

The Academy and Fourth Generation Warfare

By Candace de Russy



Candace de Russy

You've heard it argued that the twentieth century did not begin until World War I. Perhaps you too used to wonder what event would mark the birth of the twenty-first century. Would it be another Great War among nation-states?

A high-profile assassination?

The answer came, I believe, on 9/11. The century in which we all were born went down with the Twin Towers. Then came to life this new era whose shape we are only now beginning to discern.

On 9/11 a new form of warfare was manifested. This warfare will profoundly influence our way of life during this century and probably thereafter. It is not a kind of warfare that only concerns Pentagon planners and other military leaders. Because it is carried out against civilian populations, and because its perpetrators derive much of their inspiration from widely held radical ideas, this type of warfare should very much concern everyone, and not least those of us in the American academy.

What I am talking about is Fourth Generation Warfare, a term coined in 1989. Fourth Generation Warfare is characterized by a lack of definable battlefields, by groups acting not necessarily under the

direct control of a foreign government, and by its transnational nature. It does not rely on massed manpower, massed firepower, or maneuver, as in, respectively, First, Second, and Third Generation Warfare.

The new enemy—today's terrorist networks and the regimes that support them—is unencumbered by fixed borders and conventional forces. It is hydra-headed and covert. This enemy's hatred for us is rooted, not in disputes between nations, but in religious fanaticism, tribalism, historic envy, and political ideology. It does not confine its attack to military targets, but murders civilians in an effort to demoralize and destroy the will to fight back.

Perpetrators of Fourth Generation Warfare are typically the self-styled oppressed or those who claim to be fighting on behalf of the oppressed. They tend to be easily swayed by specious rhetoric and false arguments that America and the West are somehow engaged in an unending crusade of militarism, imperialism, greed, and other iniquities throughout the rest of the world. America as a champion of freedom, democracy, and human rights is a reality completely lost on them. And many others who pay lip service to peace nevertheless lend their intellectual, moral, and even financial support to the actual perpetrators of violence.

Those who wage Fourth Generation Warfare against us grow in power as their bases of intellectual support grow. And of all the institutions of society, it is our college and university campuses where the ground is most fertile for building such support. Degenerate academic thought not only breeds the extremists themselves but also worms its way into the mass mind.

A 1983 book titled *The Coercive Utopians*, by Rael and Erich Isaac, explains how this transpires. Cadres of radical "social engineers," or "The New Class," came to power within the federal government media and popular culture. This "knowledge elite," the authors point out, was spawned on the nation's most prestigious campuses. It holds that this country's institutions are antiquated and oppressive, and it appoints itself as the

"change agent" for "restructuring" our way of life. Campus radicalism, then, seeps into the minds and thoughts of millions of people among the general public, affecting American institutions far beyond academe.

Renunciations of an American identity—indeed of Western civilization itself—clearly are heard throughout the world. Witness the international success of the book *Empire*, an academic bestseller. Its authors, a Duke literature professor and a convicted Italian terrorist, joyfully celebrate anticapitalist revolutionary violence and proclaim the birth of a utopian postcapitalist age.

Campus radicals should be called to account for what they promulgate, inside and outside the campus gates. Let us, then, enter the gates. Let us note the cast of these radical teachings. I group them under the rubric of ideological multiculturalism—not multiculturalism in some positive sense, but in the sense of a reflexive denunciation of the West and capitalism, and a blind glorification of all other cultures and systems. Suffice it to say that the radical mindset implanted by "cultural" Marxists—I refer to Gramsci, Lukács, Horkheimer, and Marcuse, who sought to replace Western institutions with communism—endures in the form of multiculturalism.

Let us look at recent examples of ideological multiculturalism on campuses. Let us also ask how such radicalism may help fuel Fourth Generation Warfare and weaken the national unity needed to combat it.

To prevail against today's enemy—as analysts of the new warfare insist—we will need *unprecedented* reserves of national unity, resolve, and moral confidence. Victory no longer depends primarily on military superiority. Political will and mobilization, not smart bombs and mass armies, are now the decisive factors.

Does the climate of ideas in higher education today foster or hinder national unity? Do these ideas help defend us in this new century of Fourth Generation Warfare, or do they perpetuate such warfare?

Continued on page 6, See "The Academy and Fourth Generation Warfare"

INSIDE THIS ISSUE...

Letters to the Editor	2
New Regulation in Special Education . . .	3
Signs of the Times.	4
Landmark vs. NEA	5
IRS Audit of NEA	5
Book Revue - Discipline Strategies.	8
Effective Educational Technology	8

Lynne Cheney Article Panned

Dear AAE,

As a secondary language arts and mathematics instructor, I found your October newsletter to be both frustrating and insulting. In particular, the article “Making Matters Worse” that graced the front page gave readers a very skewed, politicized, inaccurate view of public education and of my subject areas. Had the author of this article spent any time in a public school classroom and observed the implementation of the “reforms” she so strongly denounced, she might not have written so harshly. Additionally, as a person who holds more moderate political views, I couldn’t agree with almost anything else in the newsletter—there was nothing I could enjoy reading in there.

