

North Carolinians and Allies Fight the Politicization and Racialization of Education
A prequel to the June 2023 victory of Students for Fair Admissions v. University of North Carolina

Stuart H. Hurlbert

[It] is neither race nor racism that bedevils American society, but rather that racial classification enjoys a privileged status in social studies. American society is being tied in painful knots by virtue of legislative, social scientific, and media practices of racially classifying persons... This official racial classification was never benign. The collection of occupational data by race in 1890 coincided with the imposition of jim crowism. Contemporarily, racial classification serves various Republican and Democratic electoral interests. The creation and manipulation of "blacks" and "whites" are long standing practices.... Social scientists, legislators, entrepreneurs and publicists use racial classification to generate a racial ethos that is then claimed to be the basis of their practices ... official racial classification and studies of racial experiences do nothing but render social problems insoluble. Racial solutions, such as busing, affirmative action, black power, and multiculturalism, are bound to fail, because they heighten the very racial awareness that is said to have led to "racial problems" in the first place.

-- Yehudi O. Webster, [The Racialization of America](#), St. Martins Press, New York, 1993

"Politicians like to say that diversity is our greatest strength," said Ron Wakabayashi, director of the Los Angeles County Commission on Human Relations. "That is b.s. Diversity simply is. The core question is: How do we extract its assets while minimizing its liabilities?"

-- Michael A. Fletcher, [Washington Post](#), April 7, 1998

INTRODUCTION

We are again in the process of a great national awakening. This was powerfully memorialized by the June 29, 2023 [findings by the U.S. Supreme Court](#) that use of racial preferences in student admissions by Harvard University and the University of North Carolina has been unconstitutional. It was amazing to see how quickly anger in some quarters rose to oppose two Supreme Court decisions that amount to nothing more than affirmation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution's 14th amendment and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The present document is a somewhat eclectic compilation of excerpts from 170 documents the diversity of which preclude an executive summary. These include news articles, op eds, books, speeches, letters, conference summaries, panel discussions, policy statements and legislation relating to race preferences in student admissions and faculty hiring and to the racialization and politicization of universities and societal institutions generally. The excerpts are given, unannotated, in chronological order of publication. Topics include diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) bureaucracies, critical race theory and doctrines and institutional practices based on it, racial discrimination, racial categorization, civil rights, academic freedom, cancel culture, censorship, and use of political litmus tests in the hiring of faculty and administrators and in student admissions.

With two exceptions, the excerpted items are from the period January 2020 - June 2023, a time when the Students for Fair Admissions lawsuits against Harvard and North Carolina were being heard and deliberated by the Supreme Court and getting intense public debate. Many items are by North Carolinians and/or about North Carolina public universities where there have been intense discussions

of race preferences among trustees, administrators, legislators, professors and students during this period. But all the articles should be of special interest to North Carolinians and others wanting a glimpse of the national context in which these issues have been recently debated.

The two exceptions concern visits to North Carolina a quarter century ago by legendary warrior from the West, University of California regent Ward Connerly. The first is an article about his December 1997 visit to North Carolina where he gave a talk at the John Locke Foundation and another at UNC-Chapel Hill. The NC legislature had recently failed to pass an anti-preferences bill modeled on California's Civil Rights Initiative, and UNC president Molly Broad had mandated a review of affirmative action policies throughout the UNC system.

The second exception is an article about Connerly's June 2002 visit to Raleigh where he described the Racial Privacy Initiative that had just qualified to appear on the ballot in California in 2003 or 2004. This would have prevented California state and local governments and public institutions from requiring people to specify their race on government forms of any sort. In the end, it was not approved by voters, but it remains today very much on a national "backburner".

This compilation is effectively a 'prequel' to new discussions on how to bring all of education in the U.S. into conformity with newly clarified law and how to make progress on all manner of related issues. Even persons new to the issues can quickly get up to speed with this one package of pre-decision literature. Its primary intended audience is the general public, not just the experts and activists already familiar with it. Groups of all sorts wishing to have productive and coherent discussions of the complex topics covered here might consider requesting their members first familiarize themselves with this compilation. That will provide a common information base and not be an onerous assignment. And individuals will often be stimulated to reading many articles in their entirety.

Collectively the articles excerpted have a bias favoring the deracialization and depoliticization of universities, especially their central administrations and faculty senates, but also of K-12 school systems and society generally. But there are a few articles by administrators who favor the status quo.

Reconstructing policy statements and support systems for students, faculty and staff without use of the deliberately ambiguous and much-abused labels of diversity, equity and inclusion will be necessary. These labels have no clear meaning in law or in general discourse. They have disparate meanings when used by different people and organizations. In many political contexts they serve as code for divisive, unethical and even illegal policies and actions favoring political censorship and discrimination based on race or sex. The jargon makes it difficult for the general public in particular to understand what is going on in colleges and universities as well as in K-12 public school systems. And it does so deliberately.

Auspicious as these new supreme court decisions are, they are more a call to arms than a victory. Opponents addicted to racial categorization schemes adopted from the days of slavery are strong and ready for battle. A complete victory over government-imposed racialism is only a distant possibility. While classical liberals have the support of the Supreme Court and most of the electorate, racialists and censors dominate the 'progressive' leadership of most institutions in both public and private sectors.

Accelerated progress on these issues started in the early 1990s. Under the leadership of Ward Connerly and Gail Heriot, we passed in 1996 the California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI, Proposition 209). That did for California what the Supreme Court just did for North Carolina and Harvard: it eliminated 'diversity' as a legal pretext for racial discrimination. By 2012, [eight additional states](#) -- but not North Carolina though

its legislature tried -- had done the same. In 2020 the California state legislature put on the ballot an initiative ([Proposition 16](#)) that would have overturned the CCRI. That lost badly with only 43% of the vote, thanks to an expanded multiracial coalition, [Californians for Equal Rights](#), headed up by Ward Connerly, Gail Heriot and Wenyuan Wu. In 2023 the ever race-obsessed California legislature tried again to [water down the force of Proposition 209](#) and [then failed](#). With a 'blue' governor, a 'blue' supermajority legislature, and a homogeneously 'blue' educational establishment, attempting to enforce the original meaning and intent of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the U.S. Constitution and the CCRI-modified California Constitution has been a never-ending battle in 'progressive' California.

As a "purple" state, the different political dynamics of North Carolina will be interesting to follow. NC has the possibility becoming a model for the rest of the U.S. There is a large gap between the NC legislature on the one hand and the central administrations and faculty senates of different NC university campuses on the other as regards the desirability of race and sex preferences in student admissions and faculty and staff hiring. However, the majority opinion of the entire faculty, unfiltered by senate leadership, is never considered and never asked for. Perhaps there should be a confidential survey at each UNC campus of all faculty members as to whether they approve or disapprove of the recent Supreme Court decisions. If faculty senates decline to conduct the survey, boards of trustees might be willing to supervise such a process.

Such advisory polls would seem useful if there is genuine administration interest in 'campus climate' and representative 'shared governance.' There is a resurgent civil rights movement across the country aimed at reinforcing the letter and spirit of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, wider formal adoption by universities of strong principles on academic freedom, and less top-down imposition of values and policy. 'Purple' states like NC are well-positioned to play a positive role in the national reformation process. In California such faculty-wide polling couldn't be done without a struggle. Almost all university boards of trustees, central administrations and faculty senates in our solidly 'blue' state would oppose getting honest, uncensored faculty opinion. Universities often do surveys of 'campus climate'. Such surveys, however, never ask any questions that might expose *collective* faculty opinion on controversial issues or actions to be very different from that of the central administration. It would be an intolerable threat to the latter's power.

The substance of the compilation is too diverse to characterize briefly, but here are some key 2020 – 2023 North Carolina events among those covered by the articles excerpted:

- 1. February 2021.** Recent Davidson College graduate Kenny Xu founds a new national but North Carolina-based civil rights organization, Color Us United.
- 2. September 2021.** Passage by the NC legislature of House bill 324 under the leadership of North Carolina state senator Phil Berger. This would not prohibit teaching *about* any topic but would prohibit indoctrination by teachers and professors. Though the legislation reflected classical liberal values, not a single Democratic legislator voted for it, and Democratic governor Roy Cooper vetoed it.
- 3. December 2021.** Christopher Clemens was appointed provost of UNC-Chapel Hill by the UNC Board of Trustees. As senior Associate Dean for Research and Innovation he had been instrumental in creating an interdisciplinary Environment, Energy and Ecology program, the UNC Program for Public Discourse, and the School of Civic Life and Leadership among other accomplishments.

4. January 2023. UNC Chapel Hill trustees voted unanimously to establish a School of Civic Life and Leadership.

5. February 2023. Both the UNC system and North Carolina State University decided they would no longer require an employee or applicant for academic admission or employment to affirmatively ascribe to or opine about beliefs, affiliations, ideals, or principles regarding matters of contemporary political debate or social action as a condition to admission, employment, or professional advancement.

6. June 2023. Within 24 hours of the Supreme Court decisions the initial reactions of politicians, administrators, and professors in North Carolina and elsewhere presaged the deluge of both praise and criticism that has followed.

Many of the excerpted articles come from the work of scholars, journalists and activists in various civil rights and educational reform NGOs. These would include: James G. Martin Center for Academic Renewal, The College Fix, Californians for Equal Rights Foundation, Legal Insurrection, Color Us United, Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, National Association of Scholars, 1776 Unites, Foundation Against Intolerance and Racism, American Civil Rights Project, Minding the Campus, The Heritage Foundation, and Center for Equal Opportunity.

Black voices abound, some as contributions made independently, many others as participants in conferences such as those of 1776 Unites and the Old Parkland Conference (American Enterprise Institute) or as editors of and authors in the Journal of Free Black Thought. But many blacks will find just as edifying the presentations in recent white-dominated gatherings such as the Stanford Academic Freedom Conference. That seems an excellent sign.

This introduction and the bibliography consisting of 63 pages of excerpts are both given in a pdf [here](#).

Hurlbert is a professor of biology emeritus at San Diego State University and currently resides in Chapel Hill NC. Email: hurlbert@sdsu.edu

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[Connerly Speaks, Angry Students Protest](#), Randall Chase, WRAL News, Raleigh, December 2, 1997
"The man who helped to dismantle affirmative action policies in the country's largest university system said today that racial preferences go against the "self-evident" truth outlined in the Declaration of Independence - that all men are created equal. ... Ward Connerly told the conservative John Locke Foundation that Martin Luther King Jr. understood better than most what the Declaration of Independence meant and often quoted it in his speeches. ... in recent years, however, America lost track of King's vision, Connerly said. "Instead, we began to pursue that notion that, as Cornel West at Harvard says, race matters, and that you have to use race to get beyond race." "The 'race matters' philosophy is poisonous for all Americans, because once you start using it, you don't get beyond it," Connerly said. "It becomes part of everything you do. And there is no institution in American society that practices it more than the academy. Race seeps out of every pore of our colleges and universities." ... "If we can't embrace the notion that all of us will have equal rights as citizens, if we can justify or rationalize separate standards for our students to be admitted into college on the basis of skin color, then there's no hope for this democracy," he said. "It won't work. The system simply will not work." "Race has no place in American life or law," Connerly told students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, quoting the late President Kennedy. "That was supposed to be our guiding light as a nation." "At some point,

I believe we say, 'We're going to wipe the slate clean,' and we're going to say that today is the first day of the rest of our lives.... I am not going to hold anyone accountable for yesterday, last year, 300 years ago; I'm going to hold you accountable for today. Under our system, we don't blame the son for the sins of the father." Connerly's visit to North Carolina follows a decision by UNC President Molly Broad to call for a review of affirmative action policies on all 16 UNC campuses. Already, some scholarships for black students have been abolished, and some special programs have been integrated to comply with her directive that campuses get rid of policies that use race as the only factor in admissions, financial aid or scholarship decisions. ... Meanwhile, Tuesday, at a private reception for Connerly, Rep. Edwin Hardy, R-Beaufort, said he plans to refile his anti-affirmative action bill, "The Civil Rights Restoration Act" during the 1999 legislative session. The bill, modeled after Proposition 209, failed to pass the General Assembly this year."

[The Unheralded Heroics of Ward Connerly](#), Charles Davenport Jr., Greensboro News & Record, July 1, 2002 (updated January 25, 2015)

"Ward Connerly is a black man with a long history of civil disobedience. His career as a malcontent began on Aug. 17, 1962, when he married a white woman - a brazen violation of the era's segregationist laws. Forty years later, Connerly's taste for rebellion is as strong as ever. He is a radical, a revolutionary, and to those who walk the politically correct line on matters of race, a nightmare. But in the eyes of many, he is an American hero. California voters a few years ago overwhelmingly approved Proposition 209, an initiative spearheaded by Connerly to abolish racial preferences. Speaking in Raleigh last week, he unveiled a plan to overthrow the status quo once again: In November 2004, California voters will decide the fate of his Racial Privacy Initiative, a measure that would remove from government forms those "silly little boxes," one of which - Black, White, Asian, American Indian, etc. - every client of the Nanny State is obliged to check. (The latest census form boasted 63.). Ours is indeed a great nation, Connerly says, despite a few problems. For instance, there is nothing great about "giving people preferences, treating them unequally on the basis of the color of their skin." Because it violates the fundamental American principle of equality under the law, "the idiocy of race classifications" must be abandoned. Still, in his book, "Creating Equal: My Fight Against Race Preferences," Connerly writes that the United States "has given black people far more freedom and opportunity than they ever could have found in any African homeland, real or imagined." This is a fact that many professional civil rights agitators refuse to acknowledge. ... In his book, Connerly gleefully slaughters the sacred cow of "diversity," a term he adorns with sneering quotation marks. "The people who use this word define it in a very narrow way. For them, diversity means people who have dark skin or wear a pants suit and unquestioningly support their 'progressive' political agenda." The notion that we can't succeed without teachers and fellow students who "look like us," he writes, is "morally imbecilic." True diversity, he counters, resides within the individual's heart and soul. Either color-consciousness or colorblindness must prevail. Ward Connerly is one of the nation's most convincing champions of the latter. Although his ancestors were French Canadian, Choctaw, African and Irish, as far as the government is concerned, he is one thing only: black. Further complicating matters, two of Connerly's grandchildren have a mother who is half-Vietnamese. Last week he wondered aloud, "Which box should my grandkids check? None. There is nothing that is more anti-American, in my view, than asking them to check any of those damned boxes."

[Cynical Theories: How Activist Scholarship Made Everything about Race, Gender, and Identity -- and Why This Harms Everybody](#), Helen Pluckrose & James A. Lindsay, Pitchstone Publishing, 2020

"Have you heard that language is violence and that science is sexist? Have you read that certain people shouldn't practice yoga or cook Chinese food? Or been told that being obese is healthy, that there is no such thing as biological sex, or that only white people can be racist? Are you confused by these ideas,

and do you wonder how they have managed so quickly to challenge the very logic of Western society? In this probing and intrepid volume, Helen Pluckrose and James Lindsay document the evolution of the dogma that informs these ideas, from its coarse origins in French postmodernism to its refinement within activist academic fields. Today this dogma is recognizable as much by its effects, such as cancel culture and social-media dogpiles, as by its tenets, which are all too often embraced as axiomatic in mainstream media: knowledge is a social construct; science and reason are tools of oppression; all human interactions are sites of oppressive power play; and language is dangerous. As Pluckrose and Lindsay warn, the unchecked proliferation of these anti-Enlightenment beliefs presents a threat not only to liberal democracy but also to modernity itself.”

