

June 7, 2015

Harvard used to restrict Jews, now it's Asians. [Kate Bachelder](#) with a WSJ OpEd - *Harvard's Chinese Exclusion Act*.

*... First, a few facts. Asian-Americans are the fastest-growing segment of the U.S. population, and the share of college-age Asian-Americans climbed to 5.1% in 2011 from 3% in 1990. Yet according to independent research cited in the complaint, members of this 5% make up roughly 30% of National Merit semifinalists, a distinction earned by high-school students based on PSAT scores. Asian-American students seem to win a similar share of the Education Department's Presidential Scholar awards, "one of the nation's highest honors for high-school students," as the website puts it. By any standard, Asian-Americans have made remarkable gains since 1950. They constituted 0.2% of the U.S. population then, due in part to the legacy of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.*

*Harvard admissions do not reflect these changes or gains. The percentage of Asian-American students has held remarkably steady since the 1990s. This spring, 21% of the students admitted to Harvard were Asian-American; in 1993 it was about 20%. Harvard selects students based on criteria it calls "holistic," taking into consideration subjective qualities such as, according to the university's website, "interests," "character" and "growth."*

*Yet look how Harvard stacks up against schools that explicitly don't consider ethnicity in admissions. At the California Institute of Technology, the share of Asian-American students hit 42.5% in 2013—double Harvard's and a big jump from Caltech's 26% in 1993. At the University of California-Berkeley it is more than 30%; the state's voters banned the state schools from using racial preferences in a 1996 referendum. The trend is also observable at elite high schools with race-neutral admissions: New York City's Hunter College High School was 49% Asian-American in 2013. ...*

Continuing with higher ed, [Michael Barone](#) says colleges and universities have grown bloated and dysfunctional.

*American colleges and universities, long thought to be the glory of the nation, are in more than a little trouble. I've written before of their shameful practices — the racial quotas and preferences at selective schools (Harvard is being sued by Asian-American organizations), the kangaroo courts that try students accused of rape and sexual assault without legal representation or presumption of innocence, and speech codes that make campuses the least rather than the most free venues in American society.*

*In following these policies, the burgeoning phalanxes of university and college administrators must systematically lie, insisting against all the evidence that they are racially nondiscriminatory, devoted to due process and upholders of free speech. The resulting intellectual corruption would have been understood by George Orwell. ...*

*... A glut of Ph.D.s and an ever-increasing army of administrators have produced downward pressure on faculty pay. Universities increasingly hire Ph.D.s as underpaid adjuncts, with low wages and no job security.*

*The last half-century has seen a huge increase in the percentage of Americans who go to college and a huge increase in government aid to them. The assumption was that if college is*

*good for some, it's good for everyone. But not everyone is suited for college: witness the increasing ranks of debt-laden nongraduates.*

*And the huge tranches of government money have been largely mopped up by the ever-increasing cadres of administrators. Do students get their money's worth from the masses of counselors, facilitators, liaisons and coordinators their student loans pay for? Or would they be better off paying for such services only as needed, as most other adults do? ...*

**Editors of NY Daily News** opine on campus thought crimes.

*Madness has been unleashed on college campuses — not by drunken frat boys but by the White House.*

*A wildly mishandled Obama administration campaign to combat student sexual assaults has morphed under a federal gender-equality law into a nightmarish weapon against free speech and academic freedom.*

*The statute, called Title IX, obligates colleges to act on sexually related complaints to protect students from a hostile environment. But enforcement now encompasses any member of a college community deemed by an accuser to have prompted discomfort in connection with his or her sex.*

*As Northwestern University film professor Laura Kipnis discovered, that includes writing or saying the wrong thing. Defying a gag order, she has gone public with a hair-raising account of being accused under Title IX after writing an article about Northwestern's recent ban on sexual relations between faculty and students. ...*

**Huffington Post** has more campus hijinks.

*Six weeks ago, Northwestern University President Morton Schapiro wrote a fine op-ed in the Wall Street Journal in which he offered a ringing endorsement of academic freedom. As he observed, a university must have "a compelling reason to punish anyone -- student, faculty member, staff member -- for expressing his or her views, regardless of how repugnant you might find those views." Indeed, he added, "freedom of speech doesn't amount to much unless it is tested," and if freedom of speech isn't aggressively protected "on college campuses, where self-expression is so deeply valued, why expect it to matter elsewhere?"*

*It is therefore both surprising and disappointing that Northwestern University recently found itself embroiled in two embarrassing violations of the core principles of academic freedom. Sadly, a university that should be a national leader in promoting and protecting these values allowed itself to lose sight of its very reason for being. ...*

**Kimberley Strassel** wonders why the IRS can't take a look at the Clinton shakedown foundation.

*The scandal of the century at the IRS was that agency's secret targeting of conservative nonprofits. Perhaps a close second is the scandal of what the IRS hasn't been investigating: the Clinton Foundation.*

