Although academics have never been in short supply to discuss political scandals, there seems to be a caveat: They tend to be crises in which Republicans are the alleged malefactors.

Thus, from Watergate to Iran-Contra, professors have been ubiquitous in offering commentary on current events. In striking contrast, they seem to have been on sabbatical while the Obama Administration emerged at the vortex of three controversies in May involving the IRS, Benghazi and the monitoring of AP stories and sources. Maybe it was finals week.

“Nevertheless, what the IRS did to Tea Party groups was wrong, just as what the IRS has done for years to liberal groups was wrong,” John K. Wilson wrote on the Academe blog maintained by the American Association of University Professors. “What this absurdly overwrought ‘scandal’ should result is in a much stronger commitment to freedom of political speech, including by nonprofit organizations.”

Wilson is probably one of the more reasonable voices at academe. Nevertheless, he notes that the IRS under Bush investigated Obama’s church. Perhaps, but did they ask what Jeremiah Wright read?

Yet and still, don’t expect any latent curiosity in academic circles about whether power was abused, by who, and how legal it was. The Poynter Institute presented a conference at the Washington Post last weekend which featured WaPo blogger Ezra Klein on the topic, “Hard Facts, Easy Reading.”

“On Tuesday, it looked like we had three possible political scandals brewing,” Klein wrote on May 16, 2013. “Two days later, with much more evidence available, it doesn’t look like any of them will pan out.”

“There’ll be more hearings, and more bad press for the Obama administration, and more demands for documents. But — and this is a key qualification — absent more revelations, the scandals that could reach high don’t seem to include any real wrongdoing, whereas the ones that include real wrongdoing don’t reach high enough.” And this is a key qualification—yet.

Academics may not weigh in much on bureaucratic overreach or show much curiosity about who ordered it. Meanwhile, they are beneficiaries of a more benign IRS than Tea Party activists have ever known.
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Dear Reader,

Our Washington location gives us a unique perspective. We get to watch politicians and bureaucrats run with ideas concocted in the Ivory Tower, then fall all over themselves explaining why they didn't work. At stage one—the implementation—the academic masterminds of these schemes are very much in evidence. At stage two—the aftermath—they seem to be on sabbatical.

Submitted for your consideration, as Twilight Zone creator Rod Serling used to say, are two case studies of this phenomenon of mass hypnosis—the Arab Spring and Obamacare. Elites waxed rhapsodic about a thousand flowers blooming when Dictator Hosni Mubarek was deposed: It never occurred to them that he might be replaced by and even more despotic dictatorship. Actual Egyptians such as our May 30, 2013 author’s night speaker, human rights activist Cynthia Farahat, could have set them straight.

Similarly, on Obamacare, the law’s enthusiasts pooh-poohed estimates of its costs and rushed to pass it. Now:

• Senior citizens on Medicare can’t always get the treatments they need;
• Premiums have gone up 100 percent on many insurance plans; and
• The number of uninsured has also gone up.

At the core of both of these controversies, the heralds of brave new worlds in health care and international relations made one fatal error: They failed to consult primary sources. This is a shortcoming we can trace directly to academia, whose historians and so-called social scientists routinely ignore basic information before wildly spinning theories, often with impressive looking algebraic equations attached to them.

Going to primary sources is what we do, at Accuracy in Academia and its big sister organization Accuracy in Media. We go on to point out where academics fail to do so and have no shortage of material.

We do this work for you, our readers, in order for you to see what is happening on campus. Because what happens on campus, unlike what occurs in Vegas, does not stay there, we think the higher education beat deserves more attention. In addition to the above examples, remember the Occupy Movement.

All the best,

Mal Kline,
Executive Director
Before explaining why conservative groups seem to have been targeted by the IRS, an agency official explained to congressmen why colleges and universities got a pass on taxes that they did owe.

“On April 25, 2013, the IRS released the final report of its Colleges and Universities Compliance Project. Based on responses to a questionnaire distributed to over 400 tax-exempt colleges and universities, the IRS audited a sample of 34 colleges and universities identified as at risk for noncompliance,” the U. S. House Ways and Means Committee revealed on May 1, 2013. “The report focused on compliance rates among colleges and universities in the following areas: (1) unrelated business income tax (UBIT), (2) executive compensation, and (3) employment tax issues.”