As an educator who supports your organization, I do not enjoy reading such negative articles month after month. Every month you publish details of the ills of public schools, the horrors of big unions, or the disservice being done to one group or another. We already know most of this. I support you because you want good things for kids and for educators. Could we focus on the good once in a while? Could some encouragement be given occasionally? I find your newsletter to be very negative and highly political—especially for an organization that claims to be apolitical.

I appreciate your stand for good morals in education, and I very much appreciate the services you have helped provide me in terms of insurance. I would like to enjoy the newsletter as well, and I thank you for taking the time to read my response.

—Hannah Willems
Lenexa, KS



Lynne Cheney Article Praised

Dear AAE,

I want to commend the AAE for the very fine summary article “Making Matters Worse,” by Lynne Cheney in the October issue of *Education Matters* on the state of education in America today.

Many of us had hoped that the dedicated educators and politicians working for reform would have been met with more cooperation than apparently is the case, and it is appalling to see how true reform has been blocked and co-opted at every turn by the same organizations that have always served as stumbling blocks to any real progress.

It’s a common sense wake-up call that I hope will be heeded by everyone who has the power to change or affect our current system of education in any way, first stated so well in the 1983 publication, *A Nation At Risk*.

A hearty thanks to Lynne Cheney for her courage and dedication to education in America!

—Dolores G. Hiskes
Livermore, CA

Editor’s Note—

The following is the response to Hannah Willems from the managing editor of Education Matters, Gary Beckner:

Dear Hannah,

Thank you for sharing your opinions regarding *Education Matters*. We love to hear from our members—even when they are critical of our efforts. In your case, the criticism is constructive.

I agree that Lynne Cheney’s critique of what’s ailing the public school system might be overly simplistic. However, we believe she is on target on the larger issues. If there is one thing that both sides of the political spectrum (including the past two education chiefs—Richard Riley and Rod Paige) agree on is that our public school system is not as respected as it once was, and that’s why there is a constant drumbeat for reform. Good people can disagree on how to fix the system, but most agree the system needs fixing. In that regard, the AAE goes out of its way to report the opinions of those who are usually on the opposite side of the education “establishment.” We do this because most other education publications represent the establishment that continues to stonewall true reform. There does need to be a different voice out there. We will continue to at least report views that in our opinion deserve to be heard—but are not getting enough press.

By the way, Lynne Cheney’s various public service roles have caused her to spend more time actually observing classroom teachers than nearly anyone else presently writing about education reform.

Regarding too many stories about the “horrors of big unions,” I’m afraid you will not see much change there in future *Education Matters* issues. First of all, we do believe (with good cause) that the advent of monopoly unionism in public education was a primary cause of the current “ills of public schools.” Second, we receive constant requests from our members for more information that exposes the unions’ agenda. Many of our members use that information to recruit those teachers who inherently distrust the union but need evidence to help them “get off the fence.”

However, I do agree that we sometimes lean too much toward the conservative end of the political spectrum. But, then again, most “reform” ideas emanating from the left of the political spectrum have proven to be bankrupt. Notwithstanding, your observation is valid and we will try to remain as apolitical as possible. One thing we’ve learned in the past 8 years is that educators should not trust politicians to make their lot better!

Thank you so much for believing that “we want good things for kids and for educators”—for that is truly where our heart is. And knowing where our heart is, I hope you’ll be able to view *Education Matters* through a different lens in the future. We can’t promise it will cause you to enjoy it, but perhaps it will help you appreciate our modus operandi.

An AAE Member’s Generosity Appreciated

Dear AAE,

My name is Michael Gallien and I am the new principal at Yorktown Christian Academy at Corpus Christi, Texas. My wife, Laura Gallien, was an AAE member last year when we lived in Alabama. She is planning on renewing her membership this year. (She is a public school teacher—now here in Texas.)

Last year, when I was out of a job—one of your members paid for my wife’s membership into the AAE! She did not join the Alabama Education Association (AEA) or the NEA. Upon our move, the public school system she worked for did not want to pay her the “summer” pay because she did not sign a new contract. Every time we asked for the pay that she had earned, they replied with a question, “Are you a member of the NEA or AEA?” It was only after talking to one of your legal representatives did we get advice as to what to put in a letter that got action. After wording the letter as instructed, the check that my wife had already worked for finally came in the mail. We avoided going to court once they found out that my wife was a member of the AAE. I want to sing your praises to my teachers here at Yorktown Christian and get them to be members.

Thank you!

—Michael Gallien
Corpus Christi, TX

New Regulation Offers Flexibility in Testing of Special Education Students with Serious Cognitive Disabilities

*A Report from Our Washington, D.C. Office Director, Tracey Bailey,
1993 National Teacher of the Year*



Tracey Bailey

The U.S. Department of Education has just released a new regulation that provides greater flexibility in the testing and reporting of scores for special education students who have the “most significant cognitive disabilities.”

