W. Bush & Brent Scowcroft, A World Transformed (1999).”

Unmentioned in these, Yoo’s complete references to the 41st president, is the speech Bush gave in one of these emerging nations warning of suicidal nationalism. “Yet freedom is not the same as independence,” then-President Bush said. “Americans will not support those who seek independence in order to replace a far-off tyranny with a local despotism.”
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“They will not aid those who promote a suicidal nationalism based upon ethnic hatred.” To be fair, by at least one estimate, nine of the 23 former Soviet republics have embraced the Taliban.

Nevertheless, Bush issued his warning in one of the other 14—The Ukraine. Unlike his old boss’s famous speech in Berlin a few years beforehand, Bush’s remarks didn’t tear down any walls, literal or metaphorical.

“Bush himself has said that his greatest leadership disappointment was the failure to communicate better to the public in 1992 that he had control of the domestic economy and that the nation was moving towards prosperity under his helm,” Ryan J. Barilleaux and Mark J. Rozell write in Power and Prudence: The Presidency of George H. W. Bush. “While he was in office, it was not Bush’s style to trumpet big plans or to brag about his accomplishments.”

“No president comes into office in a vacuum; nor is any chief executive given a blank check to make policy.” Barilleaux teaches at Miami University of Ohio and Rozell hangs his hat at George Mason University.

Their book was published in 2004 by Texas A & M, where the Bush presidential library is. “As a man whose approach to policy stressed prudence—a realistic assessment of possibilities—George Bush viewed his tenure in the White House as being marked by very specific circumstances relevant to shaping domestic policy,” Barilleaux and Rozell claim. “He was Ronald Reagan’s successor and he inherited a prosperous nation and faced large budget deficits.”

“His administration’s domestic policies were constructed in that context.” Thus, contextually, do the authors attempt to explain why Bush broke his “No new taxes” pledge.

“We have a tendency today to forget what the political context was like in 1989, 1990,” Bush’s deputy chief of staff Andrew Card told the authors. “The Democrats had the votes in Congress.”

“President Bush had to work with both the Democratic majority and the very frustrated congressional Republicans.” In 1991, three economists scored that fateful budget deal in a study for the minority staff of the congressional Joint Economic Committee.

“Concern about the effect of new taxes on the economy, or on the spending habits of public officials, was given short shift by pragmatism,” they wrote. “The crowning triumph of this strategy was the 1990 budget agreement, which raised taxes $160 billion, supposedly to reduce the deficit.”

“However, the facts contained in this study and elsewhere show that Federal spending actually accelerated after the 1990 tax increases were enacted, and budget deficits have hit record levels.” In fact, they found that, “domestic discretionary spending under Congressional control has actually accelerated under the budget agreement.”

“Between fiscal 1990 and 1991, domestic discretionary spending jumped from $182.5 billion to $199.8 billion, an increase of $17.3 billion, or 9.5 percent.”

NO THEORY LEFT BEHIND

There is an old Pennsylvania Dutch saying that goes, “We grow too soon old and too late smart.” Education schools might be experiencing such an epiphany.

Last October, at the University of Virginia, U. S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan characterized ed school curricula as “theory-heavy and curriculum-light.” In a stated attempt to lighten that load, DOE launched a new program. Arizona State University education majors are studying less education than they used to,” Libby Nelson reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education on February 19, 2010. “Students in the college of education are taking more courses in the subjects they intend to teach.”

“The law-school dean is writing a civics curriculum for aspiring elementary-school teachers; university scientists have created a science program. It’s a university-wide effort to make teacher training more rigorous and effective, one financed in part by a new $33.8-million grant.”

Some might question why it took all these years and a federal grant to bring about this hope and change. George Mason University economist Walter Williams has called education schools the ghetto of academia.

Others might question whether such subsidies actually serve to accomplish their stated goal or will only lead to No Theory Left Behind.- MAK
“PROFESSOR,” NOT P.C.

When Sarah Palin noted in her address to the Tea Party activists that what America needed was a “Commander-in-Chief, not a professor of law standing at the lectern,” it was viewed as the latest in a long line of comments equating professors with elitists, according to Inside Higher Education.