[Has Anti-Racism Become a New Religion?](#) (61min video), John McWhorter interviewed by Coleman Hughes, Conversations with Coleman, January 15, 2020

Most popular online comment: “Coleman, for a person your age to have already achieved such a level of knowledge, critical thinking skills, human understanding, empathy, and wisdom is truly impressive. If you continue to use your mind for learning, understanding, and explaining you will become one of the great thinkers of our age. You also present your ideas with levels of humility and empathy for the perspectives of others that can help bring Americans together at a time when other forces are tearing us apart. You are an inspiration! Please keep it up! *Karen Robinette.*”

[1776 Press Conference](#) (65min video), 1776 Unites, Robert Woodson, February 16, 2020

[A gathering convened to discuss the NY Times 1619 Project. Includes brief remarks by Glen Loury, Ian Rowe, Colman Cruz Hughes, Clarence Page, John Sibley Butler, Jason Hill, Carol Swain, Taleb Starkes, Wilfred X. Reilly, Latasha Harrison Fields & Toni McIlwain]

[Critical race theory's toxic, destructive impact on America.](#) Carol M. Swain, Washington Examiner, February 14, 2020

“Under the guise of a venture called the “[1619 Project](#),” the *New York Times* is introducing revisionist history about race in America into classrooms across the nation without the normal peer review expected of educational materials. The project began in August 2019 with [publication](#) of a collection of essays and artistic works to commemorate the 400-year anniversary of slavery in America. The project, a collaboration between the *New York Times Magazine* and the Pulitzer organization, has mushroomed into a movement to re-educate Americans with novel claims about how deeply racism is embedded at America’s core. As of February 2020, five public school systems [had adopted](#) the 1619 Project’s curriculum district-wide. Its free teaching materials had reached 3,500 classrooms. ... There is no way out for whites when it comes to race. Critical race theory assumes that racism is permanent and affects every aspect of society, including political, economic, social and religious institutions. The theory further advances the belief that being born with white skin, in itself, confers unearned privileges. Therefore, any societal attainment of colorblindness, in which race or ethnicity does not hinder opportunities, is impossible. Neutrality in law and decision-making is a pipe dream that can never be attained. Therefore, this mistaken reasoning goes, the oppressive system must be dismantled and destroyed.”

[Conformity to a Lie: Academia’s monolithic belief in systemic racism will further erode American institutions and the principles of our civilization,](#) Heather Mac Donald, City Journal, Summer 2020

“American campuses today are the most tolerant organizations in human history (at least toward official victim groups). The claim that colleges are hotbeds of discrimination is a fantasy. Every university twists itself into knots to admit, hire, and promote as many black students and faculty as it possibly can, in light of the fierce bidding war among colleges for underrepresented minorities. ... Each diversity initiative, whether in academia or in business, requires pretending that it was not preceded by a long line of

identical efforts. Instead, every new diversity campaign starts with penance for the alleged bias that leads schools and corporations to overlook some vast untapped pool of competitively qualified blacks and Hispanics. Now, the pressure to admit and hire on the basis of race will redouble in force, elevating even less skilled candidates to positions of power throughout society. American institutions will pay the price. What if the racism explanation for ongoing disparities is wrong, however? What if racial economic and incarceration gaps cannot close without addressing personal responsibility and family culture—without a sea change in the attitudes that many inner-city black children bring with them to school regarding studying, paying attention in class, and respecting teachers, for example? What if the breakdown of the family is producing children with too little capacity to control their impulses and defer gratification? With the university now explicitly committed to the racism explanation for all self-defeating choices, there will be little chance of changing course and addressing the behaviors that lie behind many racial disparities. The persistence of inequality will then produce a new round of quotas and self-incrimination—as well as more violence and anger. And the graduates of these ideologically monolithic universities will proceed further to dismantle our civilization in conformity to a lie.”

[The Legal Problem with Diversity Statements](#), Brian Leiter, Chronicle of Higher Education, March 13, 2020

“When Abigail Thompson, a mathematician at the University of California at Davis, wrote an opinion piece last fall in the *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* lamenting the use of mandatory diversity statements in job applications, comparing them to the loyalty oaths of the McCarthy era, it unleashed a torrent of commentary, both condemning and supporting her. Thompson, after praising other efforts to diversify the mathematics profession, wrote: *In 1950 the Regents of the University of California required all UC faculty to sign a statement asserting that “I am not a member of, nor do I support any party or organization that believes in, advocates, or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government, by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional means, that I am not a member of the Communist Party.” Eventually 31 faculty members were fired over their refusal to sign ... Faculty at universities across the country are facing an echo of the loyalty oath, a mandatory “Diversity Statement” for job applicants. The professed purpose is to identify candidates who have the skills and experience to advance institutional diversity and equity goals. In reality it’s a political test, and it’s a political test with teeth.* The teeth derive from the fact that some universities and departments are using scores on the diversity statement to make the first cuts in faculty searches. That would not be objectionable if it were only a device for weeding out candidates unwilling to work with a diverse student body: The ability to do so obviously goes to the core of a faculty member’s professional duties. The problem is that the new diversity statements go well beyond that, requiring candidates to profess allegiance to a controversial set of moral and political views that have little or no relationship to a faculty member’s pedagogical and scholarly duties.”

[Nikole Hannah-Jones Endorses Riots and Toppling Statues as A Product of the 1619 Project](#), Allison Schuster, The Federalist, June 20, 2020

“Nikole Hannah-Jones, staff writer at The New York Times and lead essayist in The New York Times Magazine’s 1619 Project, just endorsed the nationwide destruction of statues as a product of her historically inaccurate work. The 1619 Project debuted in 2019 on the 400th anniversary of the arrival of African-Americans in the United States as slaves, as an ongoing look into the history of U.S. slavery. Although the project has been taught in schools and applauded by elites, even winning Hannah-Jones a Pulitzer Prize this May despite having to issue major corrections, the project’s influence truly revealed itself in the recent removal of historical symbols in nearly every major city across the U.S. Claremont’s Charles Kesler wrote a column in The New York Post Friday, titled “Call them the 1619 riots,” blaming the indignation and utter lack of regard for the nation’s greatest men on the misinformation stemming

from The 1619 Project. Hannah-Jones responded to the article on twitter saying she would be honored to claim responsibility for the defamation of American heroes and Founding Fathers such as George Washington.”

[Scheming to Revive Racial Preferences in California](#), Gail Heriot, Minding the Campus, June 23, 2020
“California’s deep-blue legislature has been itching to repeal Proposition 209 for years. Now, in the midst of a global pandemic, legislators are giving that effort priority over the state’s plainly more urgent concerns. Shame on them. Adopted by voters in 1996, Proposition 209 amended California’s constitution to prohibit the state from engaging in preferential treatment based on race or sex. It was a rebuke to the identity politics obsessions of state and local governments. The rebuke was especially sharp toward public universities, where preoccupations with race and sex had grown to astonishing proportions. Golden State voters understood what the diversity industry hoped they wouldn’t: Preferential treatment for some groups necessarily means discrimination against others. By approving Proposition 209 by a wide margin, they aimed to end the race and sex spoils system. One argument against the initiative — originally made by President Bill Clinton — was that under Proposition 209, some California universities might have “nothing but Asian Americans” as students. The hyperbolic comment drew criticism at the time. Not only was it false, it was an all too obvious attempt to stoke racial resentment. Despite Clinton’s demagoguery, many Asian Americans stayed on the controversy’s sidelines in 1996. Since then, however, two things have changed. First, eye-opening facts about admissions policies at prestigious universities have been leaking out from various sources, including from the lawsuit *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard University*. Asian American voters now know just how much the deck is stacked against their children at universities not subject to Proposition 209. Second, the number of Asian American voters in California has increased substantially.”

[\[Submit measurable deliverables around diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives for your respective schools and units\]](#), Kevin M. Guskiewicz, Letter to Chancellor's and Provost's Leadership Cabinet, University of North Carolina, July 2, 2020

“The History Race and a Way Forward Commission is tackling the issue of how we tell our history, and I am grateful that the BOT lifted the moratorium on renaming buildings last month. The creation of our new Diversity Council was an important next step towards making diversity and inclusion real on our campus. I know that many of you have already participated in the Racial Equity Institute (REI) training. For those who haven’t, we have secured a day and a half session on July 20-21 with REI and I hope you will be able to join with other members of our leadership team. Amy Hertel will send details early next week. As all of this work continues, and in preparation for our joint Cabinet meeting in August, I am asking each of you to submit measurable deliverables around diversity and inclusion initiatives for your respective schools and units. Specifically, I would like you to draft a response to three specific school/unit questions.

1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Carolina’s scholarly, co-curricular, administrative and service efforts to identify and eliminate structural racism on our campus and beyond?
2. What should we be doing/what can you do to stand against structural racism and stand for equity within our/your school/unit?
3. How can we learn from and partner with other schools/units, institutions, organizations or communities in the region to be agents of change against structural racism?

As you prepare your response, I ask that you engage a diverse range of stakeholders (students, faculty, staff, alumni and community members). Please send these to me by August 3, before our joint Cabinet meeting on August 4.”

[Bolstering the Board: Trustees Are Academia's Best Hope for Reform](#), Jay Schalin, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, 76 pp, July 14, 2020

"Two conditions are needed to effect large-scale reforms in academia: a hierarchical, top-down system of governance that can enact sweeping changes, and for that system to be controlled or heavily influenced by those outside the system. Strong board governance provides both of those conditions. Most university boards, especially the public ones, were created by charters or statutes that placed the board fully in charge, and, remarkably, the boards legally retain much of their power. And yet, because of a variety of pressures and distortion, most boards have relinquished their rightful positions atop college and university governance. [This report](#) is intended to operate on two levels. One is to make the case for stronger board control. Such a hierarchical system, rather than the distributed shared governance system that exists now, is necessary to effect large-scale reform. Shared governance is a sacred cow that needs to be gored. [The report](#) also works on a more immediate, pragmatic level, providing many solutions that can be implemented individually to begin the process of reforming governance. In most situations, boards still have extensive legal authority. They merely need to exercise their existing authority to put the brakes on many of academia's excesses."

[Cornell University takes a major step towards compulsory racial activism for faculty, students, and staff](#), William Jacobson, Legal Insurrection, July 16, 2020

"Proposed initiatives include an "educational requirement on racism, bias and equity for all Cornell students," a new Anti-Racism Center, "an institution-wide, themed semester ... focus[ed] on issues of racism," and mandatory faculty participation in "programming" regarding "race, racism and colonialism in the United States.... I have repeatedly pointed out, in response to the cancel culture [targeting me](#) over my criticism of the Black Lives Matter movement, that things have changed on campuses in ways most people don't fully appreciate. The new activism surrounding race is completely at odds with the traditional goals of the civil rights movement — that all people be treated with dignity and afforded the protections of our laws *without regard to race*.... There now is an obsessive focus on race. Almost everything is viewed through a racial lens. Not only has the focus on skin color changed, there is a requirement of activism. Not being racist is not enough. One must be "antiracist," a term famously used in the book "How to Be An Antiracist," [suggested summer reading](#) by Cornell University's President Martha Pollack."

[The 'Systemic Racism' Canard](#), Peter Kirsanow, National Review, July 23, 2020

"The claim that America's awash in systemic racism is made and repeated as unassailable fact. It's repeated casually, as if everyone concedes its veracity. The term is ubiquitous in news and social media. Politicians invoke it daily, if not hourly. Corporations spend upwards of \$10,000 an hour for lessons on how to eliminate their own purported systemic, institutional racism. Lately, it seems as if schools and colleges are devoted to teaching little else. It's now axiomatic that systemic, structural, or institutional racism accounts for almost all disparities between the races, whether in educational achievement, employment rates, income gaps, crime rates, or health. Individual behavior, family structure, perverse governmental policies, and culture have little or nothing to do with such disparities, and to contend otherwise is itself a manifestation of systemic racism — a convenient and politically expedient canard. The allegation of pervasive systemic racism, as that term is used by politicians, media, academics, and woke mobs, is not merely false — it's a lie. Almost everyone knows it but few are willing to say it for fear of being labeled racist, getting canceled, and/or becoming unemployed. So the lie persists, grows, and metastasizes."

[The Cultural Revolution: Coming to a Campus Near You](#), John Staddon, Minding the Campus, September 21, 2020

“Higher education has begun a transformation similar to the Chinese “Cultural Revolution” of 1966. This claim may sound extreme, but look at the similarities for yourself. Like the Cultural Revolution, the energized identity-politics movement presents itself as a cleansing force. Pure Maoism was being corrupted by covert capitalist sympathizers—they had to be rooted out. In the U.S., the “party faithful” took for granted the permanent problems of “white privilege” and “systemic racism,” which, for many, were their livelihood. But then, after the civil rights acts, things began to look up. In recent decades racism seemed to be slowly disappearing. ... “One of the most substantial changes in white racial attitudes has been the movement from very substantial opposition to the principle of racial equality to one of almost universal support.” This steady improvement in racial attitudes increasingly conflicted with the “party doctrine” that racism is the inexpugnable American sin. A decline in racism soon produced a backlash from the anti-racists. They promulgated a gloomier narrative, and it has been effective. ... People have shifted from being relatively content with the state of race relations in America toward dissatisfaction. The change was not spontaneous. It has coincided with efforts to sow racial anxiety despite a slow improvement in objective measures of racism. There is much evidence for this, but here I will focus on a recent development: a petition/op-ed about combating “systemic racism” in STEM that *Science* (one of the two leading general-science journals) has agreed to publish.”

[Executive Order 13950: Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping](#), Donald J. Trump, Executive Office of the President, Federal Register, September 28, 2020.

“Thanks to the courage and sacrifice of our forebears [sic], America has made significant progress toward realization of our national creed, particularly in the 57 years since Dr. King shared his dream with the country. Today, however, many people are pushing a different vision of America that is grounded in hierarchies based on collective social and political identities rather than in the inherent and equal dignity of every person as an individual. This ideology is rooted in the pernicious and false belief that America is an irredeemably racist and sexist country; that some people, simply on account of their race or sex, are oppressors; and that racial and sexual identities are more important than our common status as human beings and Americans. ... Unfortunately, this malign ideology is now migrating from the fringes of American society and threatens to infect core institutions of our country. Instructors and materials teaching that men and members of certain races, as well as our most venerable institutions, are inherently sexist and racist are appearing in workplace diversity trainings across the country, even in components of the Federal Government and among Federal contractors. For example, the Department of the Treasury recently held a seminar that promoted arguments that “virtually all White people, regardless of how ‘woke’ they are, contribute to racism,” and that instructed small group leaders to encourage employees to avoid “narratives” that Americans should “be more color-blind” or “let people’s skills and personalities be what differentiates them.” ... Executive departments and agencies (agencies), our Uniformed Services, Federal contractors, and Federal grant recipients should, of course, continue to foster environments devoid of hostility grounded in race, sex, and other federally protected characteristics. Training employees to create an inclusive workplace is appropriate and beneficial. The Federal Government is, and must always be, committed to the fair and equal treatment of all individuals before the law. ... Therefore, it shall be the policy of the United States not to promote race or sex stereotyping or scapegoating in the Federal workforce or in the Uniformed Services, and not to allow grant funds to be used for these purposes. In addition, Federal contractors will not be permitted to inculcate such views in their employees. ... *General Provisions.* (a) This order does not prevent agencies, the United States Uniformed Services, or contractors from promoting racial, cultural, or ethnic diversity or inclusiveness, provided such efforts are consistent with the requirements of this order. (b) Nothing in this order shall be construed to prohibit discussing, as part of a larger course of academic instruction, the divisive concepts listed in section 2(a) of this order in an objective manner and without endorsement.”

[Task Force to Integrate Social Justice into the Curriculum: Final Report](#), Julia Draper, Alexa Mises Malchuk, Emily B. Vander Schaaf, Stephanie H. Brown, Georgette Dent, Neva Howard, Beat Steiner & E. Nathan Thomas III, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, 45 pp., October 2020

“The UNC School of Medicine has long valued social justice as critical to its mission of providing care to underserved populations and reducing health disparities in North Carolina and beyond. Yet, upon review of the medical curriculum at UNC, it was found that social justice was often de-emphasized or ignored outside of the formal Social Health Systems courses. Additionally, the review found that instructors were often not prepared to discuss the intersection of health, disease, and their social determinants, often resorting to outdated and inaccurate explanations for the prevalence of medical conditions within certain groups. Finally, a growing number of medical students reported that the hidden curriculum (i.e. the unwritten, unofficial, and often unintended lessons, values, and perspectives that students learn in school) left them feeling mistreated, discriminated against, and undervalued based on various aspects of their identities. In order to address these findings, the School of Medicine convened the Task Force to Integrate Social Justice into the Curriculum.”