This new regulation was officially adopted on December 9, 2003. The following day I attended a special USDOE policy briefing to review the regulation.

Essentially, this regulation allows states to report passing scores on alternative assessments given to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities as proficient or advanced for the purposes of reporting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). This is subject to a maximum 1 percent cap, as a percentage of all students tested at that grade level.

Please allow me to provide some more background and context on this issue:

1) One of the most frequent complaints about NCLB (particularly from special education teachers) is that NCLB requirements did not take into account that many students with serious cognitive disabilities might NOT EVER reach grade-level performance, even if they were provided with the “very best instruction possible.” States and districts were particularly concerned about the impact that these student test scores might have on their ability to meet the AYP goals established by each state, pursuant to NCLB.

2) Most people agree that these concerns are valid. However, it should also be noted that special education students have long been required by federal law to be a part of each state’s assessment system. This requirement was established in the 1997 Reauthorization of IDEA, and it precedes NCLB by at least four years. Obviously, some states and school districts have been more stringent than others in complying with this previous federal requirement for assessing special education students. The main difference causing urgency and concern NOW is that, with

the passage of NCLB, these special education student test scores now affect a school’s overall standing on AYP calculations.

3) With regard to timing of this regulation, the U.S. Department of Education proposed plans to give states this flexibility almost a year and half ago. These two formal announcements took place on August 6, 2002, and then again in March 20, 2003, in “Notices of Proposed Rulemaking” published in the *Federal Register*. Many states have been planning on (and some are already using) the flexibility this regulation now officially provides. In fact, last year the Secretary of Education used his “transitional authority” to allow states to use this 1 percent cap on 2002-2003 AYP scores, even before the rule became final and official.

4) Finally, the new regulation is now official. It is important because it provides some reasonable common-sense flexibility in NCLB to deal with special education students who have the most significant cognitive disabilities. And yet it still maintains a cap of 1 percent in counting these alternative assessment scores as proficient or advanced for NCLB purposes. This 1 percent cap is designed to prevent any abuse the system (and abuse of some special education students) by excessively categorizing too many students as not able to take the normal standardized tests – and thereby falsely raising the state’s and district’s passing rates for AYP purposes.

Certainly, this new rule provides some welcome relief and necessary flexibility. As this policy is implemented over the next few years, you – our AAE members – will be able to decide whether this rule strikes the right balance between flexibility versus protecting special education students from being incorrectly categorized or having their test scores misrepresented. As you do, please consider two more facts:

- Some critics have said the 1 percent cap isn’t high enough. However, various states have reported that approximately 1 percent of their student population seems to meet the regulatory guidelines for students with the most serious cognitive disabilities. So the 1 percent figure seems to be close to the right value.

However, in any case, the regulation allows states and districts to request a limited waiver – above the allowable 1 percent – provided that sufficient justification is given. And remember, 1 percent of the general student population amounts to about 9 percent of all students with disabilities. Thus, about 9 percent of special education students may be allowed to take alternative assessments and still have their scores count as proficient for the purposes of AYP reporting.

- Also keep in mind that many other special education students will continue to be able to take the normal standardized tests WITH TESTING ACCOMMODATIONS APPROPRIATE FOR THEIR DISABILITY, such as being given more time to finish the test or having portions of the test read aloud to them. All of these scores will continue to count in the normal way, and are not subject to the 1 percent cap.

It will probably take awhile for all states and school districts to digest the ramifications of this new regulation and then to issue any new state-specific guidelines or district policies. **EM**

For more information, you can view a “Fact Sheet” from the USDOE here:

<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/freedom/local/specedfactsheet.html>

Or, to view a PDF copy of the new Regulation itself, go here:

<http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2003-4/120903a.html>

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
Certainly, this
new rule provides
some welcome relief
and necessary flexibility.

*Quote
of the
Month*

*“On most campuses,
diversity of thought
is as hard to find
as a D student
at Harvard.”*

*—Alan Fiers of the
University of Pennsylvania*



Yet students and parents estimated tuition at between \$5,400 and \$5,800. For more information, please go to <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003030>. (To watch a webcast on college costs, demonstrating the Student Aid on the Web tool cited above, see <http://www.connectlive.com/events/deptedu/>.) **EM**

Turning Schools Around

Purposefully coinciding with the release of state lists of schools in need of improvement, the National Governors Association has prepared a guide that describes strategies for turning around low-performing schools and highlights best practices in states, districts, and schools. "Reaching New Heights" advocates five key principles: not all low-performing schools are the same; capacity building must be part of the solution; school districts are essential collaborators; be prepared for the long haul; and any assistance should be part of a larger strategy of school improvement. Want more specifics? Richard Elmore, a Harvard professor, examined the process by which two low-performing schools (which "differ... from the stereotypical image of a 'failing school'") were trying to improve and, from this analysis, derived a theory of what the process looks like when it is successful. For more information, please go to <http://www.nga.org/center/schools/>. **EM**

Hiring Teachers: How Urban Districts Lose Quality Teachers

A blockbuster report released last month by The New Teacher Project provides hard data on a problem that, until now, could only be described anecdotally. "Missed Opportunities: How We Keep High-Quality Teachers Out of Urban Classrooms," by the New Teacher Project (a teacher recruitment organization servicing high-need districts across the US) documents the experiences of teacher recruits as they navigated through dysfunctional district hiring processes. Confirming what many of us have long suspected, districts are consistently losing the best candidates—by any measure—due to slow, inefficient hiring practices, delays in budget timetables, and rigid union seniority rules. The report paints a very accurate picture of district personnel offices, which are often the least functional office in a school system.