However, at least one Harvard professor saw it in a different light. Charles J. Ogletree, a longtime Obama pal, said that he not only viewed the comment as “unproductive,” he also saw the “professor” label as “a thinly veiled attack on Obama’s race. Calling Obama ‘the professor’ walks dangerously close to labeling him ‘uppity,’ a term with racial overtones that has surfaced in the political arena before,” noted Ogletree.

He cited the Clarence Thomas hearings as a situation where then-Judge Thomas referred to the proceedings as “a high-tech lynching for uppity blacks who in any way deign to think for themselves, to do for themselves to have different ideas.”

Ironically, Professor Ogletree, who represented Anita Hill in those hearings, now “sees a bit of the ‘uppity’ label being placed on Obama.”

FROM GOO-GOO TO GOOGLE

For better or for worse, British school kids are now being “taught to read using internet search engines such as Google and Yahoo,” according to the London Telegraph.

The new regulation requires students in primary school to learn writing with keyboards, “use spell-checkers and insert internet ‘hyperlinks’ into text before their 11th birthdays.”

Fearing that students from less-than-affluent homes will be trapped in a “digital underclass,” education ministers are also promoting the use of “Google Earth in geography lessons, spreadsheets to calculate budgets in math, online archives to research local history and video conferencing software for joint language lessons with schools overseas.”

A report prepared by inspections minister Sir Jim Rose suggests that the new curriculum should also include “lessons on how to speak English in formal situations;” and “sex and human relationships education at all ages.” This includes “learning about body parts from age five, puberty from seven and human reproduction from nine,” a recommendation from the newest Planned Parenthood report.

Conservatives roundly criticize the new regs, saying that government is simply “giving in to the latest fads.”

TOXIC CHOICE?

Leave it to the environmentalists to come up with another reason to criticize the school choice movement.

The Energy and Environment Blog reports that a recent finding in the journal Environmental Science and Technology claims that “school choice leads to more driving which results in more vehicle emissions.” The overall effect causes more environmental damage.

George Mason economist Don Boudreaux responded to this statement by asking if a future study might suggest that supermarket trips should be restricted by driving to the store closest to home to avoid wasting time and “fouling the air.”

The blog posting concludes by stating that any “inconsequential effects additional driving would have on health and global warming” should be weighed “against the benefits of school choice.”

BRITS’ SCHOOL BUDGET DELETES HISTORY

A cash-strapped British university has hit upon a novel way to deal with massive budget cuts. Sussex University has apparently decided that rewriting history isn’t enough, so the powers-that-be are simply going to delete it.

From now on, the history of England will start at 1700, says Business Secretary of State Lord Mandelson, who claims that universities are being forced to figure out ways to use their resources more wisely.

Numerous historians have protested the move as a short-sighted one that risks “undermining the public’s understanding of the past.”

“To cut everything but the most modern puts in peril the public function of history, entrenching the arrogance of the present and making a mockery of the claim by the minister behind these cuts that ‘we also wish to keep this country civilized,’” said another historian.

Deputy Vice-Chancellor Paul Layzell defended
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his school’s proposal, saying that it reflects “a strategic determination to focus our research in areas of sustainability and strength, ...and a need to reflect the Government’s financial policy for higher education.” He added that “the history degree at Sussex . . . will continue to be broad-based and intellectually challenging.”

Meanwhile, Lord William Rees-Moggs called the cuts “wrong-headed and perverse,” adding that . . . apart from the threat to learning and to jobs, these universities are among our national success stories. If Britain is to succeed in building a knowledge-based economy,” Rees-Moggs suggested that English history is “fine training for the intellectual powers of the ablest graduates,” besides being a “ rattling good story.”

“The University of Sussex has responded to the cuts by offering up its cherished history faculty as a victim. Whether it is doing this as a last resort, or whether it hopes that the protests of Sussex historians will ring loudly through the corridors of Whitehall, I do not know.”

EXIT, STAGE LEFT

The death of Marxist historian Howard Zinn has inspired a multitude of reactions across the academic spectrum.

Until his death, the 87-year-old Zinn was actively spearheading an effort to “change the way our pre-K through high school children learn American history,” according to Big Hollywood. Using his “People’s History” as a vehicle, Zinn and Company had developed a wide-ranging school curriculum that included “introducing three-year-olds to the lynching of African-Americans, and/or quizzing seven-year-olds on which presidents owned slaves.