*The media's focus is on Hillary Clinton's time as secretary of state, and whether she took official actions to benefit her family's global charity. But the mistake is starting from the premise that the Clinton Foundation is a "charity." What's clear by now is that this family enterprise was set up as a global shakedown operation, designed to finance and nurture the Clintons' continued political ambitions. It's a Hillary super PAC that throws in the occasional good deed.*

*That much is made obvious by looking at the foundation's employment rolls. Most charities are staffed by folks who have spent a lifetime in nonprofits, writing grants or doing overseas field work. The Clinton Foundation is staffed by political operatives. It has been basically a parking lot for Clinton campaign workers—a comfy place to draw a big check as they geared up for Hillary's presidential run.*

*The revolving door is spinning quickly these days. There's Dennis Cheng, a finance director for Mrs. Clinton's 2008 bid, who went to the Clinton Foundation as its chief development officer. There he built a giant donor file, which he earlier this year took with him to head up fundraising for the Clinton 2016 campaign. There's Katie Dowd, who raised \$100 million as Mrs. Clinton's new media director in 2008, then went to a Clinton PAC, then to the State Department, then to the foundation as a "tech adviser." She's now at Clinton 2016 as digital director.*

*Some operatives don't even bother feigning separation. Longtime aide Cheryl Mills served as general counsel to Mrs. Clinton's 2008 campaign, then worked at State. She then joined the board of directors of the foundation and remains on it still, even as she works on Clinton 2016. Nick Merrill, an aide to Mrs. Clinton at State, has continued on as her press liaison. Last year his name popped up on a news release as a contact person for the Clinton Foundation. Mr. Merrill will be a campaign spokesman for Clinton 2016. ...*

Great post from [Free Beacon](#) on the comedians who suck up to the president and the Clintons.

*... Stephen Colbert had on Hillary Clinton for a supposedly humorous name-dropping segment about her memoir *Hard Choices* last June that was so obsequious even the *Washington Post* called it "embarrassing." In the end, he told viewers to visit the show's website to purchase copies. Colbert, in his super-edgy fake conservative persona, also allowed Obama to take over hosting his show last December at George Washington University.*

*Colbert's a top-level satirist, and he's still letting the two top Democrats in the country use his show for their own interests? Gag.*

*NBC comedian Seth Meyers, in "A Closer Look" segment on *Late Night in April*, took it upon himself to identify the perceived biases of Clinton Cash author Peter Schweizer, while failing to reveal that he'd hosted the Clinton Global Citizen Awards last year. Ironically, Meyer felt Schweizer's conservative leanings and former work as a George W. Bush speechwriter helped debunk the findings of his book on pay-for-play allegations against Hillary Clinton at the State Department, findings that were followed up on by decidedly non-conservative outlets like the New York Times and ABC.*

*It added up to a decidedly weak attempt to be like John Oliver. ...*

**Kevin Williamson** on the proposed liberal gulag.

... *Sheldon Whitehouse* is a sitting United States senator, writing in the *Washington Post*, arguing for racketeering charges against those who hold heterodox opinions on global warming.

How about we ask the candidates what they think about this? Does Mrs. Clinton support the proposal to lock people up as mafiosi for seeking to publicize their views on political issues? Does Senator Sanders? Senator Warren?

Follow-up question: Which other unpopular political views should we be locking people in cages over?

---

---

---

**WSJ**

### **Harvard's Chinese Exclusion Act**

***An immigrant businessman explains his legal challenge to racial quotas that keep Asian-Americans out of elite colleges.***

by Kate Bachelder

*Orlando, Fla.* Getting into Harvard is tough enough: Every year come the stories about applicants who built toilets in developing countries, performed groundbreaking lunar research, or won national fencing competitions, whatever it takes to edge out the competition. So you can imagine that the 52-year-old Florida businessman and author Yukong Zhao is incensed that gaining admission may be even harder for his children—because of their race.

“It’s not a political issue,” he says. “It’s a civil-rights issue.”

Mr. Zhao helped organize 64 groups that last month asked the Education Department to investigate Harvard University for discriminating against Asian-Americans in admissions. The allegation is that Harvard is holding Asian-Americans to higher standards to keep them from growing as a percentage of the student body. The complaint, filed also with the Justice Department, follows a lawsuit against the university last fall by the nonprofit Students for Fair Admissions.

First, a few facts. Asian-Americans are the fastest-growing segment of the U.S. population, and the share of college-age Asian-Americans climbed to 5.1% in 2011 from 3% in 1990. Yet according to independent research cited in the complaint, members of this 5% make up roughly 30% of National Merit semifinalists, a distinction earned by high-school students based on PSAT scores. Asian-American students seem to win a similar share of the Education Department’s Presidential Scholar awards, “one of the nation’s highest honors for high-school students,” as the website puts it. By any standard, Asian-Americans have made remarkable gains since 1950. They constituted 0.2% of the U.S. population then, due in part to the legacy of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.