[America Wants its Public Colleges Back and The Chronicle Isn't Happy About It](#), Jay Schalin, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, October 26, 2020.

“*The Chronicle of Higher Education* recently released a report decrying the politicization of public higher education governance, entitled *The New Order: How the Nation's Partisan Divisions Consumed Public-College Boards and Warped Higher Education*. The report says more about the tunnel vision that pervades the liberal media and academic establishment than it does about the real state of politics in academia. Politicization is indeed a major governance problem, as the report suggests. However, it is not, as the authors claim, a recent phenomenon resulting from Republican dominance in state politics, the Tea Party movement, and the surge in conservative populism. It is instead a longstanding pattern that has been gradually increasing for over a century. The recent resurgence of Republican, conservative, or traditionalist involvement in higher education governance is not a cause, but an effect of politicization. It is the result of pre-existing political partisanship and extremism. Only one side of the political spectrum—the left—has had significant influence at the vast majority of American campuses for a long time, and it has indeed been pushing a political agenda. Much of the country is waking up to an Ivory Tower that openly works against, not just their traditions and interests, but long-held standards of objective truth and merit. ... Because that agenda has been so successful, so biased, and so radical, higher education could use some disruption. *The Chronicle* authors appear to be too far inside the leftist bubble to see how one-sided their analysis is. And they fail to see how precarious the leftist hold on the nation's intellectual life is. They may call the pushback “politicization,” but it may in fact be an understandably awkward first step toward the American people reclaiming the public institutions they created to serve their needs.”

[Why California Rejected Racial Preferences, Again](#), Conor Friedersdorf, *The Atlantic*, November 10, 2020

“These various disputes over racial quotas and affirmative action have tended to anticipate national controversies. And last week, a majority of voters in this Democratic stronghold, where no single ethnic group constitutes a majority, reaffirmed their long-standing preference for neutrality: California voters defeated Proposition 16, an attempt by progressives to remove the provision in the state constitution that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race or gender in public employment, education, and contracting. The margin of defeat, 56 to 44 percent, was striking to students of political history, because it suggests that race neutrality is more popular now than when it was initially mandated by a 1996 ballot

initiative that passed by a slightly smaller margin. Disappointed progressives fear that Prop 16's defeat will stymie their efforts to reduce racial inequality. But California voters looking to the future of their wildly diverse state were correct to conclude that permitting its officials to treat racial groups differently would be dangerous."

[Deep blue and overwhelmingly against racial preferences: What's going on in California](#), Ward Connerly, USA Today, November 13, 2020

"Equality is central to the American creed. The Founding Fathers, Abraham Lincoln, Martin Luther King Jr. and, now, the people of America's largest state have reaffirmed that fact. ... As it turns out, embracing equality, not mapping out racial proportions, is an American value. The NO on 16 campaign drew from Republicans, Democrats, independents, and men and women of all colors and creeds. This did not happen by accident. Rather, the principle of equality, reinforced throughout American history, held firm in the hearts and minds of Californians. We can draw a direct line from the Founding Fathers to modern-day America."

[The Duo That Defeated the 'Diversity Industry'](#), Tunku Varadarajan, Wall Street Journal, November 20, 2020

"Ward Connerly, 81, is a black Louisiana native who's spent the past quarter-century campaigning against racial preferences. Wenyuan Wu, 33, is a Chinese immigrant who has recently become an activist opposed to anti-Asian discrimination in higher education. They joined forces this June. He's the grizzled mentor who says he got out of his "rocking chair" to defend "the American creed." She, his protegee, is outspoken about freedom in the classic American way, yet deferential to the older man in a manner that's unmistakably Asian. She refers to him as "Mr. Connerly" throughout the interview, which is done on Zoom—Ms. Wu speaking from rural Georgia, where she lives because "the cost of living is low"; Mr. Connerly from an office near California's capital, Sacramento. The pair led the team that vanquished California's progressive elite on Nov. 3, when Proposition 16—a ballot referendum that would have reinstated racial preferences by state and local government agencies, including universities—was defeated, 57% to 43%."

[Critical Race Theory, the New Intolerance, and Its Grip on America](#), Jonathan Butcher & Mike Gonzalez, The Heritage Foundation, December 7, 2020

"SUMMARY: Critical Race Theory (CRT) makes race the prism through which its proponents analyze all aspects of American life—and do so with a degree of persistence that has helped CRT impact all of American life. CRT underpins identity politics, an ongoing effort to reimagine the United States as a nation riven by groups, each with specific claims on victimization. In entertainment, as well as the education and workforce sectors of society, CRT is well-established, driving decision-making according to skin color—not individual value and talent. As Critical Theory ideas become more familiar to the viewing public in everyday life, CRT's intolerance becomes "normalized," along with the idea of systemic racism for Americans, weakening public and private bonds that create trust and allow for civic engagement."

[Memorializing A Dragon-Slaying and A Civil Rights Movement Reborn](#), Stuart H. Hurlbert, Minding the Campus, January 10, 2021

"In 1996, Californians passed by a wide margin a citizens' ballot initiative, the California Civil Rights Initiative (CCRI), also known as Proposition 209, that disallowed use of race and sex preferences by state and local governments in hiring, public contracting, and admissions to public universities. ... A quarter century later, the perennially race-obsessed California legislature, backed by many establishment elites and moneybags, put forward a ballot initiative, Proposition 16, that would have repealed the CCRI. This

was slapped down hard on November 3, with the anti-preferences citizenry winning by an even wider margin than they did in 1996. ... Preparing for the long haul, CFER [Californians for Equal Rights] leadership has just reconstituted the organization as a foundation. ... There will be no rest for weary dragon-slayers, however. Powerful interests and 43 percent of the California electorate still oppose the letter and spirit of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the California Constitution. And those powerful interests include virtually 100 percent of the political appointees who govern higher education in California – the University of California board of regents, the California State University board of trustees, the California Community Colleges board of governors, and the chancellors, presidents, and central administrations of 149 campuses. Until that number gets closer to 43 percent, the citizenry will suffer from an extreme lack of equity in these councils of power.”

[Biden's embrace of 'equity' means he's abandoned the quest for equality](#), Michael Gonzalez, New York Post, January 31, 2021

“President Biden preaches unity but practices division. Witness his “Executive Order on Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government,” part of an unprecedented barrage of such orders. It calls for “an ambitious whole-of-government equity agenda” that smacks of a Great Society for identity politics. One of the order’s main aspects is to require all federal agencies to ferret out any policy that may produce unequal outcomes among members of categories deemed marginalized. This will put the divisive doctrine of “disparate impact” on steroids. The doctrine rests on the dubious concept that if an impartially applied policy leads to unequal outcomes, it is illegal, no matter how nondiscriminatory in intent. Policymakers will then search for racial results, and their policies will be unfair and wasteful. The order’s “marginalized” groups are naturally often the creations of the wealthy activist class that feeds on federal dollars and influence when the left is in power. That activist class is back at the trough thanks to another part of this order. Equity has now come to mean the functional opposite of equality. The latter means equal treatment to all citizens, such as the Constitution calls for in the clause of the 14th Amendment that deals with equal protection of laws. Equity means treating Americans unequally to ensure that outcomes are equalized — the old tried (and failed) Marxian standard.”

[Political Reality on North Carolina Campuses: Examining Policy Debates and Forums with Diverse Viewpoints](#), George R. La Noue, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, 46 pp, February 2021

“ Examining the paucity of campus public policy debates and forums with diverse viewpoints over two years—which were quite politically contentious in North Carolina and the nation—some might argue that there is no need for such events because students can learn what they need to know in specific courses. If a campus offers a course in health policy or environmental policy, that assumption might be true if the lectures, readings, and discussions were well-balanced and a student can fit it into his or her schedule. But that is impossible to measure from the outside. What we can measure is what North Carolina campuses require in order to graduate. In 2019, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) published a report titled “What Will They Learn?: A Survey of Core Requirements at Our Nation’s Colleges and Universities.” Looking at the general requirements of 49 North Carolina campuses, ACTA found that 94 percent required a science course, 89 percent required a composition course, 87 percent a mathematics course, 45 percent a literature course, but only 10 percent a government or history course, and 4 percent an economics course. In short, there is no guarantee that any students will take a course that might be policy-related or that would inform the votes they may now cast. ... In short, the lack of public policy debates or forums is the inadvertent result of many existing campus dynamics and the situation is not likely to change without some outside intervention. Such requirements must respect the academic freedom of individual professors while being aware that many of the most politically relevant departments no longer house faculty that represent the diverse ideas that need discussion. The

key actor in mitigating this dilemma should be institutional governing boards, backed up by state legislatures, in the case of public campuses. Private institutions granted substantial public funding, property tax exemptions, and donor tax advantages also have an obligation to prepare their students to be thoughtful citizens. There needs to be a balance between the public interest in having serious campus discourse about our most pressing policy problems and the institutional interests in status and branding and faculty interest in their own research agendas set in the context of increased political homogeneity. If a board seeks to protect this public interest for reasons that are not partisan or parochial, these are some policy changes boards should consider:

[1776 Unites - 2020 Year in Review](#), The Woodson Center, February 25, 2021

“An overview of Woodson Center’s 1776 Unites campaign in the first year, and our key achievements in our inaugural year, 2020! We launched in February 2020 as a Black-led assembly of scholars and activists who sought to challenge those who would paint our country as irredeemably and forever tainted by the stain of racism and slavery -- and offer a more positive vision that draws on the historical examples of Black Americans who have embraced American ideals to thrive, instead. We have accomplished much in our first year: - Raised hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Piney Woods School, one of the few Black boarding schools left in America, which is devoted to American excellence and produces top-level graduates; this was equivalent to dozens of scholarships for needs students - Provided hundreds of "mini-grants" to innovative, grassroots organizations across the country -- to kickstart and invest in the leaders who are working to solve problems in our communities - Produced our [#1776Educates](#) curriculum, which has reached tens of thousands of students in classrooms and home-schools with patriotic, historical and accurate stories of Black American achievement - Reached millions with our proactive, patriotic message of hope, achievement, and results for low-income Americans - Began collaborating with law enforcement and communities to share findings of the Woodson Center’s past violence-free zone achievements, and bring together thinkers to solve the growing violence issues in our nation’s urban cores. As Bob Woodson says, "People are motivated to improve their lives when they're shown victories that are possible, not being constantly reminded of injuries to be avoided." This is what the 1776 Unites campaign is all about!”

[UNC Chancellor is facing pressure for new provost decision](#), Mimi Chapman, Daily Tar Heel, University of North Carolina, March 3, 2021

“The search for a new provost is coming to an end, and the Chancellor is under significant pressure to make a particular choice. Based on the information that is being relayed to me by multiple sources, our trustees and the UNC System are dictating his choices to the point that he really has none to make. As has happened before, some will call these “rumors” and say I deal in conspiracies. They are not rumors, and I deal only in the truth. ... I hear so much about this powerful outside person or that one who “loves Carolina.” But I wonder what that means. Does it mean destroying an institution that has benefited the people of North Carolina and beyond for over 200 years? This place is not broken. It is under siege. If you love Carolina, leave it alone.”

[Lt. Gov. Robinson takes on classroom indoctrination with new task force](#), A.P. Dillon, North State Journal, March 17, 2021

“Rain and cold temperatures did not hamper the March 16 announcement of a new task force assembled by North Carolina’s first black lieutenant governor, Mark Robinson. The Fairness and Accountability in the Classroom for Teachers and Students (F.A.C.T.S) task force was formed to combat lessons and materials that are inappropriate or politically biased. “There are parents and teachers who are literally afraid to speak up against school boards, against principals, against administrators, and folks — that has got to stop,” Robinson said. “School is supposed to be a safe place for people to go for the

purpose of instruction.” The announcement of the F.A.C.T.S. task force follows a vote by the N.C. State Board of Education approving **revised Social Studies standards**, which critics say contains elements of the highly controversial Critical Race Theory (CRT). “I think they are politically charged. I think they are divisive, and I think they, quite frankly, smack of a lot of leftist dogma,” Robinson said when the revisions were discussed by the board in January. Robinson pointed to “code words” in the standards, like “systemic racism,” that impose a negative view of the country. He **countered**, stating that the “system of government we have in this nation is not systemically racist. In fact, it is not racist at all.””

Subversive Education: North Carolina’s largest school district launches a campaign against “whiteness in educational spaces”, Christopher F. Rufo, City Journal, March 17, 2021

“Last year, the Wake County Public School System, which serves the greater Raleigh, North Carolina area, held an equity-themed teachers’ conference with sessions on “whiteness,” “microaggressions,” “racial mapping,” and “disrupting texts,” encouraging educators to form “equity teams” in schools and push the new party line: “antiracism.” The February 2020 conference, attended by more than 200 North Carolina public school teachers, began with a “land acknowledgement,” a ritual recognition suggesting that white North Carolinians are colonizers on stolen Native American land. ... At the first session, “Whiteness in Ed Spaces,” school administrators provided two handouts on the “norms of whiteness.” These documents claimed that “(white) cultural values” include “denial,” “fear,” “blame,” “control,” “punishment,” “scarcity,” and “one-dimensional thinking.” According to notes from the session, the teachers argued that “whiteness perpetuates the system” of injustice and that the district’s “whitewashed curriculum” was “doing real harm to our students and educators.” The group encouraged white teachers to “challenge the dominant ideology” of whiteness and “disrupt” white culture in the classroom through a series of “transformational interventions.” Parents, according to the teachers, should be considered an impediment to social justice. When one teacher asked, “How do you deal with parent pushback?” the answer was clear: ignore parental concerns and push the ideology of antiracism directly to students. “You can’t let parents deter you from the work,” the teachers said. “White parents’ children are benefiting from the system” of whiteness and are “not learning at home about diversity (LGBTQ, race, etc.)” Therefore, teachers have an obligation to subvert parental wishes and beliefs. Parents, according to the teachers, should be considered an impediment to social justice. When one teacher asked, “How do you deal with parent pushback?” the answer was clear: ignore parental concerns and push the ideology of antiracism directly to students. “You can’t let parents deter you from the work,” the teachers said. “White parents’ children are benefiting from the system” of whiteness and are “not learning at home about diversity (LGBTQ, race, etc.)” Therefore, teachers have an obligation to subvert parental wishes and beliefs.”

The Deceptions of "Systemic Racism," "Antiracism," and "Critical Race Theory", Stuart H. Hurlbert, Californian for Equal Rights Foundation, May 6, 2021

“This chronologically ordered bibliography of about 700 items is not intended to be exhaustive, and the literature on these topics is increasing rapidly. A major criterion for including items is that they are supportive of the letter and spirit of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the California Constitution, that they support teaching in public schools on any relevant topic, but that they oppose ideological indoctrination and compelled speech or opinion in any public school, government agency or other public institution.”

A Broad and Devastating Offensive Against Racial Preferences, George Leef, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, May 26, 2021

“Law professors Gail Heriot and Maimon Schwarzschild have edited a volume entitled *A Dubious Expediency: How Race Preferences Damage Higher Education*. Its eight essays deliver a crushing blow to

the case for racial preferences. Not only do preferences fail to achieve their proclaimed goals of improved education, racial healing, and improved social mobility for allegedly “marginalized” groups, but they do palpable harm. They promote divisiveness, erode academic standards, and hinder many of the students who supposedly benefit from them. Any fair-minded reader of this book will come away lamenting that America ever left the path of color-blind merit and started down the path of, well, discrimination. Never mind that racial preferences were intended to be “good discrimination” that would remedy the effects of many years of bad discrimination. Good *intentions* don’t matter. The *results* have been ruinous.”