According to the American Thinker’s James Lewis, Howard Zinn was “the Barack Hussein Obama of American historians, at least in the Audacity of his Mendacity. His book has been assigned to tens of millions of students, making him a wealthy man.”

Although historians used to try to tell the truth, Lewis notes that America-bashers like Zinn were “moral fabulists, whose self-appointed role it was to collect the mortal sins of the people – or at least the American people – and turn the entire history of America into one long catechism of grievances.”

This made him enormously popular with intellectual elitists and the “mind-molding pseudo-historians on the campuses of America” . . .

According to Lewis, “Howard Zinn industrialized the anti-American propaganda machine, like some colony of national brain parasites living off its host.”

Noting that “the well-oiled PC apparatus is bigger today than ever,” Lewis observed that while Catholics receive “absolution for their sins, there is no absolution for the sins of whiteness or maleness or heterosexuality – just a lifetime of taxes and mental drudgery.”

There’s more.

Lewis suggests that the “reactionary” and “regressive” agents on our nation’s campuses blame the same “enemy” as does Islamism. Indeed, “America and the West . . . are directly responsible for the prosperity and well-being of their reactionary parasites.”

PUSHING THE ENVELOPE

Between the British education system and Planned Parenthood, children may soon be forced to learn “the facts of life” while they are still in the womb.

The British government believes that “children as
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young as seven should be taught about sex and domestic violence,” according to the DailyMailonline, referring to a new study saying that seven-year-olds “should be taught about puberty and the basics of reproduction.”

The new report, “Stand and Deliver,” by the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) suggests that ten-year-olds should receive “extensive sex education, including an awareness of sex’s pleasures,” according to FoxNews.com. Claiming that religious groups, ranging from Catholics to Muslims, do not allow children to have access to such information, the IPPF report “demands” that children be allowed to get “comprehensive sexuality education” and that “young people should be seen as ‘sexual beings.’”

Netherlands official Bert Koenders, a co-author of the report, argued that sex education is a right, and sexuality is “positive force for change and development, . . . an embodiment of human rights and an expression of self.”

Religious and conservative groups have expressed outrage over the report, much the same way that they did over the 2009 U.N. report that advocated teaching masturbation to five-year-olds.

Michelle Turner, who heads Citizens for a Responsible Curriculum in Maryland, accused Planned Parenthood of attempting to diminish the family unit, and particularly parents, as authority figures in their children’s lives. And Catholic spokesman Ed Mechem noted that the Planned Parenthood approach was “trying to teach children sex without values, and that sex is a matter of pleasure without consequences.”

Climategate Bypasses Campus
By Malcolm A. Kline

Apparently, college campuses are bypassed by the information superhighway. “Beginning in the summer of 2008, the Boston College Office of Sustainability and Energy Management has endeavored to determine the carbon footprint, or the measurement of carbon dioxide emission, of the entire campus,” Megan Rauch reported in the February 2, 2010 issue of The Observer at Boston College. “As a part of this ongoing project, teams of two students each have been taking measurements concerning the amount of carbon that trees on campus sequester.”

“Over the past two summers, the students studied the species, health, and environmental benefits, of the trees on the Brighton and Chestnut Hill campuses.” Meanwhile, the UN climate chief resigned after a series of scandals that revolved around the questionable science behind the multilateral body’s warnings of global warming.

The UN used a Nature magazine article and a student paper to buttress its findings. Neither source was, to put it mildly, peer reviewed.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the UN body delivering pronouncements on global warming. “In my (perhaps too harsh) view, there have been a number of dishonest presentations of model results by individual authors and by IPCC,” Tom Wigley wrote in one of the Climategate emails that global warming alarmists with science degrees circulated among themselves. Wigley has argued that the IPCC has been too optimistic about the prospect of averting harmful climate change by reducing greenhouse emissions.
NEW DEAL @ WORK

By Malcolm A. Kline

Failure to consult primary sources and documents frequently results in a distorted view of not only American history but of America’s historical figures. “Look at all the history textbooks,” Hillsdale College historian Terrence Moore said on February 5, 2010. “What do they say about FDR?”