Harvard admissions do not reflect these changes or gains. The percentage of Asian-American students has held remarkably steady since the 1990s. This spring, 21% of the students admitted to Harvard were Asian-American; in 1993 it was about 20%. Harvard selects students based on criteria it calls “holistic,” taking into consideration subjective qualities such as, according to the university’s website, “interests,” “character” and “growth.”

Yet look how Harvard stacks up against schools that explicitly don't consider ethnicity in admissions. At the California Institute of Technology, the share of Asian-American students hit 42.5% in 2013—double Harvard's and a big jump from Caltech's 26% in 1993. At the University of California-Berkeley it is more than 30%; the state's voters banned the state schools from using racial preferences in a 1996 referendum. The trend is also observable at elite high schools with race-neutral admissions: New York City's Hunter College High School was 49% Asian-American in 2013.

This disparity suggests “a de facto quota system” at Harvard, Mr. Zhao tells me over dinner at a restaurant near his home in Orlando, where he works for a large energy company. Racial quotas aren't allowed thanks to a 1978 Supreme Court ruling, but in 2003 the court confirmed that colleges could use race as a “plus” factor.

If it were to look, the Education Department wouldn't find a mass email to Harvard staff with a projected pie chart for admissions based on race. But the quota-like rigidity is hard to miss: On average, roughly 10% of admitted Harvard students are African-American, 12% Hispanic, 2% Native American and 19% Asian-American, numbers that have barely budged in nearly a decade.

Yet no other racial or ethnic group is as underrepresented relative to its application numbers as are Asian-Americans, the complaint says, citing research from UCLA law professor Richard Sander released last year. Mr. Zhao and the coalition filed the complaint against Harvard specifically after Students for Fair Admissions detailed discriminatory practices last fall in its lawsuit (which is still under way). Yet the story seems the same at other elite schools: 16% of Yale's student body in 2013 was Asian-American, 17% at Princeton, 18% at Penn. Again, little variation from year-to-year.

How much harder is it for an Asian-American applicant? Mr. Zhao and the complaint cite 2009 research by Princeton sociologist Thomas Espenshade that found an Asian-American student must earn an SAT score 140 points higher than a white student, 270 points higher than a Hispanic and 450 points higher than an African-American, all else being equal. So if a white applicant scored 2160 on the SAT—lower than last year's Harvard average—an Asian-American would need to hit 2300, well into the 99% percentile, to have an equal chance at getting in.

Harvard denies the allegations. The university's general counsel, Robert Iuliano, said in a statement last month that the admissions policies comply with the law. “The college,” he said, “considers each applicant through an individualized, holistic review having the goal of creating a vibrant academic community that exposes students to a wide range of differences: background, ideas, experiences, talents and aspirations.”

High marks to Mr. Iuliano for working in so many diversity buzzwords, but Mr. Zhao has a rejoinder. “OK, if you don't have any discrimination, please open your admission books,” he says. “Let us see them.”

The university has reason to feel confident: In 1988 the Education Department investigated Harvard for engaging in the same kind of discrimination against Asian-Americans. Two years later bureaucrats produced a report blaming preferences for the offspring of Harvard alumni, or “legacy” admissions. Such policies were used to discriminate against Jewish applicants in the early 20th century, but never mind—nothing to see here. The report was filed away.

Still, there is no doubt that Asian-Americans face disadvantages. The test-preparation company Princeton Review's book "Cracking College Admissions" devotes a section to ethnic background. Here is some of the advice for Asian-Americans: "If you're given an option, don't attach a photograph to your application and don't answer the optional question about your ethnic background." The book offers tips for avoiding "being an Asian Joe Bloggs," a stereotypical candidate with "a very high math SAT score, a low or mediocre verbal SAT score," or, for instance, few extracurricular activities.

Mr. Zhao runs through other stereotypes that he says are used against Asian-Americans, such as their strength in science, technology, engineering or math. "Right now we have huge gaps in STEM education, and actually in this area a lot of Asian-American kids perform really well. But when they apply to elite colleges, their strength becomes a weakness." He notes that Albert Einstein was a quiet, violin-playing math whiz: "Einstein would not be admitted to Harvard today." Unless the violin added to his holistic appeal.

Another stereotype is that Asian-Americans aren't risk-takers or leaders: "A Chinese restaurant run by Chinese-Americans, or a gas station run by Indian-Americans—all need leadership, all need risk-taking," Mr. Zhao points out. "The great number we uncovered is that, between 2006 and 2012, 42% of technology startups were founded by Asian-Americans," he says, citing a study by the nonprofit Kauffman Foundation.

One reason colleges can get away with blatant bias, Mr. Zhao says, is because Asian-Americans "are not politically active, in terms of voting, in speaking out." When Mr. Zhao came to the U.S. from China in 1992, he needed an employer to sponsor his visa and didn't have the right to vote, as he wasn't a citizen. That, he says, is the story of many Asian-Americans. Only now are many becoming more involved, particularly as they sense that their children face racial barriers. Not coincidentally, Mr. Zhao's two children are in high school.