The study sent out surveys to teachers in four geographically representative districts, asking them why they had chosen to withdraw their applications. Many teachers ended up teaching in neighboring suburban districts, not because they wanted to but because time simply ran out. By the time that urban school districts offered a contract, anywhere from one- to two-thirds of the recruits had already withdrawn, with the most talented first to go elsewhere. The withdrawers tended to be the cream of the crop by any set of measures: higher GPAs, graduates of selective colleges, more education coursework, and a major in the academic subject areas.

The relatively short report is full of great data and should be read in its entirety. You may review "Missed Opportunities: How We Keep High-Quality Teachers Out of Urban Classrooms," by The New Teacher Project at <http://www.nttp.org/docs/reportfinal9-12.pdf>. **EM**

The Trials and Tribulations of Merit Pay in Florida

Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Pascoe counties in Florida may be among the first to try a new merit pay system if their plan is approved by the state. The program proposed by the three counties would group all teachers into one of four levels: associate, professional, lead, or mentor. Teachers would be assigned a group on the basis of experience, evaluations, and extra duties. These districts would be among the first to pilot the career ladder program that has \$25 million appropriated for its statewide implementation. Salaries would increase by between \$1,000 and \$8,000, based on the outcome of the teacher's classification.

However these counties decide to implement their approach, we hope that they studiously avoid following in the footsteps of Citrus County. Under their incredibly convoluted performance pay plan, which uses a 125-point rubric to target such things "communication" and "diversity," a classroom teacher who had significantly improved the achievement test scores of 93 percent of her students was considered "average" and not entitled to any bonus pay. In fact, no bonus pay was awarded to any of the teachers in Citrus County. The \$190,000 that was allocated for merit pay ended up back in district hands. **EM**

Source—TQ Bulletin is a weekly e-mail newsletter brought to you by the National Council on Teacher Quality (www.nctq.org).

Budget Cuts Lead to Program, Teacher Cuts

Tight education budgets are placing innovative teacher preparation programs in peril and leading to rounds of teacher dismissals. Recent developments offer examples of how budget cuts are playing out on the ground.

Baltimore is facing a \$52 million deficit, a projected district enrollment that was off by thousands of students, and the looming mandates of the highly qualified teacher provision of No Child Left Behind. This week the district realized it could easily dismiss eighty-three teachers who had let their teaching certificates lapse after multiple warnings. The district still has 300 surplus teachers.

A few years ago Connecticut had developed successful partnership programs between school districts and schools of education to give future teachers more experience before they entered the classroom. Such programs—there were about 50 of them in 2001—were important for the development of new teachers in Connecticut, often touted as a showcase for teacher preparation by such groups as NCTAF. Due to budget cuts, the state of Connecticut is no longer managing or even tracking these programs; however, by all accounts, the number of partnerships is dropping due to the lack of funding. **EM**

Source—TQ Bulletin is a weekly e-mail newsletter brought to you by the National Council on Teacher Quality (www.nctq.org)

College Costs

A new National Center for Education Statistics report, "Getting Ready to Pay for College," found that while the vast majority of students and parents report plans for higher education, they are generally unable to estimate accurately the cost of tuition. When they do estimate, they tend to overestimate. In 1998-99, the average yearly in-state undergraduate tuition at public four-year colleges was \$3,200.

Landmark Files Criminal Complaint Against NEA!

Landmark Legal Foundation is intensifying its effort to compel the National Education Association (NEA) to comply with its tax obligations by filing criminal complaints with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and Justice Department, alleging violations by the NEA of federal tax and criminal law. The Foundation charges that the teachers' union has knowingly, intentionally, and repeatedly evaded paying millions in taxes and penalties for at least the last decade by filing false income tax returns with the IRS relating to NEA political expenditures and activities.

In its latest complaints, Landmark calls on the Criminal Investigation Division of the IRS and the Criminal and Tax Divisions of the Department of Justice to launch formal criminal investigations into the union's political expenditures and tax reporting. If found guilty, the NEA could lose its tax-exempt status, and union leaders could be subject to fines and penalties for filing fraudulent tax returns that conceal its use of tax exempt funds to pay for political activities. The newest complaints are the latest steps in a six-year-long initiative undertaken by Landmark to force one of the nation's largest and most political unions to simply comply with federal tax, election, and labor laws.