“He was pragmatic, he believed in what works.” Moore labeled this a “code.” The current president’s favorite think tank, the Center for American Progress sponsored a seminar on “Doing what Works.”

To get a clear idea of what progressives such as FDR thought of as working, Moore urged attendees at the First Principles breakfast meeting sponsored by Hillsdale to look at Roosevelt’s 1944 State of the Union message in which he urged Congress to pass a “second bill of rights.”

“This Republic had its beginning, and grew to its present strength, under the protection of certain inalienable political rights—among them the right of free speech, free press, free worship, trial by jury, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures,” President Roosevelt said in his 1944 State of the Union message. “They were our rights to life and liberty.”

“We have come to a clear realization of the fact, however, that true individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence.” FDR then went on to give a quote without an attribution: “Necessitous men are not free men.”

“People who are hungry, people who are (and) out of a job are the stuff of which dictatorships are made,” FDR explained. “In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident.”

“We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all—regardless of station, or race or creed.” By the way, FDR had no economics degree, unlike Ronald Reagan, who proposed a “Taxpayer bill of rights” that was arguably more in sync with what the Founders had in mind.

FDR’s “second Bill of Rights” included:
- “The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;
- “The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;
- “The right of (every) farmers to raise and sell their (his) products at a return which will give them (him) and their (his) families (family) a decent living;
- “The right of every business man, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;
- “The right of every family to a decent home;
- “The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;
- “The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, and sickness, and accident and unemployment;
- “And finally, the right to a good education.”

The final irony is that FDR goes on to tag his critics with the “f” word, as in fascist. “What we were doing in this country were some of the things that were being done in Russia and even some of the things that were being done under Hitler in Germany,” the squire of Hyde Park privately acknowledged. “But we were doing them in an orderly way.”

“Oh yes,” Liberal Fascism author Jonah Goldberg, who unearthed the nugget above, observes, “the great defense against the charge of fascism: We’re more orderly!”
Dear Reader,

As I write this, Accuracy in Academia has just presented its first author’s night of 2010. The event was standing room only. Author M. Stanton Evans delivered remarks on AIA’s first textbook, *Voodoo Anyone? How to Understand Economics Without Really Trying*, for which he wrote a foreward and served as inspiration. Evans, as I noted in introducing him, was a friend and mentor to the author, the late Christopher T. Warden, as he has been to so many of us, including myself. Warden, the former editorial page editor of Investor’s Business Daily, was a tenured professor at Troy University at the time of his untimely death at the age of 51 in January of 2009.

Probably one of the best lines of the night, of many, was this one from Evans: “Gridlock is the next best thing to having a Constitution.” In remarks to interns at the American Journalism Center, Accuracy in Media editor Cliff Kincaid stressed the importance of having good mentors, noting that two of his were Evans and AIM founder Reed Irvine. As it happens, last year Evans won AIM’s Reed Irvine lifetime achievement award for excellence in journalism.

Here at AIA, we try to follow Mr. Irvine’s model of giving two stories for the price of one: what you are being told and what is really happening. This is what we endeavor to do in all of our pages including the one which you are holding right now. By the way, Sen. Mike Enzi, R-Wyoming, who attended the famous White House summit on health care, plugged *Voodoo Anyone?* in his February newsletter.

AIA’s next author’s night will feature a former intern of Evans’ named Tim Carney, author of *Obama-nomics: How Barack Obama is Bankrupting You and Enriching his Wall Street Friends, Corporate Lobbyists, and Union Bosses*. In a speech at the Conservative Political Action Conference in February, Carney noted that the president received campaign contributions of:

- $4.8 million from Wall Street;
- $10 million from the Real Estate industry; and
- $1.4 million from HMOs.

“Barack Obama got more from these sectors than they ever gave to a political candidate,” Carney said. Carney’s last book, *The Big Ripoff*, was sharply critical of the Bush Administration. In this, he is compatible with another tradition at AIM and AIA: Questioning authority no matter who is in power. Whoever is in office, neither of our groups could function without your support, whom it is our pleasure to serve.

All the best,

Mal Kline
Executive Director