"Our children have to study much harder," Mr. Zhao said late last month at a news conference. For young Asian-Americans, the perception that they must strive more than others only intensifies the competition for college admission. Then come the complaints from colleges that Asian-Americans focus too much on academics, and the cycle goes on. Mr. Zhao thinks this punishes Asian-American cultures for emphasizing education in rearing children: "We never ask for 'more' than others. We just want fair treatment."

Mr. Zhao also notes that this is the only process that allows such blatantly racial considerations. Imagine an employer looking to fill a position: "You are not supposed to consider their race—everything is based on how well they fit with the job." Yet colleges ask applicants to list a race, attach a photo, give detailed family history, and often interview in person.

A charge leveled against dissenters like Mr. Zhao is that they don't care about the disadvantaged, those who have to struggle to make it to campus. "We care deeply about the poor," he replies, several times. This isn't an abstraction for him: "My father was persecuted during the Cultural Revolution," he says, when Mao Zedong ruled China. Food rationing in his childhood at times permitted him a pound of meat a month.

More broadly, Mr. Zhao says, it is time to change a college-admissions system that is too subjective. "I think the college's number one job should be educating students to build this country. Then, secondly, to reach diversity, to whatever extent possible." He adds: "College is not a theater," not a place where students are being cast to fill a specific role.

Harvard's understanding of diversity actually takes a narrow view of the concept: About 60% of the world's population lives in Asia, and Mr. Zhao mentions that the complaint includes groups representing Pakistanis, Indians and other cultures, all of whom are unfairly lumped together as a "monolithic block." These are people from richly diverse ethnic, religious, economic backgrounds. And even when applicants look similar on a college application: "People who have the same background can innovate on different things," he argues. They shouldn't be punished for having similar skills—for instance, science aptitude.

Will the Education and Justice departments intervene? Not clear. Justice seems more concerned with cracking down on international soccer lords and busting the movie-theater cartel than helping a group of minority students. "We're going to keep putting pressure," Mr. Zhao says, noting that the groups may lodge complaints against other Ivy League schools if no action is taken. His cause did get a political victory in California last year, when Asian-American lawmakers beat back an attempt to reinstate racial preferences within the state's college system.

Mr. Zhao's motivation is simple, and he says it is why he came to America: "If we lose the equal-opportunity principle, how can we continue to convince parents from all over the world to come to this country?"

*Ms. Bachelder is an assistant editorial features editor at the Journal.*

## Examiner

### Colleges and universities have grown bloated and dysfunctional

by Michael Barone

American colleges and universities, long thought to be the glory of the nation, are in more than a little trouble. [I've written before](#) of their shameful practices — the racial quotas and preferences at selective schools (Harvard is being sued by Asian-American organizations), the kangaroo courts that try students accused of rape and sexual assault without legal representation or presumption of innocence, and speech codes that make campuses the least rather than the most free venues in American society.

In following these policies, the burgeoning phalanxes of university and college administrators must systematically lie, insisting against all the evidence that they are racially nondiscriminatory, devoted to due process and upholders of free speech. The resulting intellectual corruption would have been understood by George Orwell.

Alas, even the great strengths of our colleges and universities are threatening to become weaknesses. Sometimes you can get too much of a good thing.

American colleges, dating back to Harvard's founding in 1636, have been modeled on the residential colleges of Oxford and Cambridge. The idea is that students live on or near (sometimes breathtakingly beautiful) campuses, where they can learn from and interact with inspired teachers.

American graduate universities, dating back to Johns Hopkins's founding in 1876, have been built on the German professional model. Students are taught by scholars whose Ph.D. theses represent original scholarship, expanding the frontiers of knowledge and learning.

That model still works very well in math and the hard sciences. In these disciplines it's rightly claimed that American universities are, as *The Economist* recently put it in a cover story, "the gold standard" of the world. But not so much in some of the mushier social sciences and humanities. "Just as the American model is spreading around the world," *The Economist* goes on, "it is struggling at home."

Consider the Oxford/Cambridge residential college model. Up through the 1960s, colleges administrators acted in loco parentis, with responsibilities similar to those of parents. Men's and women's dorms were separate and mostly off-limits to the other sex; drinking and drug use were limited; cars were often banned.

The assumption is that 18- to 21-year-old students were in important respects still children. The 1960s changed all that. Students were regarded as entitled to adult freedoms: unisex dorms and bathrooms, binge drinking, a hookup culture.

But now the assumption is that adult-aged students must be coddled like children. They are provided with cadres of counselors, so-called "trigger warnings" against supposedly disturbing course material and kangaroo courts to minutely regulate their sexual behavior.

Most colleges and universities abroad and many in this country (notably for-profit and on-line) don't use the residential model. Students live with parents or double up in cheap apartments and — horrors! — commute, like most employed adults.