"School is out for the NEA when it comes to skirting federal law," said Landmark President Mark R. Levin. "Politics is one of the teachers' union's primary functions—and yet the union tells the government that it spends absolutely nothing on campaign

activities. This is not an accident or oversight. We want the IRS and the Justice Department to do their jobs and uphold the law."

Under the Internal Revenue Code, labor unions such as the NEA are required to report—and pay taxes on—all funds spent by the union on political activities. These expenditures include direct cash contributions to federal, state, and local political campaigns; in-kind contributions like the salaries and employment costs of union employees delegated to work on campaigns; union-funded advertising and polling that benefits a specific candidate or political party; and other efforts designed to advance a specific campaign or party. Any political expenditures or contributions given to a political party or campaign organization are not tax deductible and are required, by federal law, to be funded separately through a political action committee or PAC. At least since 1994—the first year Landmark began tracking the union's political expenditures—Landmark claims the NEA has spent millions of dollars derived from its members' tax-exempt union dues payments on unreported political expenditures and activities.

These expenditures include:

\$1,993,735

In the NEA's Strategic Plan and Budget for fiscal years 2000-2002 for "[a] coordinated state-specific campaign developed and implemented to elect bipartisan pro-public education candidates in the 2000 general election."

\$76,400,000

To fund the UniServ program in 1999-2002 NEA Budget—A nationwide network of more than 1,800 NEA-funded affiliate employees who, according to one account, act as "the largest army of paid political organizers and lobbyists in the U.S., dwarfing the forces of the Republican and Democratic national committees combined."

\$9,600,000

In the NEA's 1996 Strategic Focus Plan to "build bipartisan constituencies among those running for and elected to public office to support public education." Some of the activities funded by this appropriation included "screening candidates for federal office; conducting political surveys for candidate evaluation; mobilize members and other resources... to support the election of pro-education candidates and ballot measures; provide technical assistance, surveys; and training in political campaign work to affiliates and members at all levels; identify and evaluate new/innovative ways to effect election results, such as mail ballot early voting, term limits on state-elected officials, etc.; cultivate working relationships with Democratic and Republican parties."

"The pressure is also growing on the IRS and the Justice Department to step up to the plate and enforce the law," Levin concluded. "There has never been—and will never be—a stronger case presented to the government about the NEA's transgressions. The time is now to ensure that the nation's teachers have a union that represents their interests and follows the law." **EM**

Definition of "Political Expenditure" Is Key Issue in IRS Audit of NEA

The Internal Revenue Service does not publicly discuss audits, ongoing or otherwise. So the only way we are going to learn anything about the IRS audit of the National Education Association is through the lips of officials at NEA headquarters who will be highly motivated to put the best possible spin on the investigation and its ultimate results.

I mention this because it may take years for those not directly involved (that includes most NEA members) to determine exactly what the IRS was auditing, what they found, and what they decided to do about it. Then there will be more time until we see what NEA does in response. All that, even if there are no appeals, lawsuits, or other forms of administrative legerdemain.

However, unless there is some strange financial activity that none of us knows anything about, the key question to be answered is whether any of NEA's political activities meets the IRS definition of "political expenditure."

This is not a new conflict. People regularly call Education Intelligence Agency (EIA) with questions about NEA's claim that it doesn't spend dues money on politics. If politics is defined narrowly as "donating cash and services to individual candidates for political office," then NEA is being truthful. Giving dues money directly to candidates is illegal. However, laymen use "politics" in a more general way, to include exerting influence over the legislative process. By that definition, NEA absolutely does spend dues money on politics.

Nor is this a first-time decision for the IRS. In 1998, the Christian Coalition was fined by the IRS, retroactively lost its tax-exempt status for a couple of years, and had to restructure its political activities in response to an audit.

The relevant IRS definition reads: "A political expenditure is one intended to influence the selection, nomination, election, or appointment of anyone to a Federal, state, or local public office, or

office in a political organization, or the election of Presidential or Vice Presidential electors. It does not matter whether the attempt succeeds. An expenditure includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or anything of value. It also includes a contract, promise, or agreement to make an expenditure, whether or not legally enforceable."

Since "anything of value" is an expenditure, NEA may be answering an awful lot of IRS questions.

Reacting to the audit, NEA President Reg Weaver said, "We want nothing more – or less – than any other American citizens, regardless of their ideological viewpoints." But other American citizens pay taxes, and NEA is exempt as long as it follows the rules. That's the price of a government favor. **EM**

Source—Communiqué, a publication from EIA, that conducts public education research, analysis, and investigations. www.eiaonline.com.

The Academy and Fourth Generation Warfare

(Continued from page 1)

Let us ask, in sum, how it came to pass, by the mid-1990s, that an influential sociologist at New York University, Richard Sennett, could confidently proclaim the “evil of a shared national identity.”

The Australian critic Keith Windschuttle observes that multiculturalism originally promoted tolerance and respect for non-Western cultures. It held that the West was not the apogee of human achievement but simply one of many equally worthy cultures. But, this essential relativism has been seized and manipulated by campus radicals. Their “fair-mindedness” has not applied to American or Western cultures. The radicals ignore our own history or retell it as little more than a litany of sins against humanity.