“During its four-year investigation, the IRS found significant noncompliance and underreporting of UBIT by over 90 percent of the audited schools, with income adjustments of about $90 million, and loss disallowances of over $170 million. The primary increases to UBIT were: disallowed expenses that were not connected to unrelated business activities, errors in computation or substantiation of losses, and the misclassification of unrelated activities as exempt.”

“The examinations of college and universities identified some issues with respect to UBI,” Lois Lerner of the IRS told the House Ways and Means Committee Subcommittee on Oversight on May 8, 2013. “As a result, the IRS plans to look at UBI reporting more broadly.”

“In addition, IRS plans to ensure that tax-exempt organizations are aware of the importance of using appropriate comparability data when setting compensation.” Colleges and universities make a lot of money off of such enterprises. “Thousands of commercial programs are being run by state and private non-profit universities, engaging in unfair competition with for-profit companies, including small businesses.” John Palatiello, president of the Business Coalition for Fair Competition (BCFC), pointed out in an article for Accuracy in Academia.

“The programs offer little education for students or research for science. Rather, tuition, endowments, or state and Federal funds are used to operate business units inside institutions of higher learning.” BCFC is a coalition of firms, organizations and individuals fighting unfair government-sponsored competition with private enterprise.

Nevertheless, the approach by Lerner and the agency to well-heeled college administrators could probably be described as collegial. It stands in marked contrast to that of Lerner and the IRS during the Obama years in its reaction to right-of-center groups.

At the agency’s Cincinnati office, “Instead of referring to the cases as advocacy cases, they actually used case names on this list,” Lerner told the American Bar Association on May 10. “They used names like Tea Party or Patriots and they selected cases simply because the applications had those names in the title. That was wrong, that was absolutely incorrect, insensitive, and inappropriate — that’s not how we go about selecting cases for further review. We don’t select for review because they have a particular name.”

“The other thing that happened was they also, in some cases, cases sat around for a while. They also sent some letters out that were far too broad, asking questions of these organizations that weren’t really necessary for the type of application. In some cases you probably read that they asked for contributor names. That’s not appropriate, not usual, there are some very limited times when we might need that but in most of these cases where they were asked they didn’t do it correctly and they didn’t do it with a higher level of review. As I said, some of them sat around for too long.”

Lerner denied that, under the Obama Administration during an election cycle, political considerations played a role in the audits. “They didn’t do this because of any political bias,” Lerner insisted. “They did it because they were working together.”

“This was a streamlined way for them to refer to the cases. They didn’t have the appropriate level of sensitivity about how this might appear to others and it was just wrong.”

Malcolm A. Kline and Spencer Irvine is a staff writer at Accuracy in Academia.

If you would like to comment on this article, e-mail mal.kline@academia.org.
GLOBAL WARMING ON THE HOT SEAT

A couple of environmentalist professors who apparently decided it was time to fight fire with fire, “recently took a match – plus a photo of their little exercise – leaving an image that clearly illustrates the state of science-based academic freedom on college campuses nationwide,” according to the College Fix.

Although the image which appeared on the official Department of Meteorology and Climate Science webpage at San Jose State University, was picked up by the popular “wattsupwiththat” global warming and climate change website under the headline “San Jose State University Meterology decides burning books they don’t agree with is better than reading them,” it was later removed from the school’s website.

The professors, Dr. Alison Bridger, chairman of the Meteorology Department and Asst. Professor Craig Clements, wrote under their picture that they were “testing the flammability of the book,” titled The Mad, Mad, Mad World of Climatism: Mankind and Climate Change Mania.

Some excerpts from the book quickly reveal why leftist faculty might be incensed at its ideas:

For example, the book suggests that “if you’re an educator, teach your students that ‘if you change light bulbs, you can save polar bears. Wind and solar are good, while coal and oil are bad. Teach them that we’re running out of natural resources, overpopulating the Earth, and must change our ways if we’re to save the planet.

“If you’re a college science Ph.D candidate, better choose the road of Climatism. Acceptance of the theory of man-made global warming means research contracts, peer acceptance, tenure, wealth and fame. The alternative road of climate skepticism offers only ridicule, poverty and failure.”

IS COLLEGE WORTH IT?