The residential college model, with its bloated ranks of coddler/administrators, has become hugely expensive and increasingly dysfunctional. It's overdue for significant downsizing.

The Ph.D. university model is also metastasizing. A plethora of humanities and social science Ph.D. theses are produced every year, many if not most written in unreadable academic jargon and devoid of scholarly worth. Most will probably be read by only a handful of people, with no loss to society. But some worthy scholarship will be overlooked and go unappreciated.

A glut of Ph.D.s and an ever-increasing army of administrators have produced downward pressure on faculty pay. Universities increasingly hire Ph.D.s as underpaid adjuncts, with low wages and no job security.

The last half-century has seen a huge increase in the percentage of Americans who go to college and a huge increase in government aid to them. The assumption was that if college is good for some, it's good for everyone. But not everyone is suited for college: witness the increasing ranks of debt-laden nongraduates.

And the huge tranches of government money have been largely mopped up by the ever-increasing cadres of administrators. Do students get their money's worth from the masses of counselors, facilitators, liaisons and coordinators their student loans pay for? Or would they be better off paying for such services only as needed, as most other adults do?

As [Glenn Reynolds](#) of instapundit.com has written convincingly, the higher education bubble is now bursting. Colleges are closing, college applications and graduate program enrollments are declining, universities are facing lawsuits challenging the verdicts of their kangaroo courts.

Naturally administrators seek more money. But the money pumped into these institutions is more the problem than the solution.

## **NY Daily News - Editorial** **Thought crimes on campus**

Madness has been unleashed on college campuses — not by drunken frat boys but by the White House.

A wildly mishandled Obama administration campaign to combat student sexual assaults has morphed under a federal gender-equality law into a nightmarish weapon against free speech and academic freedom.

The statute, called Title IX, obligates colleges to act on sexually related complaints to protect students from a hostile environment. But enforcement now encompasses any member of a college community deemed by an accuser to have prompted discomfort in connection with his or her sex.

As Northwestern University film professor Laura Kipnis discovered, that includes writing or saying the wrong thing. Defying a gag order, she has gone public with a hair-raising account of being accused under Title IX after writing an article about Northwestern's recent ban on sexual relations between faculty and students.

Kipnis had criticized the ban for casting professors as all-powerful predators and female students as helpless damsels, thus denying students experience navigating the complex realities of sex.

Soon Northwestern's administration informed Kipnis that two students had initiated Title IX proceedings. The accusers were unnamed; the charges, unspecified.

Kipnis would be told no more, the university's Title IX coordinator told her, until she met with investigators for questioning. Only when she insisted on hearing the charges before answering questions did an outside law firm reveal them.

Both came from grad students. One charged that the article had a "chilling effect" on students' ability to report sexual misconduct. The other came from a student whose entanglement with a Northwestern professor got a mention in Kipnis' article.

Mercifully, Northwestern cleared Kipnis shortly after she published her embarrassing account. But the threat remains for faculty everywhere, whose words now put them at professional risk.

The fault is not with Northwestern, which is bound by law to pursue every complaint, but with federal regulators who wrongly saw in Title IX their key to a social revolution.

This insanity must stop.

**Huffington Post**

**Academic Freedom Under Siege**

by Goeffery R. Stone

Six weeks ago, Northwestern University President Morton Schapiro wrote a fine op-ed in the *Wall Street Journal* in which he offered a ringing endorsement of academic freedom. As he observed, a university must have "a compelling reason to punish anyone -- student, faculty member, staff member -- for expressing his or her views, regardless of how repugnant you might find those views." Indeed, he added, "freedom of speech doesn't amount to much unless it is tested," and if freedom of speech isn't aggressively protected "on college campuses, where self-expression is so deeply valued, why expect it to matter elsewhere?"

It is therefore both surprising and disappointing that Northwestern University recently found itself embroiled in two embarrassing violations of the core principles of academic freedom. Sadly, a university that should be a national leader in promoting and protecting these values allowed itself to lose sight of its very reason for being.

The first of these controversies began a little over a year ago. *Atrium* is a journal published by Northwestern University's Medical Humanities and Bioethics Program. Each issue focuses on a different theme, and each contributor is expected to explore the theme "in different, thought-provoking ways." The [Winter 2014 issue](#) of *Atrium*, which was edited by Professor Alice Dreger, included a series of lively articles on the theme of "Bad Girls."

One of the articles, written by William Peace, then the 2014 Jeannette K. Watson Distinguished Visiting Professor in the Humanities at Syracuse University, was titled "Head Nurses." In this essay, Peace, who is disabled, told the story of how 36 years earlier a young woman nurse, with whom he had grown close, provided oral sex to him during rehabilitation in order to address his deep concerns that, after a severe health problem left him paralyzed, he could no longer be sexually active.

Apparently, Peace's essay, which was written and edited in a responsible, mature, and thoughtful manner, so upset the authorities at Northwestern University's Feinberg School of Medicine that they ordered the story removed from the online version of *Atrium*. This act of blatant censorship, in direct contravention of any plausible understanding of academic freedom, remained in place for fourteen months, over the continued objections of Peace and Dreger.