Ideological multiculturalism also whitewashes non-Western failings. Its proponents wish away—to quote the French writer Pascal Bruckner—“bloody messes in banana republics, . . . butchery of political opposition and . . . dictatorial lunacy by . . . petty chieftains.”

This particularly applies to the events of 9/11 and the Fourth Generation War currently being waged. In the 1980s and 1990s, prominent professors of Middle Eastern studies tried to wish away the growing threat of radical Islamism and terrorist attacks on American soil. In his book *Ivory Towers on Sand*, Martin Kramer relates that almost all of these scholars simply refuse to study extremist Muslims and even Islam itself. Academics such as John L. Esposito of Georgetown University dismissed Bin Laden’s many threatening statements and actions. Sarah Lawrence professor Fawaz Gerges accused “the terror industry” of fomenting an “irrational fear of terrorism by focusing . . . on farfetched horrible scenarios.”

Lately we’ve all heard about the study guide on the Koran that incoming freshmen at the University of North Carolina must read. I am all for students studying the world religions and indeed reading the Koran—but in its uncut version. Regrettably, the author of the study guide, Michael Sells of Haverford College, omits those portions of the Koran that terrorists use for justifying their attacks.

However, campus radicals do not merely sin by omission. As Daniel Pipes of the Middle East Forum notes, a Harvard professor of Islamic history portrays *jihad* as

“a struggle without arms.” The student chosen by the Harvard faculty to deliver this year’s commencement address entitled his talk “Of Faith and Citizenship: My American Jihad.” The student had earlier praised the raised money for the Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development, a militant Islamic group closed down by the Justice Department.

According to Pipes, Middle Eastern scholars have been unapologetic about their errors and, worse, have tended to blame the attacks on U.S. policy.

And they certainly have not been alone in their perverse treatment of matters in relation to national security.

For example, in a commencement address, radical feminist bell hooks (sic), a professor at Southwestern University, equated terrorism with “life-threatening conservatism.” She excoriated “white, capitalist” men for their “imperialist aggression enacted in the name of bringing an end to terrorism.” Noam Chomsky, the MIT linguist and icon of the left, shares Professor Hooks’ hysteria. In his widely read book titled *9/11*, Chomsky

asserts that the United States is a “leading terrorist state.”

Swayed by such propaganda, fresh new recruits of Fourth Generation Warriors all the more readily carry out murderous attacks on civilians, and their bases of intellectual support continue to grow.

In addition to propagating dangerous ideas, ideological multiculturalists undertake actions that hinder our ability to fight back. Journalist Stanley Kurtz cites a telling example. Networks of influential multiculturalists, such as David Wiley, who is head of the African Studies Center at Michigan State University, are trying to do away with the National Security Education Program (NSEP), which requires grantees to work for a security-related federal agency after graduation. Those boycotting the NSEP, Kurtz states, believe “scholarly cooperation with the American government to be a form of immoral collusion with imperialism.”

Kurtz exposes a similar bias in schools of education, which use federally funded teacher training materials steeped in ideological multiculturalism. Yet another case illustrates the visible bias on many campuses with regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict: at SUNY-Binghamton, a professor of political science, Robert Ostergard, turned his classroom into an anti-Zionist forum.

Should we be surprised, in light of such indoctrination, at signs that our national identity is in ill repute among many

students and administrators on campuses? Here are the words of one Joshua Greene, a student at West Virginia University: “In light of the destructive nationalism calling for war, the sight of the flag burning would be preferable to its display.” Here too is what administrators did at San Diego University. An immigrant from Ethiopia took some Arab students to task after over-hearing them praise the 9/11 attacks. And the verdict? He was threatened with criminal charges and expulsion, and university public relations officers vilified his name.

In an example of anti-military bias, at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, faculty and administrators shouted down Marine Captain Felix Rodriguez as he attempted to make a pitch for military recruitment. At Washington University, the faculty voted to drop military men and women from a loan-assistance program for graduates who go into public service.

Imagine the cumulative effects of decades of such radical teaching and administrative truckling. Picture the spread of ideological multiculturalism, like a virus, in all our institutions: the popular culture and media, our schools and churches, and government. Does anyone doubt that this virus contributed to the nation’s complacency before 9/11? And post-9/11, it is not reasonable to believe it has hindered the efforts of those whose job it is to protect us? For example, it is widely believed that accusations of racial profiling discouraged FBI, CIA, and INS employees from effectively carrying out their duties.

In this Fourth Generation, we can no longer afford to indulge radicals in the academy who, as historian Donald Kagan warns, are “subversive of our safety.” Our national unity is the stuff of life and death.

How can we more effectively counter campus radicalism? What can be done to prevail in this most consequential war of ideas? Although I do not pretend to have an original strategy, I do have a few suggestions.