[The Peril of Politicizing Science](#), Anna I. Krylov, Journal of Physical Chemistry Letters, June 10, 2021

“I grew up in a city that in its short history (barely over 150 years) had its name changed three times. Founded in 1869 around a steel plant and several coal mines built by the Welsh industrialist John Hughes, the settlement was originally called Hughesovka (or Yuzovka). When the Bolsheviks came to power in the 1917 Revolution, the new government of the working class, the Soviets, set out to purge the country of ideologically impure influences in the name of the proletariat and the worldwide struggle of the suppressed masses. Cities and geographical landmarks were renamed, statues were torn down, books were burned, and many millions were jailed and murdered. In due course, the commissars got to Yuzovka, and the city was stripped of the name of its founder, a representative of the hostile class of oppressors and a Westerner. In modern terms, Hughes was canceled. For a few months, the city was called Trotsk (after Leon Trotsky), until Trotsky lost in the power struggle inside the party and was himself canceled. In 1924 the city became the namesake of the new supreme leader of the Communist Party (Stalin), and a few years later renamed to Stalino. My mother’s school certificates have Stalino on them. Following Stalin’s death in 1953, the Communist party underwent some reckoning and admitted that several decades of terror and many millions of murdered citizens were somewhat excessive. Stalin was canceled: his body was removed from the Mausoleum at Red Square (where it had been displayed next to Lenin’s); textbooks and encyclopedias were rewritten once again; and the cities, institutions, and landmarks bearing his name were promptly renamed. Stalino became Donetsk, after the river Severskii Donets. ... I came of age during a relatively mellow period of the Soviet rule, post-Stalin. Still, the ideology permeated all aspects of life, and survival required strict adherence to the party line and enthusiastic displays of ideologically proper behavior. ... Fast forward to 2021—another century. The Cold War is a distant memory and the country shown on my birth certificate and school and university diplomas, the USSR, is no longer on the map. But I find myself experiencing its legacy some thousands of miles to the west, as if I am living in an Orwellian twilight zone. I witness ever-increasing attempts to subject science and education to ideological control and censorship. Just as in Soviet times, the censorship is being justified by the greater good. Whereas in 1950, the greater good was advancing the World Revolution (in the USSR; in the USA the greater good meant fighting Communism), in 2021 the greater good is “Social Justice” (the capitalization is important: “Social Justice” is a specific ideology, with goals that have little in common with what lower-case “social justice” means in plain English). As in the USSR, the censorship is enthusiastically imposed also from the bottom, by members of the scientific community, whose motives vary from naive idealism to cynical power-grabbing.”

[Can Academic Freedom Survive Critical Race Theory?](#), George R. La Noue, Law & Liberty, June 10, 2021

“Across the country, from Pre-K to graduate schools, the use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in curriculums is causing conflict. Of course, like any theory, there are differences in the way CRT is defined. It should not be confused with honest discussions about the role of slavery, Jim Crow, or redlining in American history. CRT, however, is not about discussion. It is about converting theory into group-based actions that would erase the constitutional concept that each person is entitled to equal protection of the law. CRT essentially reduces all important human identities to race. There is nothing wrong with exposing

students to CRT and DEI perspectives if they are considered only one alternative among others. But when campuses are loath to debate these theories or other public policies, only the most intimidating voices will be heard. When a monolithic view of DEI issues is imposed, then the academic freedom and even the survival of dissenting faculty and students on campus may be at stake. In this circumstance, legislatures may have a role to play, if it is not exercised for partisan reasons.... If campuses want to preserve their autonomy in these areas, several steps should be taken.... Without these measures, it would be hypocritical for a campus to complain about legislative or board interference, for it would mean that campus leadership has not confronted the threats to free speech that it has caused and could control.”

[Voters Aren't Happy With K-12 Education](#), John Locke Foundation, June 24, 2021

“As the school year comes to a close and a debate over the teaching of Critical Race Theory heats up, a majority of likely voters are unhappy with the direction of education in North Carolina. Likely voters across the state were asked whether they believed education in North Carolina was headed in the right direction or off on the wrong track. Fifty-five percent of those surveyed said they believed education was off on the wrong track, whereas 26% said it was headed in the right direction. The disapproval for education was even stronger among parents of school aged children, with 69% of this subset expressing their dissatisfaction. “It is no surprise that so many North Carolinians believe that education is on the wrong track. They want a public education system laser-focused on academic excellence but too often find schools committed to ideological conformity and Left-wing political mobilization,” said Dr. Terry Stoops, Director of The John Locke Foundation’s Center for Effective Education.”

[Critical race theory seeks to recast America’s foundational beliefs](#), Phil Berger, Carolina Journal, July 14, 2021

*“[T]he full and unedited remarks of NC Senate Leader Phil Berger, R-Rockingham, on the threat [of] critical race theory to American society and its founding principles. Certain Enlightenment Era concepts have defined American culture since our nation’s founding. Sometimes referred to as “classical liberalism,” they include freedom of inquiry, freedom of thought, freedom of debate, and rationality. From these concepts stem the scientific method; technological advancement; innovation; the peaceful existence of a multiethnic society and its ability to adapt, improve, and survive. For a long time we took these concepts as a given – they’re there, and they always will be, so we needn’t pay them much mind.... But what do we do when confronted with a doctrine that “questions the very foundations of the liberal order”? That’s how leading legal scholars Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic **describe critical race theory, the school of thought** they helped found. ... They seek to replace the existing order with a new order, one that preaches “the only remedy to past discrimination is present discrimination,” and that everything we see and do boils down to race and a racial hierarchy – the intersection of race and power. This doctrine is ascendant in American culture and in parts of North Carolina.... We can, and hopefully will, **pass a law** to prohibit indoctrinating students while preserving the inviolable principle of freedom of thought. Children must learn about our state’s racial past and all of its ugliness, including the cruelty of slavery to the 1898 Wilmington massacre to Jim Crow. But students must not be forced to adopt an ideology that is separate and distinct from history; an ideology that attacks “the very foundations of the liberal order,” and that promotes “present discrimination” – so long as it’s against the right people – as “antiracist.” And we can, and hopefully will, put to the voters a Constitutional amendment that reinforces the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and places in our state’s foundational text the principle of equality before the law.”*

[Black Eye for America: How Critical Race Theory Is Burning Down the House](#), Carol Swain & Christopher Schorr, BeThePeople Books, August 1, 2021

“In schools and workplaces across the United States, Americans are being indoctrinated with a divisive, anti-American ideology: Critical Race Theory (CRT). Based in cultural Marxism, CRT bullies and demonizes whites while infantilizing and denying agency to blacks, creating a deep racial rift. As Abraham Lincoln famously observed, "A house divided against itself cannot stand." CRT aims to divide the American nation against itself and burn down the house.... Carol Swain and Christopher Schorr expose the true nature of Critical Race Theory, and they offer concrete solutions for taking back the country's stolen institutions. They describe CRT in theory and practice, accounting for its origins and weaponization within American schools and workplaces; explain how this ideology threatens traditional American values and legal doctrines, including civil rights; and equip everyday Americans with strategies to help them resist and defeat CRT's pernicious influence.”

[The Diversity Problem on Campus](#), Dorian S. Abbot & Ivan Marinovic, Newsweek, August 12, 2021

“American universities are undergoing a profound transformation that threatens to derail their primary mission: the production and dissemination of knowledge. The new regime is titled "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" or DEI, and is enforced by a large bureaucracy of administrators. Nearly every decision taken on campus, from admissions, to faculty hiring, to course content, to teaching methods, is made through the lens of DEI. This regime was imposed from the top and has never been adequately debated. In the current climate it cannot be openly debated: the emotions around DEI are so strong that self-censorship among dissenting faculty is nearly universal. The words "diversity, equity and inclusion" sound just, and are often supported by well-intentioned people, but their effects are the opposite of noble sentiments. Most importantly, "equity" does not mean fair and equal treatment. DEI seeks to increase the representation of some groups through discrimination against members of other groups. The underlying premise of DEI is that any statistical difference between group representation on campus and national averages reflects systemic injustice and discrimination by the university itself. The magnitude of the distortions is significant: for some job searches discrimination rises to the level of implicitly or explicitly excluding applicants from certain groups. ... DEI undermines the public's trust in universities and their graduates. Some on campus might be surprised to learn that, according to a recent Pew poll, 74 percent of Americans think only qualifications should be taken into account in hiring and promotion, even if this results in less diversity. If current trends continue, employers and consumers will quickly adjust their perception of the value of a university degree. We propose an alternative framework called Merit, Fairness, and Equality (MFE) whereby university applicants are treated as individuals and evaluated through a rigorous and unbiased process based on their merit and qualifications alone. Crucially, this would mean an end to legacy and athletic admission advantages, which significantly favor white applicants, in addition to those based on group membership.”

[Senate passes bill barring public schools from teaching Critical Race Theory](#), Carolina Journal, August 29, 2021

“The vote split along party lines, with 25 Republicans voting in favor and 17 Democrats against. House Bill 324, Ensuring Dignity and Nondiscrimination in Schools, would ban the teaching of 13 discriminatory concepts in the classroom, including:

- That one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex.
- An individual, solely by virtue of his or her race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive.
- An individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely or partly because of his or her race or sex.
- A meritocracy is inherently racist or sexist.
- Particular character traits, values, moral or ethical codes, privileges, or beliefs should be ascribed to a race or sex, or to an individual because of the individual's race or sex.

Each of these ideas has been linked to Critical Race Theory. Senate leader Phil Berger, R-Rockingham, spearheaded the bill. Berger has vowed to fight the teaching of CRT in public schools “with everything that I have.” “Students must not be forced to adopt an ideology that is separate and distinct from history; an ideology that promotes ‘present discrimination’ — so long as it’s against the right again — as ‘antiracist,’” said Berger in a statement. At one point, Berger asked his Democrat colleagues to name one item on the list of 13 discriminatory concepts that they would favor changing. No Senate Democrats responded. Instead, Democrats claimed the bill would muzzle teachers’ ability to instruct students in the full scope of American history.”

[Gov. Roy Cooper vetoes bill that restricts certain racial concepts from being taught in North Carolina’s schools](#), Greg Childress, The Pulse, NCPolicyWatch, September 10, 2021

“As expected, Gov. Roy Cooper vetoes House Bill 324, the controversial legislation critics contend would restrict what students could be taught about the nation’s racial history. ... HB 324 includes 13 concepts teachers would be prohibited from “promoting” in North Carolina classrooms. They include the concept that “one race or sex is inherently superior to another race or sex and an “individual, solely by virtue of his or her race or sex, is inherently racist, sexist, or oppressive.” The bill also requires educators to post reading lists, workshops, training and curriculum on school websites a month in advance and to notify the NC Department of Public Instruction. Educators would have also been required to post guest speakers and diversity trainers on school websites. Senate leader Phil Berger, (R-Rockingham) said he is confused by the governor’s veto. He said the bill placed no restrictions on what educators could teach about America’s history. “It’s perplexing that Gov. Cooper would veto a bill that affirms the public school system’s role to teach students the full truth about our state’s sometimes ugly past,” Berger said. “His invented excuse is so plainly refuted by the text of the bill that I question whether he even read it.””

[Cooper’s all in on critical race theory](#), Ray Nothstine, Carolina Journal, September 18, 2021

“Even in North Carolina, the rejection of fundamental American principles thunders ahead. The proof? Gov. Roy Cooper vetoed an anti-critical race theory bill on Sept. 10. If one reads the text, it’s hard to imagine political leaders opposing these principles a few years ago. Simply put, the bill works to reinforce the American tenets of equality and our *E Pluribus Unum* motto. A common refrain, lawmakers, and advocates for the bill are right to wonder whether Cooper has even read what he opposed. What’s controversial about saying one race or sex is not inherently greater than another? Certainly, he has read it. Even in a state that Donald Trump won twice; Cooper continues to fully morph into one of the most reliable mouthpieces for the national Democratic Party. One can no longer conjure up a single-issue Cooper disagrees with his party today. The Republican-led bill didn’t ban the teaching of critical race theory outright. That’s an important point. The sole aim of the bill champions greater transparency in the classroom while elevating the core principles of a color-blind society. “People need to take note when our governor and lawmakers won’t support the principles of equality and nondiscrimination,” says Dr. Robert Luebke, a senior fellow at the John Locke’s Center for Effective Education.”

[The White Backlash That Wasn't: Opposition to critical race theory is broad and bipartisan](#), Christopher Rufo, City Journal, September 26, 2021

“Over the past year, the left-leaning media has peddled the narrative that an emotional constellation of “white resentment,” “white fragility,” “white rage,” and “white fear” drives opposition to critical race theory in America’s public schools. Now NBC News claims it can prove it. In a long story featuring analysis of demographic data, NBC News reporter Tyler Kingkade and data editor Nigel Chiwaya claim that the parent uprisings against critical race theory, which have occurred in more than 200 school districts across the country, are a “backlash” against “rapid demographic change” and “the exposure of

white students to students of color.” Or, to put it bluntly, it’s the ugly reaction of white racism in the face of rapidly integrating schools. As left-leaning Slate concluded, NBC’s reporting proves that fear of “white replacement” and the desire to “protect whiteness” motivate the anti-critical race theory movement. There is only one problem: NBC’s analysis is nonsense. ... NBC News’s misleading report is part of a broader campaign to confuse the public about critical race theory. Over the summer, as parent protests began to make headlines, left-leaning media initially claimed that CRT was an obscure theory found only in law schools. But parents saw the overwhelming amount of reporting about critical race theory in their schools and watched as powerful organizations, including the national teachers’ union and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, explicitly endorsed critical race theory in public education. When these and other attempts at denial and deflection failed, left-leaning activists and journalists fell back on an old sawhorse: decrying opponents as racists.”

[Chinese Immigrants Speak out: Stop Cultural Revolution in America](#), (11min video), Lily Tang Williams, Presentations by Lily and three other Chinese immigrants, September 26, 2021

“In light of what’s happening in today’s America, four Chinese immigrants who love their new country -- the USA -- feel compelled to come out and share their personal stories from China. Some of them have witnessed the catastrophic Proletariat Cultural Revolution launched by Chairman Mao from 1966 to 1976. Some of them have worked within the CCP’s system. They all have one thing in common: they do not want to see a repeat of China’s Cultural Revolution happening here in America.”

[M.I.T.’s Choice of Lecturer Ignited Criticism. So Did Its Decision to Cancel](#), Michael Powell, New York Times, October 20, 2021

“The Massachusetts Institute of Technology invited the geophysicist Dorian Abbot to give a prestigious public lecture this autumn. He seemed a natural choice, a scientific star who studies climate change and whether planets in distant solar systems might harbor atmospheres conducive to life. Then a swell of angry resistance arose. Some faculty members and graduate students argued that Dr. Abbot, a professor at the University of Chicago, had created harm by speaking out against aspects of affirmative action and diversity programs. In videos and opinion pieces, Dr. Abbot, who is white, has asserted that such programs treat “people as members of a group rather than as individuals, repeating the mistake that made possible the atrocities of the 20th century.” He said that he favored a diverse pool of applicants selected on merit. ... On Sept. 30, M.I.T. reversed course. The head of its earth, atmospheric and planetary sciences department called off Dr. Abbot’s lecture, to be delivered to professors, graduate students and the public, including some top Black and Latino high school students. ... A few fields have purged scientific terms and names seen by some as offensive, and there is a rising call for “citational justice,” arguing that professors and graduate students should seek to cite more Black, Latino, Asian and Native American scholars and in some cases refuse to acknowledge in footnotes the research of those who hold distasteful views. Still the decision by M.I.T., viewed as a high citadel of science in the United States, took aback some prominent scientists. ... This is a debate fully engaged in academia. No sooner had M.I.T. canceled his speech than Robert P. George, director of Princeton’s James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, invited him to give the speech there on Thursday, the same day as the canceled lecture. Dr. George is a founding member of the Academic Freedom Alliance, which is dedicated to promoting academic debate. “M.I.T. has behaved disgracefully in capitulating to a politically motivated campaign,” Dr. George said. “This is part of a larger trend of the politicization of science.” Phoebe A. Cohen is a geosciences professor and department chair at Williams College and one of many who expressed anger on Twitter at M.I.T.’s decision to invite Dr. Abbot to speak, given that he has spoken against affirmative action in the past. Dr. Cohen agreed that Dr. Abbot’s views reflect a broad current in American society. Ideally, she said, a university should not invite speakers who do not share its values on diversity and affirmative action. Nor was she enamored of

M.I.T.'s offer to let him speak at a later date to the M.I.T. professors. "Honestly, I don't know that I agree with that choice," she said. "To me, the professional consequences are extremely minimal." What, she was asked, of the effect on academic debate? Should the academy serve as a bastion of unfettered speech? "This idea of intellectual debate and rigor as the pinnacle of intellectualism comes from a world in which white men dominated," she replied."