Northwestern finally reversed course only after Peace and Dreger made clear that they would take the matter public if the university did not relent. Presumably, the university's concern was that the inclusion of such an "offensive" article in *Atrium* might put off some of the university's donors and the hospital's patrons, either because of its acknowledgement of oral sex or because it might be construed as demeaning to women. Neither concern is a justification for censorship. The journal, the issue, and the essay were all squarely within the bounds of academic freedom, and Northwestern University should have stood proudly in support of that principle.

As Bill Peace later noted, "obviously, sexual relations between patients and health care professionals is inappropriate," but "what I object to even more" are those "who are dedicated to branding medical institutions by censoring legitimate scholarship and attempting to erase the lives and experiences that they deem embarrassing."

The second controversy began several months ago when Northwestern University professor Laura Kipnis wrote [a piece](#) in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in which she raised important questions about the regulation of student-faculty relationships, the meaning of consent, the procedural irregularities that frequently taint the efforts of colleges and universities to address such issues, and the messy and destructive lawsuits that often follow.

Kipnis' article is a serious, provocative, and valuable contribution to the ongoing debate about these often difficult and vexing issues. Among other things, Kipnis charged that some of the recently enacted campus codes dealing with such matters have had the effect of infantilizing women students. This, she reasoned, is not a good thing.

In response to this essay, several students at Northwestern staged a protest demanding "a swift, official condemnation" of the article because they had been made to feel uncomfortable by her thoughts on the subject. One woman student went so far as to describe the essay as "terrifying." Shortly thereafter, a women student who had filed sexual assault charges against a professor at Northwestern filed a Title IX (sex discrimination/sexual harassment) complaint against Kipnis because of the publication.

As Kipnis traces in a powerful new [article](#) published this week in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, for the past several months she has been subjected to a star-chamber proceeding in which outside investigators retained by Northwestern University have sought to determine whether her initial essay somehow constituted unlawful retaliation, "intimidation, threats, coercion, or discrimination" against the student who had previously filed the sexual assault charge against the faculty member at Northwestern.

As anyone who has read Kipnis' initial article can discern, the accusation is ludicrous on its face. An essay that takes aim at the substantive values and procedures employed by universities in their efforts to regulate sexual relationships on campus is not, and cannot rationally be taken to be, an act of discrimination, retaliation, or harassment directed against any particular student who may have filed such a complaint.

What Northwestern should have done in the face of such a complaint was to dismiss it as quickly and decisively as possible and to reaffirm the fundamental right of members of the university community to write, speak, argue, and complain openly and vigorously about matters of public concern. Instead, Northwestern put Kipnis through months of "investigation" for doing nothing more than writing an interesting and provocative article in a journal of considerable repute.

It was only after Kipnis went public in her second article this week that Northwestern finally informed her that the charges against her were unfounded. As evidenced in both of these situations, it seems, not surprisingly, that the best way to get universities to stand up for academic freedom is to call them out publicly on their lack of commitment to the principles for which they are supposed to stand.

In fairness, I have to say that, at least in the Kipnis incident, this is not all Northwestern's fault. The Department of Education has run roughshod over colleges and universities in recent years by demanding, on pain of loss of federal funds, that these institutions take extreme measures, often inconsistent with basic notions of due process, to deal with complaints of sexual abuse. But this is not much of an excuse, because the Kipnis case was not an instance in which she was accused of sexually abusing anyone. She was accused, rather, of writing an article that upset some students. Turning that into a federal case is beyond the pale.

Northwestern, and other universities, must have the courage to live up to President Schapiro's ringing declaration that a university must have "a compelling reason to punish anyone -- student, faculty member, staff member -- for expressing his or her views, regardless of how repugnant you might find those views." That is, after all, what makes a university a university.

**WSJ**

## **The Clinton 'Charity' Begins at Home**

***Employment rolls for the Clinton Foundation show scads of political operatives—but this doesn't seem to bother the IRS.***

by Kimberley A. Strassel

The scandal of the century at the IRS was that agency's secret targeting of conservative nonprofits. Perhaps a close second is the scandal of what the IRS *hasn't* been investigating: the Clinton Foundation.

The media's focus is on Hillary Clinton's time as secretary of state, and whether she took official actions to benefit her family's global charity. But the mistake is starting from the premise that the Clinton Foundation is a "charity." What's clear by now is that this family enterprise was set up as a global shakedown operation, designed to finance and nurture the Clintons' continued political ambitions. It's a Hillary super PAC that throws in the occasional good deed.

That much is made obvious by looking at the foundation's employment rolls. Most charities are staffed by folks who have spent a lifetime in nonprofits, writing grants or doing overseas field work. The Clinton Foundation is staffed by political operatives. It has been basically a parking lot for Clinton campaign workers—a comfy place to draw a big check as they geared up for Hillary's presidential run.