Bill Bennett’s new book, Is College Worth It?, poses a fascinating question, especially in today’s cost-conscious environment. While the orthodox answer to the question is “Of course it is,” the book “provides a thoroughgoing deconstruction of the “of course it is” delusion, according to The Washington Times, explaining that for a great many of today’s students, the answer is clearly “no.”

There’s more.

“Whether the standard of excellence for higher education is cultivating the mind and the soul or maximizing financial return on investment, most of higher education fails most students,” according to Bennett and
his co-author David Wilezol.

Numbers don’t lie. And the stats regarding higher education are truly frightening. For example:

Borrowers have defaulted on $3.5 billion in student loans during first three months of 2013

Estimated total college debt is over $1 trillion

Cost of college has risen 1,120 percent in past 30 years

Approximately 50 percent of class of 2011 was unemployed or underemployed according to 2012 study

Nearly 46 percent of students do not graduate within six years

However, some aspects of college education have remained the same. Case in point: it still matters where you get that degree – Graduates of Stanford, Princeton, U. of Michigan, etc. still out-earn the competition.

Still, the future is far from optimistic for future grads. “By 2018, there will be 14 million jobs that will require more than a high school diploma but less than a bachelor’s degree. Many of these jobs pay good middle-class wages: nurses, air traffic controllers and IT professionals.

“Additionally, America is currently facing a deficit of 3 million skilled-labor jobs – professions like welders, electricians and plumbers that earn good money and can never be shipped overseas.”

“Thought Leaders” Extol China Schools

By Spencer Irvine

At the Center for American Progress’s forum on education, “What can U.S. schools learn from other countries?,” the U.S. education system was disparaged by the panelists and speakers present. They found what they like in education in communist China:

• Ben Jensen, School Education Program Director of the Australia’s Gratten Institute, claimed that Shanghai’s schools continue to be the top performers in the world. Shanghai students up to the age of 15 are up to 33 months ahead of the U.S. student, according to Jensen.

• Lydia Logan, of Chiefs for Change, argued that state education chiefs have a short time to learn the facts and problems facing their state, but by the time they realize it, they’re already almost out of office. By way of contrast, Logan claims, China’s education bureaucracy nurtures up-and-coming talent.

• Marc Tucker, president and CEO of the National Center on Education and the Economy, recommended a national federal school board of administrators to oversee education policy. He went on to slam charter schools, saying that they’re not “relevant” and unless they recruit better quality teachers from the public and private school system, they are not much different from public schools. He said the idea of charter schools is “negative” and promotes the “animating impulse [of] anti-regulation…anti-bureaucracy, anti-teachers unions.”

• Chester Finn, Jr., of the Thomas Fordham Institute, averred that although Shanghai is a viable model, the U.S. “can’t just Xerox” the results. These strategies need to be adjusted for America’s needs. He pointed out that America has not found a “foolproof” way to turn around struggling schools and said that Tucker’s idea of a national education council, though full of good intentions, will be ineffective due to the current political environment. Finn addressed Tucker’s point on reforming the education hierarchy and simply said, “We do a lousy job of creating state governments.” Finn served in the Education Department during the administration of President George H. W. Bush.

None questioned the source of the information on China’s educational progress—the Chinese government itself, which historically has concealed much more than it has revealed. Moreover, it may not have occurred to them that the ultimate goal of Chinese educational control is obedience to the state, or did it?
UNEMPLOYMENT GOES TO COLLEGE

By Ali Swee

The worth of college is greatly contested, particularly to those who might hire graduates. “No longer can we afford to have every kid go to college,” Gary Shapiro, president and CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association said at a recent bloggers’ briefing at the Heritage Foundation. “What we do is we encourage people to go to college promiscuously.”

Similarly, students consistently earn degrees in areas where they cannot acquire jobs. “They shouldn’t be getting a degree in human or race or sex studies where they can’t get a job,” Shapiro averred.

Part of the disconnect comes from the degree to which colleges and universities are insulated from the outside world. “I’m on the board at George Mason University,” Shapiro said. “It’s a great school but the incentive there is to spend, spend, spend.”

After 30 years of experience in the business world, Shapiro has seen hundreds of successes and failures firsthand. These successes were compiled and transformed into the “10 killer strategies of the most successful businessmen.” Shapiro’s new book, Ninja Innovation, connects these strategies and lessons of business with those used by the ninjas of past generations.