[Woke Racism: How a New Religion Has Betrayed Black America](#), John McWhorter, Portfolio/Penguin, October 26, 2021

"AMAZON: "New York Times bestselling author and acclaimed linguist John McWhorter argues that an illiberal neoracism, disguised as antiracism, is hurting Black communities and weakening the American social fabric. Americans of good will on both the left and the right are secretly asking themselves the same question: how has the conversation on race in America gone so crazy? We're told to read books and listen to music by people of color but that wearing certain clothes is "appropriation." We hear that being white automatically gives you privilege and that being Black makes you a victim. We want to speak up but fear we'll be seen as unwoke, or worse, labeled a racist. According to John McWhorter, the problem is that a well-meaning but pernicious form of antiracism has become, not a progressive ideology, but a religion—and one that's illogical, unreachable, and unintentionally neoracist. In *Woke Racism*, McWhorter reveals the workings of this new religion, from the original sin of "white privilege" and the weaponization of cancel culture to ban heretics, to the evangelical fervor of the "woke mob." He shows how this religion that claims to "dismantle racist structures" is actually harming his fellow Black Americans by infantilizing Black people, setting Black students up for failure, and passing policies that disproportionately damage Black communities. The new religion might be called "antiracism," but it features a racial essentialism that's barely distinguishable from racist arguments of the past."

[Other Than Merit: The Prevalence of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Statements in University Hiring](#), James D. Paul & Robert Maranto, American Enterprise Institute, November 2021

"Traditionally, American universities have prided themselves on being meritocratic institutions dedicated to the disinterested pursuit of academic excellence and the production and dissemination of new knowledge. But increasingly, universities are not hiring faculty based purely on the quality and promise of their scholarship. Rather, more and more candidates for professorships are also being screened on their commitment to "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI). **Key Points:**

- Diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) statement requirements for job applicants seeking university faculty posts seem increasingly common.
- Proponents claim these requirements create a more inclusive academy. Critics claim they amount to political correctness loyalty oaths. Yet, until now, no one has conducted an empirical investigation of their prevalence or how these requirements vary across academic disciplines, geographic regions, type of faculty position, and university prestige.
- Prestigious universities are significantly more likely to have DEI requirements than nonprestigious universities. Perhaps surprisingly, these statements are as prevalent in STEM fields as in the humanities and social sciences, once controls are accounted for.
- Regular faculty posts are more likely to require DEI statements than adjunct and postdoc positions. Relative to other regions, jobs in the West are most likely to require DEI statements."

[UNC Board of Trustees approves "outspoken conservative" voice as new provost](#), Joe Killian, The Pulse, NC Policy Watch, December 9, 2021

"The UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees approved Chris Clemens, a senior associate dean, as the school's new executive vice chancellor and provost after a special meeting held largely in closed-session Thursday. ... Clemens has been at the center of controversy over the creation of a program at Chapel

Hill called the “Program in Civic Virtue and Civil Discourse,” which Clemens and others described as a “conservative center” going back to its inception in 2017. Clemens has since denied the program will be explicitly conservative. Clemens has described himself as “among the most outspoken conservative members of the Arts & Sciences faculty at UNC for many years, sponsoring the college Republicans, Carolina Review and several other student organizations.” ... Clemens’s conservative bona fides are incidental to his long service as a faculty member and senior associate dean, Kotis said. “I think when you see Republicans or conservatives chosen for these positions, these big leadership positions at the universities, it only stands out because most of those positions are held by Democrats,” Kotis said.”

Governor DeSantis Announces Legislative Proposal to Stop W.O.K.E. Activism and Critical Race Theory in Schools and Corporations, News Release, Office of the Governor, December 15, 2021

“ Today, Governor Ron DeSantis announced the Stop the Wrongs to Our Kids and Employees (W.O.K.E.) Act, a legislative proposal that will give businesses, employees, children and families tools to fight back against woke indoctrination. The Stop W.O.K.E. Act will be the strongest legislation of its kind in the nation and will take on both corporate wokeness and Critical Race Theory. Today’s proposal builds on actions Governor DeSantis has already taken to ban Critical Race Theory and the New York Times’ 1619 project in Florida’s schools. For more information about the Stop W.O.K.E. Act, [click here](#). “In Florida we are taking a stand against the state-sanctioned racism that is critical race theory,” said **Governor Ron DeSantis**. “We won’t allow Florida tax dollars to be spent teaching kids to hate our country or to hate each other. We also have a responsibility to ensure that parents have the means to vindicate their rights when it comes to enforcing state standards. Finally, we must protect Florida workers against the hostile work environment that is created when large corporations force their employees to endure CRT-inspired ‘training’ and indoctrination.””

Critical Social Justice in the UNC System, Scott Yenor & Anna K. Miller, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, January 2022

“Critical Social Justice (CSJ) poses a threat to higher education and to the American way of life. This school of thought goes by many names, including Critical Race Theory, Critical Theory, Multiculturalism, and Identity Politics. All these ideologies divide the world into aggrieved minorities and oppressive majorities, reducing people to a group identity grounded in immutable characteristics such as race and sex. They are based on a distorted view of what a human being is, compromising the pursuit of truth and diverting institutions that adopt it away from excellence and merit and toward factionalism. They cultivate resentment and anger among the supposedly aggrieved while undermining the stability, equal treatment, and mutual toleration that contributes to individual happiness and good citizenship. Universities promote CSJ policies under the seemingly innocuous rubric of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI). Most schools in the UNC System have adopted CSJ in their strategic plans, and things are accelerating across the system. ... The Board of Governors and the legislature stand at an inflection point: either stop the DEI industrial complex or it will take over North Carolina’s universities.”

The Inconvenient Minority, Kenny Xu, Pacific Legal Foundation, January 5, 2022

“Ivy League schools are still clinging to these outdated stereotypes about Asian-Americans, and weaponizing the images against them in the admissions process. Look at the *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard* court case, for example: Harvard has a strict quota on Asian students and allows their admissions process to be racially biased in order to maintain their ideal numbers of enrollees. Asian-Americans—who make up nearly 50% of all American SAT scores higher than 1500—have made up 20% or less of Harvard’s student body uniformly between 1995 and 2015. In justification of these actions, Harvard claims that Asian-American applicants rank lower on personality scores and are therefore not the ideal Harvard candidates. Asian-Americans rank lowest of all the races on Harvard’s

“personal” score, even though they rank highest of all the races in Harvard’s corresponding alumni interviews. A paradox? No, deliberate ignorance. In my latest book, *An Inconvenient Minority*, I show how Harvard’s admissions officers, who never interact firsthand with their applicants, nevertheless attack Asian personalities as being “robotic,” “social outcasts,” and “test-taking robots with no personality.” I show the human consequences of the back-breaking stereotyping of a group of people who study many hours per day more than the average American and work extremely hard to get into college, often to see the fruits of their efforts rot under the gaze of diversity-obsessed admissions officers who see “too many Asians” at their schools.”

[UNC Schools Indoctrinate Future Teachers](#), Jenna A. Robinson, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, January 24, 2022

“White fragility. Equitable math. The invisible knapsack. These critical theory terms and practices are now common in North Carolina’s public K-12 schools. And Lieutenant Governor Mark Robinson has collected many more examples with his Fairness and Accountability in the Classroom for Teachers and Students (F.A.C.T.S.) Task Force. But North Carolina’s public schools didn’t “go woke” spontaneously. Our K-12 schools and classrooms have been slowly transformed by teachers who learned and practiced critical theory in schools of education across the state, including those in the UNC system. The John Locke Foundation’s Terry Stoops documents one example of education schools’ critical pedagogy [here](#). Such ideology is infused throughout education school courses. ... It is indoctrination, not education. And it is especially concentrated in new certificate programs that have begun to pop up across the UNC system. Certificate programs are shorter than degree programs and usually targeted at very specific skills or bodies of knowledge, in this case “social justice education” and critical theory. East Carolina, UNC Charlotte, UNC Greensboro, and NC Central all have such programs.... Without oversight, these programs will continue to indoctrinate North Carolina’s future teachers. The UNC Policy Manual should be changed to provide necessary oversight to certificate programs, especially in teacher education.”

[Academic Freedom and the Mission of the University](#), Keith E. Whittington, Houston Law Review, January 8, 2022

“ABSTRACT: The utility of academic freedom depends on the particular mission of a university. In a system in which institutions of higher education are dedicated to truth-seeking and the advancement and dissemination of human knowledge, then robust protections for academic freedom for scholars and instructors is essential to effectuating that mission. As American universities adopted this as their central mission, the groundwork was laid for the development of ideas and practices of academic freedom in the United States. Academic freedom is much less useful, or even counterproductive, if universities prioritized some other mission over truth-seeking. Unfortunately, there are several competing missions currently in play around universities, and to the extent that any of them become central to how we understand the rationale and operation of American universities then academic freedom as a meaningful set of protections for dissident scholars will eventually suffer.”

[Joint Statement Against Critical Race Theory Using Race to Divide Americans](#), Alliance Against Critical Ethnic Studies, Californians for Equal Rights, February 2022

“CFER has partnered up with various organizations throughout California and nationwide to raise public awareness about the prevalence of divisive ideologies in the California Ethnic Studies Model Curriculum (ESMC). We hosted multiple seminars and organized a broad-based coalition of 29 partner groups to collectively voice dissent against the ethnic studies mandate AB101. CFER testified at the State Assembly and Senate on multiple occasions against the bill as a primary expert witness and sent joint letters to both the State Legislature and the Governor’s office. ... As a broad-based coalition, we wholeheartedly support teaching cultures and history including slavery, racism and discrimination in a balanced,

unabridged, nuanced and constructive fashion. We welcome meaningful efforts to build understanding and appreciation for different cultures and ethnicities in our diverse country. But we strongly oppose attempts to use race as a wedge to divide Americans and denigrate our great country. In this spirit, we stand firmly against CRT and its egregious manifestations in our schools, workplaces, and governments. We call upon you and all like-minded individuals to join our growing coalition for a genuine movement to safeguard democratic values of equality, liberty and unity.”

[My debate with Holden Thorp. UNC, Feb 8, 2022 online](#), Luana Maroja, Heterodox STEM, February 26, 2022

“This February, I participated in an online conversation with Holden Thorp, moderated by Christopher Clemens. It was part of the series “Science and Democracy” at UNC – the video is available [here](#). Thorp is currently the editor-in-chief of Science magazine. Having started his career as a chemistry professor, Thorp also served as a Chancellor of UNC Chapel Hill, and as provost at Washington University in St Louis. In his role as an editor of Science, Thorp writes frequently about [politics](#) and [social justice](#), with representative titles such as “Trump Lied about Science” and “Science Needs Affirmative Action.” ... The next question was about the rise of ideologically driven students' resistance to conversations on "controversial topics" in the classroom. This question was based on my [Atlantic](#) piece. I, and colleagues from multiple institutions, have been observing increasing ideological intolerance in the science classroom, most often occurring in discussion sessions, questions, and in private emails to the teacher. I first noticed this pattern the year that Trump was elected. I was teaching genetics that semester, and, as before, I introduced the concept of heritability by talking about a controversial topic: IQ differences between countries. As I had done many times before, I presented the large average difference in IQ scores between the inhabitants of the United States and those of my home country, Brazil. I asked students to think about the limitations of the data, which do not control for environmental differences, and explained that the raw numbers say nothing about whether observed differences are indeed “inborn” — that is, genetic. To my surprise, some students started arguing that it is impossible to measure IQ, that IQ tests were invented to ostracize and marginalize minority groups, and that IQ is not heritable at all. This is an example of students pushing back against an observation they dislike, not by using scientific arguments, but by employing an a priori moral commitment to equality, anti-racism, and anti-sexism ... After the discussion was over, we had the Q&A session – there were 86 questions in total and the moderator selected a few. The most interesting one was about how much we should be “coddling students.” Thorp asserted that universities were originally created for people who look like him, referring to the first universities in medieval Europe. ... What Thorp does not seem to realize is how offensive it is when it is argued that inclusiveness requires special accommodations, such as lowering the expectations for people who “look like me.” I described my experience of participating in a training session for a hiring committee at the college where I now teach. During this session, we were told that “we cannot expect as much from Latina women [as from white men], because they have more obligations towards family,” something I found incredibly insulting, as if I don’t have the agency to decide how to balance my own time just like anyone else. ... In many instances during the conversation and in his writings, it is clear that Thorp subscribes to a Woke worldview. He believes in the value of diversity, but assumes that the diversity can be attained only by lowering the bar for women and minorities, and that “inclusion” can be achieved by excluding white males.”

[Science Needs Honesty, Not Affirmative Action](#), John Staddon, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, March 9, 2022

“Holden Thorp is a very clever fellow. With a PhD in chemistry from Caltech and after some business ventures and a spell teaching at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, he ascended to the

chancellorship of the university in 2007 at the young age of 43. He resigned in 2013 amid allegations of widespread academic fraud in the Chapel Hill Department of African and Afro-American studies. Undeterred, Thorp went on to become provost at Washington University in St. Louis. In 2019 he became Editor-in-Chief of *Science*, one of the two premier general-science journals (the other is *Nature*, published in the UK). As his years in administration accumulated, Holden Thorp seems to have become committed to the fundamentally anti-science dogma of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), which he now proclaims from his lofty *Science* perch. Cleverness is not incompatible with passion, as Mr. Thorp demonstrated in a recent Twitter exchange. The topic was affirmative action; the stimulus was what a tweeter deemed a “stunning” comment by Pedro Domingos, an emeritus professor of computer science. First the tweets, and then to Thorp’s influential editorial contribution. Domingos wrote, “Half of the female STEM [science, technology, engineering, and math] faculty in the US were hired over more qualified men.” To which Thorp responded: “Amplifying this so people will know not to join this jerk’s lab.” *Passion*, possibly, but *science*, no.”

[The American Bar Association’s “Diversity” Agenda Endangers the Integrity of the Legal Profession](#),

Sarah Perry & Zach Smith, The Heritage Foundation, March 31, 2022

“SUMMARY: The American Bar Association’s new standard does not promote intellectual diversity, but instead focuses exclusively on legally questionable, surface-level diversity of admitting and hiring “underrepresented groups, particularly those related to race and ethnicity.” The American Council of Trustees and Alumni rightly observes that “in the world of higher education, diversity has come to mean a preference for a diversity of backgrounds, but not a diversity of views.” Through its proposed “diversity, equity, and inclusion” standard—combined with its other efforts to establish racial preferences across the entire profession—the ABA seeks to return the study and practice of law to an era in which Americans placed a shameful emphasis on skin color and race.”

[Meet the 24-year-old North Carolinian behind a national movement for a “race-blind America”](#), A.P.