The revolving door is spinning quickly these days. There's Dennis Cheng, a finance director for Mrs. Clinton's 2008 bid, who went to the Clinton Foundation as its chief development officer. There he built a giant donor file, which he earlier this year took with him to head up fundraising for the Clinton 2016 campaign. There's Katie Dowd, who raised \$100 million as Mrs. Clinton's new media director in 2008, then went to a Clinton PAC, then to the State Department, then to the foundation as a "tech adviser." She's now at Clinton 2016 as digital director.

Some operatives don't even bother feigning separation. Longtime aide Cheryl Mills served as general counsel to Mrs. Clinton's 2008 campaign, then worked at State. She then joined the board of directors of the foundation and remains on it still, even as she works on Clinton 2016. Nick Merrill, an aide to Mrs. Clinton at State, has continued on as her press liaison. Last year his name popped up on a news release as a contact person for the Clinton Foundation. Mr. Merrill will be a campaign spokesman for Clinton 2016.

Maura Pally was until recently the acting CEO of the Clinton Foundation. Her training for this important job was working as a lawyer in the Clinton White House, as a counsel to Hillary 2008, and in cultural affairs at the State Department. Valerie Alexander is the foundation's chief marketing officer, and the woman responsible for turning the outfit into a Clinton PR machine. She worked as a senior communications adviser for Hillary 2008.

Amitabh Desai is the foundation's foreign policy director. He was a legislative aide to Sen. Hillary Clinton. Craig Minassian is the foundation's chief communications officer. He worked on

Hillary 2008. Ira Magaziner is CEO of the Clinton Health Care Access Initiative. He is one of the Clintons' oldest advisers. Bari Lurie, chief of staff to Chelsea Clinton, worked on Hillary's Senate campaign and her 2008 run, and for her PAC. Erika Gudmundson is the foundation's deputy director of communications initiatives. She was a press aide for Hillary 2008. You get the point.

The question isn't how or whether these folks will help with Clinton 2016, but when and in what capacity. Ditto more than a dozen other staffers at the foundation who lack long histories with Clinton but who came straight out of politics—either working for the Democratic National Committee, other politicians or super PACS.

The other question is how many more operatives are cashing foundation checks that we don't know about—as “consultants” for the group. We now know longtime Clinton pal Sid Blumenthal drew \$10,000 a month. For what?

Then there's Mrs. Clinton's longtime aide, Huma Abedin, who worked as traveling chief of staff during the 2008 campaign, then went to State. There she was granted a special arrangement to continue earning money as a private-sector consultant. Among those she consulted for? The Clinton Foundation. Ms. Abedin has transitioned back as vice chairman of Mrs. Clinton 2016 campaign. There are surely more.

This is typically Clinton, which means it is typically on the edge of legal. The foundation operates as a nonprofit, raising hundreds of millions as a “charity.” We know from foundation tax filings that it spends an extraordinary portion of its funds on travel and staff. How many donors are unaware that their money is going to keep Clinton friends in full employment? How many are aware and give precisely for that reason—to help elect a new president, one who will gratefully remember their help?

Lucky for the Clintons, nobody looks. As a charity (and unlike a super PAC), the foundation is subject to almost no oversight. The IRS in the past has stripped charities of their tax-exempt status when they are shown to be operating for a purpose other than benevolence. The agency has shown no real interest in the Clinton Foundation. Go figure.

Clinton allies are insisting to all who listen that the foundation exists to do good. It does. It exists to do very good things for Hillary and Bill and all their longtime allies. And in that, it has succeeded beautifully.

## **Free Beacon**

### **[Chickens: Today's Comedians Suck Up to Obama, Clinton and the Democrats](#)**

by David Rutz

Last March, President Obama [appeared on the online show \*Between Two Ferns\*](#), Zach Galifianakis' satirical program that sends up the usual gush-fest celebrity interview. Galifianakis normally asks his famous guest a series of uncomfortable questions and makes a fool out of him or her, [like in this edition with Brad Pitt](#) where he alludes to his infamous split with Jennifer Aniston.

It's usually pretty funny.

But Obama was the guest, there was a government health care program to sell, and the script was flipped, with Obama being the comedic aggressor instead in the scripted segment. It was, quite frankly, comedy malpractice. But for Galifianakis and a website that now [spends half its time producing subpar political](#) “comedy,” it was a way to do the Obama administration’s bidding. [Sonny Bunch wrote at the time](#):

The Obama interview, however, was just dreadful. After a few semi-unbearable moments during which the president shows he doesn’t at all understand the point of the show—the guest is not supposed to get in good zingers; he’s supposed to be taken down a peg—there’s an utterly unbearable moment during which he hawks the failed social experiment that is HealthCare.gov. It’s just gross.

Nothing screams “brave, edgy comedy!” like “I’m here to let The Man sell you on health insurance!”