First, let us be clear about our goals. Our intent should be to create a new intellectual pluralism in which all issues—including national security-related issues—will be heard from all sides. And whereas we may disagree with the extremist activities of some Muslim professors and student associations, we must protect their basic rights.

Meanwhile, more professors need to fight for intellectual diversity on campuses. They are the first line of defense against the monopolization of ideas by campus ideologues. Among other things, speech codes and other leftist tools of repression must be abolished. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education has been at the forefront of this battle.

(Continued on next page)

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
Degenerate academic
thought not only breeds
the extremists themselves
but also worms its way into
the mass mind.

Academics should, in particular, demand genuine tolerance for ideas relating to our national security. Students should be permitted to hear, for instance, the case for reinstating the nation's historic "assimilation compact," that is, its former embrace of the need better to integrate immigrants into American society. From colonial times until the 1960s, as SUNY Provost Peter Salins reminds us in his book *Assimilation, American Style*, professors extolled this compact.

Professors also have an obligation to tell the truth about the achievements and faults of non-Western cultures. In the present crisis, for instance, students should learn about Islam. But they should not willfully be left in ignorance about Wahhabism, the medieval Saudi doctrine that is a main source of the radical Islamists' hatred of all "infidels."

A similar revisiting of the curriculum is in order. For example, Rick Vallery, a professor of political science at Swarthmore College, advocates that political scientists explore "recent revelations of intelligence and bureaucratic failure, and...the proposed reorganization of government around the new focus on homeland security." He specifically points to specialties such as "organizational sociology," which can help shed light on why the FBI neglected the so-called Phoenix memo, a document warning of suspicious students at aviation schools.

To create a climate on campuses that permits us to combat the Fourth Generation Warriors, more faculty members should become active in the ranks of the National Association of Scholars—those intellectuals, such as Steve Balch and Barry Smith here, who've been in the front ranks to restore the curriculum. Faculty members should also spread the message of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture. Who more heroically than its president—my colleague here David Horowitz—has borne witness against the despotism of leftist ideologues, and most recently their autocratic hiring and promotion practices throughout the academy?

Various other academic constituencies must address the leftist bias that undermines our national security. Concerned parents, alumni, donors, governors and legislators, higher education trustees and administrators, and federal education officials must also rise to the occasion.

Chancellors such as Robert King of SUNY are to be commended for mobilizing the scientific resources of the system against

terrorism. At his behest, SUNY campuses have begun to expand upon three areas of existing expertise: cybersecurity, sensor technology, and vaccine development.

But the mounting of such relatively uncontroversial scientific projects, however vital to our defense, is not enough. He and other higher education leaders must also take bolder action in behalf of intellectual pluralism on campuses. They must stop ignoring and legitimizing campus radicals and confront them publicly, in particular, for their irresponsible approach to national security-related issues. Consider the example set by Robert M. Berdahl, the chancellor of U.C. Berkeley, in his response to a particularly raw display of political bigotry on that campus. In a description for a course involving the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, "conservative thinkers" were urged to seek other sections. Reacting to a torrent of criticism by civil libertarians, Chancellor Berdahl spoke out publicly against teaching that crosses the line into "indoctrination."

Another promising sign is efforts to create curricula that focus on the foundation principles of the West. An alliance of administrators and faculty at the University of Buffalo, for instance, is considering establishing a humanities program focused on Western Civilization.

There is also a need to redirect public and private funding of higher education. Parents and students should reject, and alumni and other benefactors withhold money from, campuses that recklessly purvey anti-Americanism and anti-Westernism. The American Council for Trustees and Alumni has a program for redirecting such funds toward institutions that practice intellectual pluralism.

Foundations should also rethink their priorities. Unfortunately some of the most influential of them avidly conform to the most nationally divisive academic fads. The Ford Foundation, for instance, has funded a "demonstration model" for Middle Eastern studies at New York University, which it has handed over to "progressive activists."

Federal funding also deserves scrutiny. The program known as Title VI is a particularly relevant example, since it funds the various area studies that have so often degenerated into mindless multiculturalism.

I need not dwell again, by way of conclusion, on this nation's current great need during this Fourth Generation War. I will but urge my colleagues in the academy to respond to this need and join the fight.

"We fight," President Bush said on the first anniversary of 9/11, "not to impose our will but to defend ourselves and extend the blessings of freedom."

The fight is therefore about much more than what goes on at the Department of Defense. The ubiquity and elusiveness of Fourth Generation Warfare require profound changes throughout society, and above all throughout the nation's college and university campuses, since they so heavily shape the nature of our society.

The extremists currently waging war against us justify their actions in the name of religion but also in the name of ideological multiculturalism. Typical among such ideologues everywhere, radical Islamists tend to regard the United States and the West as the chief cause of poverty and oppression throughout the world, and are deeply suspicious of capitalism. The fact that the terrorists targeted the World Trade Center, which was probably the greatest symbol of capitalism in the world, attests to their deep, quasi-Marxist worldview.