The emphasis on innovation is a unique American strategy, according to Shapiro. America stands as one of the only countries in the world where it is acceptable to start a business and fail and reward those who are “willing to take risks.”

One of the most important causes of business growth is the health of the economy. Currently, “our government is hurting us, spending money they don’t have, according to Shapiro. He believes the most important thing his company has contributed to the economy has been their astonishing growth.

“[Innovation comes from] free market, free trade, the ability to get the best and the brightest people in the world, which is why the immigration debate is so important,” Shapiro said. A strong focus on growth and innovation is vital in any successful business.

Shapiro attributes many successes in business to the importance of working in a team. “Nobody does this by themselves,” Shapiro explained. “Put together people who complement your strengths and weaknesses.” In America today, this diversity is seen as a “good thing.” In fact, “it is our greatest strength.”

While in Vietnam, Shapiro noticed the yearning for education amongst the citizens. Parents hire after-school tutors to teach their children English. They dream of sending their children to American schools. “[Here in America,] we’re better at teaching kids how to think out of the box. Our kids ask why and why not.” Shapiro said.

Looking toward the future, Shapiro sees the innovation of robotics, driver-less cars, and motion detectors as promising new fields of technology. “We are living in a world and an era where anyone with a computer and broadband internet access can create an international business overnight.” Shapiro said.

Ali Swee 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.
IS COLLEGE WORTHWHILE?

By Isabel Mittelstadt

Billionaires like Bill Gates, Steve Jobs, and Mark Zuckerberg have more in common than their entrepreneurial skills: They were all college dropouts. So, if they can succeed without a college degree, why should others put themselves through high levels of student loans and debt to earn a piece of paper they may never need?

Maybe they shouldn’t. At least, that’s what William Bennett and David Wilezol suggest in their recent book “Is College Worth It?” The two spoke at the weekly bloggers’ briefing at the Heritage Foundation on May 21, 2013.

Bennett, who served as secretary of education under former President Reagan, says that with college tuition rising higher than inflation rates and with increasing unemployment levels among college graduates, perhaps some should rethink the idea of attending a higher education institution.

However, parents are concerned about investing thousands of dollars in their child’s education and students wonder whether the four-year effort is worth it. “Our answer to the question is it all depends,” Bennett said Tuesday at the Heritage Foundation. “It depends on the student who’s going, what the interest is, what the motivation is – if there is motivation – what the talent is, what the student wants to study, [and] how much money you have.”

He added, “It also depends on the institution.”

Wilezol, currently an associate producer of Bennett’s “Morning in America” radio show, said, “It matters where you go – not only because of the institutional resources – but because of the better social connections you can make at better schools.”

And these “better schools,” Wilezol explained, are often to blame for the sharp increase in tuition prices – a rise of 1100 percent since 1978. Because of their seemingly endless supply of “students who have the highest capacity to pay,” elite universities can raise tuition costs yearly. The problem comes when “second-tiered private institutions follow the same pattern,” Wilezol said.

But most high school graduates aren’t able to attend elite institutions like Yale, Harvard, or Stanford. Bennett and Wilezol understand this.

“Our thesis isn’t ‘don’t go to college;’” Wilezol said. Rather, because “46 percent of people who enroll in four year colleges never finish,” he encourages readers to “take an honest look at your capacity, inclination, and ability for academic work.”

In addition to the type of institution, the student’s area of interest also should be considered, the co-authors said.

“STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) studies have a higher return on investment than the liberal arts,” Wilezol explained. In fact, one of the reasons the two decided to write “Is College Worth It?” was in response to “a lot of sob stories about kids who…majored in things like history and political science and are [now] working in Starbucks.”

During a time in which politicians are urging more Americans to attend some sort of higher educational institution, some might take offense to Bennett and Wilezol’s argument.

President Obama said, in February 2009, that he believed “every American will need to get more than a high school diploma.”

Perhaps President Obama should take a closer look at the numbers: For those in the bottom “40 percent of their high school class, 76 percent of those who go to college don’t graduate within 8.5 years,” Wilezol said.

And Bennett is quick to remind people that both he and Wilezol are “classic liberal arts guys.”

“[For] philosophy, the classics…if you love it, and you want to get into debt, and you want to do it…fine,” Bennett said.

“All we’re saying is to go into this with your eyes open.”

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.
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.