It hardly stops there in modern comedy. Truly mocking people in power seems to be a thing of the past, so long as they’ve got a D by their name. This is not in any way shocking, as the creative class is decidedly liberal, but it’s a bit jarring that their commitment to politics constantly seems to trump their commitment to laughs.

Stephen Colbert had on Hillary Clinton for a supposedly humorous name-dropping segment about her memoir *Hard Choices* last June that was so obsequious [even the Washington Post](#) called it “embarrassing.” In the end, he told viewers to visit the show’s website to purchase copies. Colbert, in his super-edgy fake conservative persona, [also allowed Obama to take over hosting his show](#) last December at George Washington University.

Colbert’s a top-level satirist, and he’s still letting the two top Democrats in the country use his show for their own interests? Gag.

NBC comedian Seth Meyers, in “A Closer Look” [segment on Late Night in April](#), took it upon himself to identify the perceived biases of *Clinton Cash* author Peter Schweizer, [while failing to reveal](#) that he’d hosted the Clinton Global Citizen Awards last year. Ironically, Meyer felt Schweizer’s conservative leanings and former work as a George W. Bush speechwriter helped debunk the findings of his book on pay-for-play allegations against Hillary Clinton at the State Department, findings that were followed up on by decidedly non-conservative outlets like the [New York Times](#) and [ABC](#).

It added up to a decidedly weak attempt to be like John Oliver.

*Saturday Night Live*’s Cecily Strong was the featured comedian at the 2015 White House Correspondents Dinner, and the slate of 2016 candidates was a hot topic for parody. She hit Clinton for her private email server at the State Department, but she couldn’t help but show her political colors later.

“There are so many great people who’ve already announced they’re running for president,” Strong said. “It’s like, who I should even vote for? Hillary,” saying the last word under her breath for effect.

“There’s Marco Rubio,” she said. “It’s like, who’s better than Marco Rubio? Hillary. And there’s Rand Paul. I mean, who’s more knowledgeable about foreign policy than Rand Paul? Hillary.”

Scathing.

Before her appearance, Strong [talked with MSNBC's Ronan Farrow](#) about the courage of Colbert's WHCD routine in 2006, when he absolutely roasted President Bush sitting a few feet away. ([This remains one](#) of the greatest things [liberals have ever experienced](#) to this day). Strong [also mentioned](#) how "cool" President Obama was, with Farrow agreeing enthusiastically.

Contrast that to 2009, when newly elected President Obama was treated to a routine by Wanda Sykes declaring, "It's hard to poke fun at the president, because he's so likable ... People love you!"

Fellow SNL [cast member Kate McKinnon](#), who has hilariously portrayed Clinton in 2015 as a slightly maniacal, un-hip, power-hungry bundle of nerves, [told a roundtable of female comedians hosted by the Hollywood Reporter](#) that she's "rooting for her, obviously." She added she finds Clinton "resplendent."

Very committed Democrat Lena Dunham chimed in, "I believe you can make it funny while also not compromising our race."

That, in the end, is what humor appears to be about nowadays.

## National Review

### [The Liberal Gulag, Revisited](#)

By Kevin D. Williamson

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse, a Democrat from Rhode Island, has a big idea: launching [organized-crime investigations under RICO](#) against people and institutions that disagree with him about global warming.

Some time ago, I wrote about [Democrats' calls to imprison people](#) for holding the wrong views on global warming. The response at the time was predictable: "Oh, that's just some nobody at *Gawker* – you can't tar the Left and the Democrats with the loony opinions of that one guy!" And then it was Robert Kennedy Jr., speaking at a very large global-warming rally, purportedly the largest event of its kind ever. "Oh, that's just daft old Robert Kennedy Jr., he has all kinds of weird views!" Etc.

Never mind that Harry Reid, joined by every single Democrat in the Senate, was at that time voting to repeal the First Amendment in order to bring the federal police power to bear against political critics who spoke without their permission.

Just a few fringe elements, right?

Sheldon Whitehouse is a sitting United States senator, writing in the *Washington Post*, arguing for racketeering charges against those who hold heterodox opinions on global warming.

How about we ask the candidates what they think about this? Does Mrs. Clinton support the proposal to lock people up as mafiosi for seeking to publicize their views on political issues? Does Senator Sanders? Senator Warren?

Follow-up question: Which other unpopular political views should we be locking people in cages over?

**THERE ARE TWO KINDS OF COUNTRIES**



**THOSE WHO USE THE METRIC SYSTEM, AND THOSE WHO HAVE LANDED ON THE MOON**

RED WINE MAKES THEM LIVE LONGER,  
BUT THEY GET TO BE A REAL PAIN.



IT HAS  
A TIMID NOSE  
WITH THE  
USUAL NOTES  
OF OAK  
AND VANILLA.

I CAN'T  
BELIEVE  
YOU'RE  
DRINKING  
MERLOT.

**RIDING INVISIBLE HORSES**



**BEFORE IT WAS COOL**