Dillon, North State Journal, March 31, 2022

“Color Us United, an organization based out of Morrisville, North Carolina, is behind a national effort advocating for a “race-blind America.” According to the group’s website, “We are the voice of those who oppose dividing America by race, religion, sexual orientation or any other characteristic. We resist those who divide Americans in the name of “racial equity” — in government, schools, corporations, journalism, or social media.” At just 24 years old, Kenny Xu serves as the president and main spokesperson for Color Us United. In an interview with North State Journal, Xu noted the debates going on in the public discourse about what the appropriate response to race relations should be in this country and he says that the best response is “race blindness.” “We should not use it [race] to hire. We should not use it to promote. We should not use it to admit either for or against anybody,” Xu said. “We should strive to treat people as individuals.” Xu is the author of the book *An Inconvenient Minority*, and the host of the podcast *Inconvenient Minority*, which does deep dive investigations into race, identity, and culture. “The current narrative, unfortunately, is propagating a very divisive view that says that we need to use race in everything and furthermore that America is a racist country and they use the racist country to justify that,” said Xu. “And I think both of those tenants are seriously questionable and need to be taken down, which is why we [Color United] started.” Xu is a graduate of Davidson College with a major in math and minor in philosophy. He currently resides in Raleigh. Before leading Color Us United, Xu worked at Young America’s Foundation before writing his book. “I fell in love with NC while at Davidson and always knew it would be the place to make my home and build a national nonprofit based upon the ordinary goodness of Americans,” said Xu of his decision to live in the Tarheel state.”

[What's Driving the Free-Speech Crisis on College Campuses](#), Jonathan Butcher, The Heritage Foundation, April 8, 2022

"Campus "shout-downs" have made headlines for over a decade. But what are the driving forces behind them and the riots that increasingly plague colleges across the country? Rioting students and their faculty supporters are not just expressing disagreement. They are vying for power in the name of critical race theory. Pay careful attention to their actions and the words they use. In last month's incident at Yale, rioters pounded on the walls in the hallway after they left the room, "making it difficult to hear the panel." In a recent shout-down at the University of California, rioters yelled for 45 minutes at guest speaker Ilya Shapiro, who found himself in the spotlight after tweeting about President Biden's Supreme Court nominee, Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson. Regardless of what you think about Mr. Shapiro's tweets or Yale's guest speakers, the students at Yale and in California were not protesting, they were trying to make sure some ideas could not be heard at all. Through these actions, these students were living out the worldview of critical theory and its philosophical children, critical race theory and critical gender studies. They view everything in public and private life as the result of power imbalances. ... State lawmakers should consider policies that protect anyone who wants to listen and be heard in public areas of public college campuses. Public universities should be prepared to issue consequences to individuals, including students, who exercise the "Heckler's Veto," and they should engage local law enforcement as necessary to keep people safe. Private university leaders should adhere to their own statements supporting free speech."

[Critical Race Theory and the Long March Through the Institutions](#), C. Bradley Thompson, The Redneck Intellectual, April 26, 2022

"Ordinary Americans got their first real taste of Critical Race Theory in 2019 when the *New York Times* published a special issue of its weekend magazine dedicated to what it called the "1619 Project," which was a compilation of essays, commentaries, poems, and photographs demonstrating the racist roots of American history. Then, starting sometime in the Spring of the 2020-21 school year, CRT exploded onto the American scene..... And with the introduction of Critical Race Theory to the national consciousness, a whole new lexicon of words and phrases entered the American dialect such as "unconscious racial bias," "whiteness," "white privilege," "white fragility," "white identity development," "internalized racial superiority," "color consciousness," "systemic racism," "race essentialism," "white-washed curriculum," "intersectionality," "intergenerational trauma," "culturally responsive education," "pedagogy of liberation," "emancipatory curriculum," "racial mapping," "decolonization," "spirit murder" (what government schools do to "children of color"), "oppressor/oppressed," "anti-racist therapy," and so on. ... Critical race theorists old and new reject the attempt by both classical and 20th-century liberals to create a colorblind society via legal institutions that do not discriminate on the basis of race.... And what does "systemic" racism actually look like in practice, according to its proponents? In August 2020, a racial task force in Durham, NC, issued a 68-page report to the cities' leaders claiming to demonstrate the nature of structural racism in North Carolina. According to the report, the North Carolina criminal legal system was designed to "protect white people by controlling people of color"; the housing system was designed to "create and maintain private white land by controlling the access people of color have to such land"; the economic system was designed to "build and sustain wealth for a select group of white people by ensuring that people of color and poor whites lack access to build and sustain wealth"; the health-care system was designed to "privilege the health of white bodies at the expense of the bodies of people of color"; and, most importantly, the education system was designed to "indoctrinate all students with the internalized belief that the white race is superior." This is what they mean by systemic racism. It's here, it's there, it's everywhere, but, oddly, the only people who can actually see it are the CRT Shamans, who see racism where no one else does."

[The CRT-Industrial Complex](#), C. Bradley Thompson, The Redneck Intellectual, May 10, 2022

In my essay on “[Critical Race Theory and the Long March Through the Institutions](#),” I examined *what* Critical Race Theory (CRT) is and what its philosophic origins are. The primary purpose of the present essay is to show *how* CRT made its way into America’s K-12 government school system. My specific concern is to highlight the various delivery mechanisms by which the Education Deep State smuggled CRT into America’s schools. ... The corollary principles of CRT include: First, the rejection of concepts such as “objectivity” and “truth” as white constructs. According to two leading CRT proponents, Gloria Ladson-Billings and William F. Tate, all “knowledge” and “truth” is relative: “truths only exist for this person in this predicament at this time.” Second, the repudiation of all the core values, principles, virtues, and institutions associated with the West, such as equality, liberty, individual rights, private property, merit, work, personal responsibility, equal protection under the law, neutrality, due process, federalism, freedom of speech color blindness, constitutionalism, separation of powers, and, most of all, capitalism because white people identify with them. ... Third, the assumption that virtually everything good or great produced by Anglo-European culture and its American offshoots is inherently racist and built on the slave labor of others, and therefore must be deconstructed, dismissed, or destroyed. ... Fourth, the demand that “critical” education be used to delegitimize, subvert, and overturn American society. Critical Race Theory is concerned first and foremost with turning students into advocates, activists, and change agents pushing a political agenda defined by radical egalitarianism. ... Without question, the principal transmission belt delivering Critical Race Theory directly into the bloodstream of America’s K-12 schools is through America’s teacher-training institutions. For almost thirty years now, CRT has dominated the pedagogic philosophy of the nation’s “ed” schools.”

[The Public Discourse Program at UNC-Chapel Hill: Expanding Students’ Minds](#), Grace Hall, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, May 13, 2022

“Since the rise of social media, many students have gotten used to discussing difficult topics within the protection of their own echo chambers. Students are often not expected to defend their points of view or engage with others of differing opinions. While universities frequently support such closed-mindedness with “safe spaces” and the barring of certain speakers from campus, some university programs and faculty are attempting to push back against this anti-intellectual trend. One such program is housed at UNC-Chapel Hill, the mission of which, in part, is “to teach a diverse community of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to become the next generation of leaders.” Some at UNC seem to recognize that students cannot become future leaders without being able to debate and have civil conversations with those who disagree with them. Students need to practice such skills and receive exposure to a wide range of ideas. This need is what propelled the founding of the Program for Public Discourse (PPD).”

[Why Does Racial Inequality Persist?](#) (30min video), Glenn Loury, Old Parkland Conference, American Enterprise Institute, May 13, 2022

“A specter of racial conflict is growing in America. Persisting black disadvantage across so many fronts in our country’s economic and social life continue to puzzle intellectuals, politicians, journalists, and activists. What are we to make of racial inequality, and how can we address it? In his keynote remarks, Glenn Loury contended that socially-mediated behavioral issues lie at the root of today’s racial inequality problem, that these problems are real and must be faced squarely, and that these are American problems, not merely matters of concern to black people.”

[Discrimination and Disparities: Is Policing a Bigger Problem Than Crime?](#) (58min video), Panel discussion among Janice Rogers Brown, Roland Fryer, and Rafael Mangual moderated by Jason Riley, Old Parkland Conference, American Enterprise Institute, May 13, 2022

“Are racial disparities in arrests and incarceration evidence of racist policing? Is over-policing a primary threat to the safety of black communities, as Black Lives Matter activists and others have argued in recent years? Should we reduce police resources and prosecute fewer crimes? Do black men have more reason than others to fear law enforcement? Is the drug war driving “mass incarceration”?”

[The Shock of Freedom and the Reinvention of Racism](#) (50min video), Shelby Steele interviewed by Ian Rowe, Old Parkland Conference, American Enterprise Institute, May 13, 2022

“Nearly six decades after the end of Jim Crow, are black Americans still oppressed? Does a persistent focus on racism as the sole cause of inequality help or harm the advancement of black Americans? Ian Rowe and Shelby Steele discussed these questions and more. Steele argued that racism is not the primary challenge facing black people in this country today, but rather the question of how to steward freedom. He argued that denial is often the first response to freedom, and that social reform efforts in recent decades have been more effective in giving white people relief from the charge of racism than they have in encouraging the development of black people.”

[Affirmative Action Reconsidered](#) (65min video), Panel discussion among Gail Heriot, Kenny Xu and Devon Westhill moderated by Mene Ukuieberuwa, Old Parkland Conference, American Enterprise Institute, May 13, 2022

“Since the 1970s, Americans have been divided over the merits of affirmative action, while the courts have hemmed and hawed over the legality of race-conscious policies. What is the track record of racial preferences? Do they benefit the black poor, as proponents claim? Do they stigmatize beneficiaries? Do they increase racial resentment? Does affirmative action harm black students by placing them in schools where they are unprepared to handle the work and less likely to thrive? Are there alternative ways of addressing black underrepresentation at elite schools and in white-collar professions? How should the Supreme Court decide the discrimination case filed by Asian students against Harvard?”

[The Fairmont Conference: Four Decades Later](#) (25min video), Jason Riley, moderator, Old Parkland Conference, American Enterprise Institute, May 13, 2022

“In 1980, the economist Thomas Sowell organized the Black Alternatives Conference, which reporters later dubbed the Fairmont Conference because it was held at the Fairmont Hotel in San Francisco. The goal of the Fairmont Conference was to bring together people within the black community who had unorthodox views about addressing social inequality and to showcase those views to a media establishment that too often covered racial controversies as though all blacks thought alike. Glenn Loury, Jason Riley, Ian Rowe, and Shelby Steele discussed how the economic, cultural, and political landscape has changed for blacks since the Fairmont Conference and why they were inspired to mount a similar effort in 2022.”

[FIRE releases statement on the use of ‘diversity, equity, and inclusion’ criteria in faculty hiring and evaluation](#), Aaron Ter, Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, June 2, 2022

“FIRE is concerned by the proliferation of college and university policies requiring faculty applicants or current faculty to demonstrate their commitment to “diversity, equity, and inclusion,” often through a written statement that factors into hiring, reappointment, evaluation, promotion, or tenure decisions. In our newly released Q&A and full Statement on the Use of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Criteria in Faculty Hiring and Evaluation, we explain how DEI statement policies can too easily function as ideological litmus tests that threaten employment or advancement opportunities for faculty

who dissent from prevailing thought on DEI. ... Of course, institutions of higher education have both the authority and obligation to prevent unlawful discrimination on campus, as well as an interest in employing faculty who work toward the academic success of students of various backgrounds and identities. But DEI policies frequently go further, compelling faculty to affirm contested views on matters of public debate or to embed specific ideological perspectives in their academic activities. This violates faculty members' individual rights and thwarts values like intellectual freedom, epistemic humility, and open-mindedness that underlie a university's mission to produce and disseminate knowledge. As our [statement explains](#), these policies are especially concerning given that "[adverse consequences](#) for those who hold or voice dissenting, minority, or simply unpopular opinions are increasingly common on campus." The last thing universities need is another tool for enforcing ideological conformity, this time in the form of politicized DEI statement policies."

[Lori Lowenthal Marcus: Ethnic studies courses are marinating students in antisemitism](#) (65min video), Interview on Top Story with Jonathan Tobin, Jewish News Syndicate, June 30, 2022

"In this week's episode, JNS editor-in-chief Jonathan Tobin discusses both recent Supreme Court cases defending religious liberty and the need to "separate the state from the new secular woke religion on race, sex and gender." According to Tobin, this set of beliefs that is rooted in Marxism and being brought into the schools is nothing less than a secular state religion that seeks to silence dissent. He's joined by Lori Lowenthal Marcus, the legal director of the Deborah Project, which is suing to halt the teaching of an anti-Semitic ethnic studies curriculum in California. Marcus warns that the course is marinating kids in hatred and provides the same rationale that led to violence against Jews in the streets of Los Angeles."

[When Black Lt. Gov. Winsome Sears Tried to Help Purge Racism From Schools, NAACP Called Her A 'Pawn' In White Supremacy](#), Kenny Xu, The Federalist, July 8, 2022

"On May 10, Virginia's newly elected Lt. Governor Winsome Sears [released an amicus curiae brief](#) siding with a fairer, merit-based admission system and limiting affirmative action programs. Sears showed support for the *Students for Fair Admissions (SFFA) vs. Harvard* and *SFFA vs. University of North Carolina* cases, in which SFFA sued both universities for unlawfully discriminating against Asian American applicants in violation of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. ... Essentially, Sears filed to eliminate race as a factor in admissions evaluations. "The right to a good education doesn't come at the expense of denying another the right as well... We are not about to deny educational rights to Asian children. Rather, we are to ensure that all children have access to educational opportunities," Sears said in a press release. ... However, the Virginia NAACP, the state's "largest nonpartisan civil rights organization in the Commonwealth," attacked Sears for advocating that merit should be valued over race. On May 14, the NAACP [released a statement](#) claiming that overturning *Grutter vs. Bollinger* will hinder minority access to education and that "mass incarceration" of minorities and "opportunity gaps" in K-12 education proves there is an ongoing racism problem in America. Amy Tillerson-Brown, chair of the Education Committee for the Virginia NAACP, stated in response to the Sears amicus curiae: "Any American who values racial equity or opportunity, should not allow themselves to be used as pawns in the larger game of White supremacy." Tillerson-Brown seems to be implying that Sears, a black woman, is in fact a "pawn" in the white supremacist agenda. This is, of course, a ludicrous idea in the sense that all Sears is really advocating for is to *stop* racism, particularly against qualified Asian and white candidates who just want to be judged in admissions based on their individual merit."

[UNC-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees adopts resolution affirming free speech](#), David N. Bass, Carolina Journal, August 3, 2022

“The Board of Trustees for the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has unanimously adopted a resolution affirming the school’s commitment to academic freedom and freedom of speech on campus. “Our universities, particularly, should be the place where we most expect the freedom to challenge the status quo, both in society and amongst the folks in the institution itself,” said vice chair John Preyer. “We should expect this to be a place where we are encouraged to understand and articulate positions other than our own in a fair and honest manner.” The vote, on July 27, followed a presentation on the results of a new survey from UNC-CH faculty that gauged how comfortable students of conservative, moderate, or liberal viewpoints are about expressing their views in class or on campus. The survey queried randomly selected students at a cross-section of UNC System schools, including UNC-Chapel Hill, Appalachian State, N.C. Central University, and UNC-Greensboro. Although the report concluded that faculty “generally do not push political agendas,” campuses still “do not consistently achieve an atmosphere that promotes free expression” and “students who identify as conservative face distinctive challenges.” A greater proportion of conservative students felt “uncomfortable giving honest opinions in class” on issues such as race, police, immigration, and masks. Liberal students felt the most comfortable sharing their viewpoints, with moderate students falling in the middle. On the question of which students are most engaged, the survey found that students who were “less open-minded, less adept at perspective taking, and more likely to harbor negative stereotypes” felt the most freedom to speak out. Students also expressed a larger appetite for hearing conservative speakers on campus. That support held true even among self-identified liberal students: “Among students who identify as liberal, there is often more support for inviting more conservative speakers than for inviting more liberal speakers.” “We talk a lot about diversity, equity, and inclusion,” said board of trustees member Marty Kotis. “Diversity also means diversity of opinions and freedom to explore thoughts. I just feel like we could say it’s the most critical issue going on right now. And it certainly is among conservative families out there when they’re deciding where to send their children.””