Our nation's colleges and universities are helping to fuel this mindset. It not only broadens support for the Fourth Generation warriors but also breeds new warriors themselves, who are ready and willing to unleash remorseless violence against innocent civilians in the name of anti-Americanism.

In a different time, when American shores were immune from malevolent attacks, we perhaps could afford to treat ideological multiculturalism as an irritant.

But not anymore. We all know what can happen when mass-murder weaponry falls into the hands of extremists. It is up to us to help prevent the breeding of new extremists and to neutralize the existing ones. The principal weapons at our disposal are intellectual pluralism, national unity, resolve, and moral confidence.


Although academic radicals have much influence, they are not invincible. Try as they might, they could not contain the tide of patriotism that engulfed our campuses in the aftermath of 9/11 and that continues to this day. So there is cause for much hope.

Entrusted as we in the academy are with passing on the American and Western democratic heritage, it is no small part of our mission to extend its blessings. **EM**

Candace de Russy, formerly a professor of French, is a member of the board of trustees of the State University of New York. From her base in Bronxville, NY, she writes and lectures on higher education.

Source—Academic Questions, a publication of the National Association of Scholars, Vol 16, No. 2. Copyright 2003 by Transaction Publishers. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

★ ★ ★ ★ ★
The principal weapons
at our disposal are
intellectual pluralism,
national unity, resolve,
and moral confidence.



From Gene Bedley's popular national seminar "Discipline and the Difficult Child" comes this new behavior-changing book.

Thousands of teachers have profited from these highly successful and practical national seminars. Gene provides numerous, creative solutions and strategies for teaching different and challenging students.

Now individual teachers can purchase this comprehensive book *Discipline Strategies and Solutions*. Primary and elementary school educators feel like their hands have been tied when it comes to working

with angry, ADHD, and oppositional children. Gene gives them portable- and classroom-proven ideas. His unique and detailed implementation procedures can help every educator achieve success—and, more importantly, make a significant difference!

The strategies, poems, and songs are items you will want to use over and over. Every primary grade teacher will profit from this comprehensive collection of positive discipline ideas.

"Time and time again I have turned to Gene's materials. Although I have stacks of other materials, it is Gene Bedley's that I turn to first and last. I suppose you could say they speak to me. His no-frills approach, no fancy psycho-babble talk, no flavor-of-the-month methodology, no fluff, is refreshing."

—Allison Read,
Character Education Coordinator
Stuart, Florida

Publisher—People-Wise Publications, P.O. Box 80208, Rancho Santa Margarita, California 92688; or order online at www.ethicsusa.com.

New Study to Highlight Effective Educational Technology

Mathematica Policy Research in Princeton, N.J., and their subcontractor, SRI International, Menlo Park, CA, have been awarded a three-year \$36 million contract to carry out a congressionally mandated evaluation of the effectiveness of educational technology in improving student achievement in reading and mathematics. This team brings together expertise with randomized assignment research on the topic of educational technology.

"I am pleased that Congress recognizes the need for rigorous evaluations of the effectiveness of educational technology tools," said Grover "Russ" Whitehurst, director of the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences. "The results of this evaluation will give schools and policymakers the

information they need to choose and implement technologies that will improve the achievement of students."

The No Child Left Behind Act mandates an independent long-term study using scientifically based research methods and control groups. This study will focus on identifying particular uses of education technology that increase student achievement, and the conditions that increase the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction. A report is due to Congress on April 1, 2006.

"We have an opportunity to truly assess the way technology can make a difference in teaching and learning," said John Bailey, director of the Office of Educational Technology. "We can increase technology's impact on student achieve-

ment by better understanding the conditions and practices necessary to improve teaching and instruction."

Over the last year, a technical advisory group composed of subject matter experts and research experts helped to design the study. To implement the study, education technologies in reading and mathematics will be put in place in schools during the 2004-2005 school year.

Mathematica and SRI International will assess the impact of these interventions on improving reading and mathematics achievement through a random assignment study design. **EM**

Additional information regarding the study can be found at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/os/technology/evaluation.html>.



ASSOCIATION
OF
AMERICAN
EDUCATORS

Gary Beckner
Managing Editor

Kelley Autry
Associate Editor & Research

Diane Meyer
Editorial Assistant

Bobette Craycraft
Editorial Assistant

Ron Law
Newsletter Design & Layout

★★ Advisory Board ★★

Leta Rains Andrews • Tracey Bailey
Patricia Ann Baltz • Gene Bedley
Polly Broussard • Eric Buehrer
Dr. Kevin Ryan • Guy Rice Doud
Thomas A. Fleming • Valerie Anderson Hill
Dr. Lewis Hodge • Dr. William Kilpatrick

EducationMatters is published by the Association of American Educators. For more information, contact AAE, 25201 Paseo de Alicia, Suite 104, Laguna Hills, CA 92653

(949) 595-7979
(800) 704-7799
Fax (949) 595-7970

E-mail: info@aaeteachers.org
Website: aaeteachers.org

©2004 by Association of American Educators