[An Inconvenient Minority: The Harvard Admissions Case and the Attack on Asian American Excellence](#), Kenny Xu, Diversion Books, August 9, 2022

“In *An Inconvenient Minority*, journalist Kenny Xu traces elite America’s longstanding unease about a minority potentially upending them. Leftist agendas, such as eliminating standardized testing, doling out racial advantages to “preferred” minorities, and lumping Asians into “privileged” categories despite their deprived historical experiences have spurred Asian Americans to act. Going beyond the *Students for Fair Admission (SFFA) v. Harvard* case, Xu unearths the skewed logic rippling countrywide, from Mayor Bill de Blasio’s attempted makeover of New York City’s Specialized School programs to the battle over “diversity” quotas in Google’s and Facebook’s progressive epicenters, to the rise of Asian American activism in response to unfair perceptions and admission practices. Asian Americans’ time is now, as they increase their direct action and amplify their voices in the face of mounting anti-Asian attacks. *An Inconvenient Minority* chronicles the political and economic repression and renaissance of a long ignored racial identity group—and how they are central to reversing America’s cultural decline and preserving the dynamism of the free world.”

[Diversity, Equity and Inclusion is tearing academia apart](#), John D. Sailer, The Post, UnHerd, August 10, 2022

“Ideological litmus tests are becoming the norm in American academia. Already, many universities require faculty job candidates to submit “diversity statements” — 19% of the faculty job listings in one recent survey. Now, similar requirements increasingly apply to sitting faculty members, as diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) statements and criteria have become standard components of the promotion and tenure process. To give one example: last year, the highly-ranked Oregon Health and Science University School of Medicine released its Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Anti-Racism Strategic Action

Plan, listing dozens of “tactics” for advancing social justice. Here is an example: “Include a section in promotion packages where faculty members report on the ways they are contributing to improving DEI, anti-racism and social justice. Reinforce the importance of these efforts by establishing clear consequences and influences on promotion packages.” The reference to “consequences” reads like a warning to dissenters, especially given that concepts such as “equity”, “anti-racism”, and “social justice” often simply connote adherence to progressive political views.”

[The Reopening of the American Mind](#), Wenyuan Wu, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, August 10, 2022

“In 1987, philosopher Allan Bloom published *The Closing of the American Mind*, a book critiquing higher education in America. As a self-described teacher “dedicated to liberal education,” Bloom offered a thoughtful account of illiberal cultural and ideological trends: *Civic education turned away from concentrating on the Founding to concentrating on openness based on history and social science. There was even a general tendency to debunk the Founding, to prove the beginnings were flawed in order to license a greater openness to the new. What began in Charles Beard’s Marxism and Carl Becker’s historicism became routine.* Over three decades later, moralistic assaults on the American political traditions of constitutional neutrality, rationalism, freedom, and equality under the law have not dissipated. Attacks on free speech have particularly intensified, manifesting as both “cancelation” of dissenting individuals and self-censorship. Some would argue that Bloom’s “closing of the American mind” thesis is playing out in real time. Yet every action invites a counter-action. Though examples of the phenomenon are too numerous to recount, one anecdote and two data points are worth mentioning here. Last September, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) canceled a guest science lecture by University of Chicago professor Dorian Abbot due to his support for merit-based college admissions. ... Some would argue that Bloom’s “closing of the American mind” thesis is playing out in real time. Yet every action invites a counter-action. Those who believe in the value of free speech are not just going to surrender this hard-fought principle and constitutional right. After the Abbot incident, a group of MIT alumni, faculty, students, and friends formed the MIT Free Speech Alliance (MFSA), a nonprofit and nonpartisan organization created to “promote and defend MIT’s cardinal values,” including free speech and expression, viewpoint diversity, academic freedom, and open scientific inquiry. ... MFSA joins the Alumni Free Speech Alliance, a growing national network founded in October 2021 by alumni groups from Cornell University, Davidson College, Princeton University, the University of Virginia, and Washington & Lee University. ... If American higher education continues its leftward lurch undeterred, and its leaders increasingly give in to the mob’s woke fragility, the financial cost of platforming controversial speakers will only get higher. More young students will be incited to shout speakers down or even use violence to stop their compatriots from hearing politically incorrect ideas.”

[‘Students who identify as conservative face distinctive challenges’: report](#), Lena Branch, Campus Reform, August 13, 2022

“On May 17, the University of North Carolina (UNC) System released a report on the status of “Free Expression and Constructive Dialogue” at member schools. Key findings of the report included that “[c]ampuses do not consistently achieve an atmosphere that promotes free expression,” “[s]tudents who identify as conservative face distinctive challenges,” and “[s]tudents across the political spectrum want more opportunities to engage with those who think differently.” The report conducted extensive surveys among students across campuses such as UNC Chapel Hill, UNC Asheville, and UNC Charlotte, and built on a previous study on the same subject conducted by UNC-Chapel Hill in 2019. One notable finding of the 2020 survey was that conservatives were more likely than liberals at UNC Chapel Hill to self-censor their political beliefs, with survey results showing that 41% of conservatives, as opposed to

9% of liberals, have “[s]elf-censored more than once. Mandatory diversity statements are widespread at UNC. The most egregious example comes from the university’s school of medicine.”

[Mandatory DEI Statements Undermine Academic Freedom at UNC-Chapel Hill](#), John D. Sailer, Article, National Association of Scholars, August 15, 2022

“In my recent trio of reports—which examined civics education at the universities in [Texas](#), [Utah](#), and [Arizona](#)—I found a consistent trend: In each state, universities had recently created policies requiring diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) evaluations for faculty promotion and tenure. ... These DEI requirements for promotion and tenure are [becoming ubiquitous](#), but they build on a more established trend—namely, mandatory “diversity statements” for job applicants. The American Enterprise Institute conducted a [survey of university job listings](#) and found that 19 percent required diversity statements, which are commonly used to [weed out job applicants](#). ... It’s hard not to see these as ideological litmus tests. ... This brings me to the University of North Carolina (UNC). Recently, UNC-Chapel Hill [reaffirmed its commitment](#) to the Chicago principles on free expression and adopted the Kalven Committee Report, a statement that codifies the principle of institutional neutrality, promising “a heavy presumption against the university taking collective action or expressing opinions on the political and social issues of the day.” Mandatory DEI evaluations come in conflict with both sets of principles. A university that asks its faculty to state their commitment to politically-coded concepts is hardly neutral. Such statements make it likely for scholars to be penalized for expressing opinions held by many Americans. ... All told, 19 out of the 234 jobs currently listed require diversity statements, in disciplines ranging from politics, to art history, to medicine, to chemistry. While UNC-Chapel Hill has not yet taken the diversity statement policy as far as some other institutions, this snapshot reveals that many candidates who apply to teach and research at UNC-Chapel Hill will have to submit diversity statements in order to have their application considered. All told, 19 out of the 234 jobs currently listed require diversity statements, in disciplines ranging from politics, to art history, to medicine, to chemistry. While UNC-Chapel Hill has not yet taken the diversity statement policy as far as some other institutions, this snapshot reveals that many candidates who apply to teach and research at UNC-Chapel Hill will have to submit diversity statements in order to have their application considered. Those who are required to submit statements will be assessed on such metrics as “examples of how you have incorporated equity into your research, teaching and/or service,” “how you will contribute to an inclusive environment at the [university],” and perhaps the most on-the-nose, “[evidence of] family, community, civic, religious, political, academic, clinical or work efforts that further the goals of equity and inclusion.” To put it lightly, this seems to fly in the face of UNC-Chapel Hill’s commitment to free expression and institutional neutrality.”

[Which Way for Chapel Hill?: UNC’s Board of Trustees adopts a resolution on free expression and institutional neutrality—but the school’s academic departments remain committed to ideological coercion](#), John D. Sailer, City Journal, August 26, 2022

“Last month, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill Board of Trustees passed a resolution reaffirming the [Chicago Principles](#) on free expression and adopting the [Kalven Committee Report](#) on institutional neutrality. In doing so, UNC became the first institution other than the University of Chicago to adopt both sets of principles, which together provide an unequivocal articulation of the value of academic freedom. Such a statement should prompt us to ask: What’s next? How will this newly clarified commitment to academic freedom play out? One obvious measure presents itself. The university should take aim at an egregious policy widely adopted in academia—the use of diversity statements for hiring, promotion, and tenure. The Chicago Principles promise “the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn.” The Kalven Committee Report argues that universities harm their basic mission when they make statements or take collective action on controversial issues because such statements pressure faculty to conform to the university’s official

stance. Thus, the report ultimately endorses institutional neutrality because of a more fundamental principle: that scholars cannot fulfill their role, the pursuit of truth, if pressured to affirm specific political and social views.”

[Six Unsettling Features of DEI in K-12: A guide for parents, educators, and anyone concerned about new curricular interventions](#), The Editors, Journal of Free Black Thought, August 30, 2022

“The purpose of this article and its associated downloadable [PowerPoint](#) is to make available, for parents, educators, and all who care about K-12 education, information about some of the potentially harmful ideas and practices around race that have become increasingly prevalent in K-12 education. For convenience, we call these new ideas and practices “DEI,” that is, “Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.” Other terms you may have seen for roughly the same phenomenon include “Critical Race Theory (CRT),” “(critical) social justice,” “diversity work,” and “antiracism.” This is not to say that there are no constructive alternative-DEI / alternative-to-DEI frameworks out there. There are, and we discuss some in the final section. It is merely to say that the broad mainstream of the DEI industry, now asserting itself in classrooms everywhere, tends to evince some unsettling features. Some of these features are the subject of this post.”

[Affirmative Distraction: Racial preferences won’t solve racial inequality](#), Glenn C. Loury, City Journal, Autumn 2022

“Racial inequality is deep and abiding, showing no sign of going away, and we are a lesser nation for it. Yet while affirmative action helps to obtain an adequate representation of diverse ethnic groups at elite institutions of higher education, it imposes serious costs. Institutionalizing the practice of preferential affirmative action when assessing African-Americans for selection into highly competitive arenas—in other words, using different standards when judging the fitness of blacks competing with others for access to certain venues—is inconsistent with the goal of racial equality. It invites us to become liars—to pretend that false things are true. It invites us to look the other way. It’s not equality; it’s the opposite of equality. ... True equality would seek to remedy the foundational circumstances reflected in the underrepresentation of African-Americans at the Bronx High School of Science, Brooklyn Tech, Holy Cross, or Harvard. I’m for racial equality, not patronization. Don’t patronize my people, inflict on us the consequences of a soft bigotry of low expectations, or presume that we’re not capable of manifesting excellence in the same way as any other people. ... Affirmative action has nothing to do with whether blacks go to college; it’s about which colleges we go to. Policymakers can close the college education gap without practicing affirmative action. This policy is really about the most selective institutions—about choosing elites. That’s all the more reason to be exercised about the prospect that those choices would become grounded in a permanent and institutionalized practice of judging blacks by a different standard.”

[In higher education and beyond, race-based policies stifle individualism and ultimately harm everyone](#), Wen Fa, SCOTUSBlog, October 27, 2022

“The Supreme Court will hear arguments in cases involving race-based admissions policies against the backdrop of a larger discussion about the meaning of 14th Amendment and its guarantee of equality before the law. Some contend that the 14th Amendment promises equality of outcomes among broadly defined racial groups. To them, the government must act to remedy racial disparities — regardless of cause — in employment, economic status, health care, education, housing, and countless other areas. That vision of the 14th Amendment is misguided in two fundamental ways. First, the 14th Amendment protects not equality of outcomes but equality of liberty. The principle was enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, which recognized that all persons are created equal — each endowed with unalienable rights such as “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” America failed to put this principle

into practice for decades after the Founding. But after a bloody civil war, Congress attempted to guarantee equality before the law through the passage of the 14th Amendment. Senator Jacob Howard, in a speech introducing the amendment to the Senate, praised the amendment's guarantee of equal rights. He explained that the 14th Amendment "gives to the humblest, the poorest, the most despised of the race the same rights and the same protection before the law as it gives to the most powerful, the most wealthy, or the most haughty." ... The principles undergirding the 14th Amendment are key to understanding what is at stake in cases challenging race-based admissions policies at Harvard and the University of North Carolina. Both schools admit that admissions officers may use race in admissions to ensure that the demographics of the incoming class are aligned with the demographics preferred by the universities."

[What we want the Supreme Court to know about race and admissions](#), Kevin Guskiewicz, The Charlotte Observer, October 30, 2022

"On Oct. 31, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill will appear before the U.S. Supreme Court to argue that diversity on campus is essential. We are making our case for the value of diversity not only for our campus but for the thousands of colleges and universities that have been working for decades to provide the opportunity of higher education to all Americans who want to go to college. As chancellor of UNC-Chapel Hill and a member of the faculty for 27 years, I have a front row seat to the impact of a diverse student body and why it is important for the future of our nation. ... We consider everything we know about each student who applies, including their race, because each one has a unique story. No single factor ever decides admission. But taken together, they help us create a Carolina education that prepares everyone for the world that awaits beyond graduation. ... Now the Supreme Court is weighing whether universities may continue to use race as one factor among many in admissions decisions. At Carolina, we are firmly committed to diversity in all forms and its importance for our students' education. Other public universities in states that have banned race-conscious admissions have faced enormous difficulty achieving diversity when race is excluded from that equation."

[Why is the ADL on the side of the racists in the affirmative action case?](#), Jonathan S. Tobin, Jewish News Syndicate, November 1, 2022

"A lot is on the line as the U.S. Supreme Court begins deciding two separate cases on the use of race-based admissions policies at universities. The practice, commonly known as affirmative action, is rooted in the notion that race-based discrimination was necessary to correct the racist policies of the past. The use of race in this manner has survived several court challenges over the past few decades, but the above cases—in which the non-profit group, Students for Fair Admissions, is suing both the University of North Carolina and Harvard—may finally put an end to it. ... A lot is on the line as the U.S. Supreme Court begins deciding two separate cases on the use of race-based admissions policies at universities. The practice, commonly known as affirmative action, is rooted in the notion that race-based discrimination was necessary to correct the racist policies of the past. The use of race in this manner has survived several court challenges over the past few decades, but the above cases—in which the non-profit group, Students for Fair Admissions, is suing both the University of North Carolina and Harvard—may finally put an end to it."

[Editorial: Supreme Court needs to follow the law, uphold UNC affirmative action in admissions](#), Capitol Broadcasting Company, November 1, 2022

"If the U.S. Supreme Court does away with affirmative action in college admissions, as it appears poised to do after it heard arguments over a challenge to the policies at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Monday, it won't be because of the law or the facts. It will be because a majority on the court just doesn't like it. ... Standing outside the Supreme Court building and wearing a Carolina blue Old

Well tie, UNC Chancellor Kevin Guskiewicz cut through the legalese: “Today was really about values. Today was about the value of diversity. It’s a fundamental value that is core to our mission at Carolina. For that reason, we believe in our holistic admissions process. “At Carolina, we are building better citizens and if we remove race as one of the many factors we consider in admission decisions, we jeopardize that effort. Our students are preparing to enter diverse workforces and if they do not have experience on group projects or in their dorm rooms with people who have different perspectives and life experiences, they will fall short of their potential.”

[Opening Remarks](#), John H. Cochrane, Academic Freedom Conference, Stanford Classical Liberalism Initiative, November 4-5, 2022 [Links to 17 videos showing presentations by: Jonathan Haidt; Jerry Coyne, Luana Maroja, Anna Krylove & Mimi St Johns; Peter Thiel; Dorian Abbot, Peter Arcidiacono, Richard Lowery & John Hasnas; Lee Jussim; John Rose, Solveig Gold & Joseph Manson; Niall Ferguson, Tyler Cowen & John H. Cochrane; Gad Saad, John Ellis & Eric Kauffman; Bjorn Lomborg, Noah Diffenbaugh, Jay Bhattacharya & John Ioannidis; Jordan Peterson & Douglas Murray; Greg Lukianoff, Nadine Strossen, Shweder & Robbins; Scott Atlas; Ilya Shapiro, Eugene Volokh & Michael McConell; Steven Pinker; Amy Wax, Joshua Katz, Elizabeth Weiss & Frances Widdowson] “The two-day Academic Freedom Conference aimed to identify ways to restore academic freedom, open inquiry, and freedom of speech and expression on campus and in the larger culture, and restore the open debate required for new knowledge to flourish. The conference focused on the organizational structures leading to censorship and stifling debate and how to repair them.”

[The University of North Carolina fights for the right to racial discrimination](#), Andy Jackson, The Carolina Journal, November 5, 2022

“Using race to determine who gets admitted into college contradicts American ideas of fundamental fairness. When is it fair to penalize someone in the college admissions process because of race? Nothing short of overturning *Grutter v. Bollinger* will end racial discrimination in college admissions in our — or even our children’s — lifetimes. It is well past time for the court to end race-based admissions.”

[An Existential Threat to Doing Good Science](#), Luana Maroja, The Free Press, November 7, 2022

“As an evolutionary biologist, I am quite used to attempts to censor research and suppress knowledge. But for most of my career, that kind of behavior came from the right. In the old days, most students and administrators were actually on our side; we were aligned against creationists. Now, the threat comes mainly from the left. The risk of cancellation at Williams College, where I have taught for 12 years, and at top colleges and universities throughout this country, is not theoretical. My fellow scientists and I are living it. What is at stake is not simply our reputations, but our ability to pursue truth and scientific knowledge. If you had asked me about academic freedom five years ago, I would have complained about the obsession with race, gender and ethnicity, along with safetyism on campus (safe spaces, grade inflation, and so on). But I would not have expressed concerns about academic freedom. We each have our own woke tipping point—the moment you realize that social justice is no longer what we thought it was but has instead morphed into an ugly authoritarianism. For me that moment came in 2018, during an invited speaker talk, when the religious scholar Reza Aslan stated that “we need to write on a stone what can and cannot be discussed in colleges.” Students gave this a standing ovation. Having been born under dictatorship in Brazil, I was alarmed.”

[What the Justices Heard and Said](#), Wenyuan Wu, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, November 7, 2022

“One week ago today, attorneys for Students for Fair Admissions (SFFA) laid out their cases against Harvard and the University of North Carolina before the U.S. Supreme Court. The justices also heard arguments from attorneys representing the defendants and the Executive Branch. While the plaintiff held firm on the narrowly tailored position that racial preferences are wrong, proponents of race-based affirmative action brought to the Court overblown theatrics concerning diversity. Putting an end to race-conscious college admissions would, they explained, have devastating effects on campus diversity, which could not be compensated for by race-neutral alternatives.... The glaring issue with the reasoning that diversity itself is on trial is that the multidimensional nature of diversity makes the concept impossible to substantiate and quantify. Justice Sotomayor defaulted to *racial* diversity by arguing that “race is part of culture and culture is part of race” while hearing the UNC case. But her comment is an oversimplifying one. A lopsided emphasis on racial diversity crowds out more constitutionally and legally permissible forms of diversity. In a recent interview with the *Wall Street Journal*, legal scholar David Bernstein pinpoints the contrast between the arbitrary use of racial box-checking and the reality of nuanced ethnic diversity. He is right. Among the 46.8 million Americans who self-identified as Black in a 2021 Pew survey, 10 percent were foreign-born, while 41 percent of those born between 1997 and 2012 are multiracial. Similar “within-group” diversity exists among Asian Americans, around 60 percent of whom were foreign-born from more than 20 countries of origin. As for the 62.5 million Hispanic Americans, about 27.6 million identified as multiracial, and 20 percent identified as white (compared with 53 percent in 2010).”

[1620: A Critical Response to the 1619 Project](#), Peter W. Wood, Encounter Books, November 8, 2022
“AMAZON: Peter Wood argues against the flawed interpretation of history found in the *New York Times*’ 1619 Project and asserts that the true origins of American self-government were enshrined in the Mayflower Compact in 1620. When and where was America founded? Was it in Virginia in 1619, when a pirate ship landed a group of captive Africans at Jamestown? So asserted the *New York Times* in August 2019 when it announced its 1619 Project. The *Times* set out to transform history by tracing American institutions, culture, and prosperity to that pirate ship and the exploitation of African Americans that followed. A controversy erupted, with historians pushing back against what they say is a false narrative conjured out of racial grievance. This book sums up what the critics have said and argues that the proper starting point for the American story is 1620, with the signing of the Mayflower Compact aboard ship before the Pilgrims set foot in the Massachusetts wilderness. A nation as complex as ours, of course, has many starting points, most notably the Declaration of Independence in 1776. But the quintessential ideas of American self-government and ordered liberty grew from the deliberate actions of the *Mayflower* immigrants in 1620.”

[The Extended Parasite: On the Design of the Diversity Bureaucracy](#), Mason Goad, Minding the Campus, November 14, 2022

“Much has been said about diversity, inclusion, and equity (DIE) ideology—an amalgamation of postmodernism and critical theory—but few scholars, if any, have bothered to study the DIE bureaucratic structure itself. In *The Extended Organism* (2000), Dr. J. Scott Turner examined how animals “construct and use structures to harness and control the flow of energy from their environment.” If we seek to excise the DIE ideologues—the “brainworms,” as Turner later analogized them—we should examine the DIE bureaucracy as an extended organism, or better yet, as an extended parasite. We must understand how its structure was intentionally designed to foster blind obedience to authority.... Consider the rising trend of required “diversity statements.” It is no coincidence that the practice has become a favorite tool of the DIE bureaucracy. Critics of this practice have argued that such statements function as ideological litmus tests, but few have realized the significant psychological ramifications for those who—even begrudgingly—acquiesce to the DIE bureaucracy. Diversity

statements certainly operate as litmus tests, but they are also the first step in the extended parasite's greater function: to harness and control the energy—the obedience—of the DIE ideologue's environment.... Leftist movements have long used labels that sound wholesome to mean something else entirely. Words such as "liberal" and "progressive" have reigned over the most illiberal and regressive of social movements—the DIE bureaucracy has recently co-opted the term "antiracism" for similar purposes. To be a genuine antiracist is perhaps the single most meaningful role that one can play in an ethnically heterogeneous society like the United States. Unsuspecting people will, naturally, cling to the title, even if that means submitting themselves to illogical policies.... There are many policy-based pesticides that we may deploy against the DIE bureaucracy, but sunlight is a solid disinfectant. Educating others about these psychological "traps" will be useful, as will thorough explanations of what DIE ideology actually is and why it proves so harmful."

[From Russia with Love: Science and Ideology Then and Now](#), Anna Krylov, Heterodox STEM, November 28, 2022

"My everyday experiences as a chemistry professor at an American university in 2021 bring back memories from my school and university time in the USSR. Not good memories—more like Orwellian nightmares. I will compare my past and present experiences to illustrate the following parallels between the USSR and the US today: (i) the atmosphere of fear and self-censorship; (ii) the omnipresence of ideology (focusing on examples from science); (iii) an intolerance of dissenting opinions (i.e., suppression of ideas and people, censorship, and Newspeak); (iv) the use of social engineering to solve real and imagined problems. ... I will begin with a Russian joke from my childhood.

A kid comes home from school and says: "Daddy, today we had a civics lesson and the teacher told us about the Constitution."

Dad: "Uh-hum."

Kid: "He told us in the USSR we have a Constitution, just like in America."

Dad: "Uh-hum."

Kid: "And that our Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, just like in America."

Dad: "Well, the difference is that the American Constitution also guarantees freedom *after the speech*." Today, perhaps, not quite. I am sure many of you have read Orwell's books—*1984* and *Animal Farm*. If it has been a while, you should reread them now. You may find them much more relevant than you did 20 years ago. Orwell's characters live in a dystopian reality in which control of the individual by ideology has been taken to its limit. In the USSR, we lived in such a dystopia. When I read Orwell's books in the late 80s, I was stunned. *How did he know* what it was like to live in our country, the happiest and most-progressive on the planet? When I left the USSR in 1991, shortly after the Wall came down, I thought that the oppressions of totalitarian regimes would be a thing of the past; a story you tell your grandchildren, and they tell you, "Oh, come on, grandma, you are making this up." I thought I would never again experience an atmosphere of ideological control, omnipresence of ideology, policing of speech and thought, suppression of dissent, compelled speech, fear, and self-censorship. We must forcefully resist this rise of illiberalism before it is too late. It will not go away on its own. ... Do your share in defending humanism, democracy, and the liberal Enlightenment."

[Unpopular, Polarizing, and Ineffective: Affirmative action's days may finally be numbered](#), Jason L. Riley, City Journal, Winter 2022

"Last year, in anticipation of two Supreme Court cases challenging the use of race as a factor in college admissions, the *New York Times* ran a story on public opinion of affirmative action. The coauthors queried a dozen college students and were flabbergasted by the responses, though they shouldn't have been. ... "Rarely have we been as surprised by a focus group as when we asked this racially and socioeconomically diverse group of 12 students whether they supported affirmative action in college

admissions. Just one person said yes.” ... A Pew Research Center poll from 2019 found that 73 percent of respondents, including 78 percent of whites, 65 percent of Hispanics, 62 percent of blacks, and 58 percent of Asians, say that “colleges should not consider race in admissions.” In 1996, voters in California, not only the most populous state but also one of the most racially and ethnically diverse, approved a ballot initiative that barred the use of race in admissions at public universities. Over the next quarter-century, eight other states adopted similar restrictions. And in 2020, Californians soundly rejected a ballot referendum that would have overturned the 1996 ban. ... When it comes to skepticism of affirmative-action policies, the issue isn’t whether today’s college students are “left-wing activists who aren’t in touch with the real world” but rather whether that description better applies to *New York Times* journalists and other liberal elites. ... Still, support for the equal treatment of blacks isn’t the same thing as support for racial quotas, statistical parity, or double standards, and lawmakers at the time made that clear. The floor manager of the Civil Rights Act in the House, Representative Emanuel Celler, said that the bill contained “no authorization” for mandating “racial balance in given schools.” Senator Humphrey echoed that sentiment with respect to the workplace, assuring colleagues that the legislation “does not require an employer to achieve any kind of racial balance in his workforce by giving preferential treatment to any individual or group.” Hence, not only does the Civil Rights Act prohibit employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin; it also states clearly that nothing in the law requires an employer “to grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on account of any imbalance which may exist . . . in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of such race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in any community, State, section or other area.” ... Notwithstanding past warnings from the Supreme Court, these schools [Harvard, University of North Carolina] are obviously using race as a large and decisive factor. The only question is whether the justices will end the charade or let the discrimination continue while selective colleges and universities pursue indefinitely what U.S. Solicitor General Elizabeth Prelogar described in oral arguments as their “diversity goals.””

[The Great Parent Revolt: How Parents and Grassroots Leaders Are Fighting Critical Race Theory in America's Schools](#), Lance Izumi, Wenyan Wu & McKenzie Richards (editors), Pacific Research Institute, December 7, 2022 [Includes contributions by Gabs Clark, Joshua, Xi Van Fleet, Elena Fishbein, Asra Nomani, Elina Kaplan, Lia Rensin, Nicole Solas, Kelly Schenkoske, Emile Ortiz-Wichmann, Mari Burke & Ryan Girdusky] “AMAZON: The instruction of critical race theory in America's schools, popularized through controversial curriculum such as the 1619 Project, has disrupted classrooms from coast to coast and impacted families from every ethnic, cultural, and income background. *The Great Parent Revolt* profiles ordinary people who have taken on the extraordinary task of defeating the most divisive doctrine to ever threaten America's children. These are parents, grandparents, educators, students and community leaders who have been affected, directly or indirectly, by the sweeping forces of thought conformity and political indoctrination in public schools. These grassroots agents of change come from vastly different backgrounds. They are immigrants and native-born Americans. Their political views span the ideological spectrum. But through their activism and advocacy, they are standing up for fundamental values of equality, liberty, and freedom, and for the shared future of our next generation. Most had never engaged in activism before. But meeting in living rooms and coffee shops, they launched effective grassroots movements that have successfully stopped the growth of these destructive policies in their communities, and protected students from being ostracized and bullied at school. Through their courageous stories, *The Great Parent Revolt* aims to inspire other frustrated parents and community members across the country that they, too, can fight back against the education bureaucracy - and gives them the tools to stop classroom indoctrination.”

[Time to end affirmative action?](#), Nick Gillespie & Zach Weissmueller, moderators, discussion with David Bernstein & Kenny Xu, Reason TV, December 8, 2022

“The Supreme Court might end race-based college admissions with upcoming rulings in two cases: one involving Harvard, the other the University of North Carolina, both filed by the non-profit Students for Fair Admissions. Should universities, and other institutions, take race into account when considering applicants? When considering that question, does it matter that Harvard is a private university, while UNC is a state school? And should the U.S. government abandon racial classification altogether? Join Reason’s Nick Gillespie and Zach Weissmueller this Thursday at 1 p.m. Eastern for a live discussion of these questions and more with David Bernstein, a law professor at George Mason University and author of the book *Classified: The Untold Story of Racial Classification in America* and Kenny Xu, president of Color Us United, a non-profit “advocating for a race-blind America” and author of *An Inconvenient Minority: The Harvard Admissions Case and the Attack on Asian American Excellence*.”

[White Students Are Prohibited from Applying to This UNC Fellowship](#), Aaron Sibarium, Washington Free Beacon, December 19, 2022

“The public university dragged into court over its race-conscious admissions policy is now advertising a research fellowship that bars white applicants from applying. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill—whose affirmative action program, along with that of Harvard University, is under review by the Supreme Court—sponsors the Fellowship for Exploring Research in Nutrition, which accepts applications exclusively from students who are “Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC),” [according to the program’s website](#). Fellows earn thousands of dollars, live in on-campus apartments paid for by the university, and receive generous mentorship opportunities, including letters of recommendation.”

[The Radicalization of Race: Philanthropy and DEI](#), Katharine Gorka & Mike Gonzalez, The Heritage Foundation, December 21, 2022

“DEI’s practices violate the Constitution and the Civil Rights Act. Numerical quotas, government race-conscious policies, and speech codes do nothing to close the real disparities of achievement, because they do not address the root causes. DEI eradicates the best aspects of the American experiment, which have brought prosperity and opportunity to so many—the rule of law, respect for individual rights, and equal treatment under the law. Many Americans instinctively embrace DEI because the words diversity, equity, and inclusion each have dual meanings. Indeed, each of these concepts, in its original meaning, is central to the American ethos. ... But the fact is that each of these words has been distorted to mean the very opposite of its original intention. As a result, these words as they are now understood in the DEI paradigm are taking the United States in a direction opposed to what the Founders had originally intended. How did this divergence come about and what are the assumptions that drove it?”

[Abolish DEI Bureaucracies and Restore Colorblind Equality in Public Universities](#), Christopher F. Rufo, Ilya Shapiro & Matt Beienburg, Manhattan Institute: Issue Brief, January 18, 2023

“There is a lot that state legislatures can do to reverse the illiberal takeover of higher education through Diversity, Equity, Inclusion (DEI) offices that, ironically, stifle intellectual diversity, prevent equal opportunity, and exclude anyone who dissents from a rigid orthodoxy. Here are four proposals for reforming public universities: 1. Abolish DEI bureaucracies. 2. End mandatory diversity training. 3. Curtail political coercion. 4. End identity-based preferences. These rather straightforward reforms would go far in pushing back on some of the negative trends that have afflicted higher education.” [Detailed Model Legislative Text is offered.]

[The Plan to Dismantle DEI: Conservatives take on colleges’ “illiberal” bureaucracy](#), Eric Kelderman, Chronicle of Higher Education, January 20, 2023

“Two influential conservative think tanks described in detail on Wednesday how legislatures could dismantle the administrative structures that support diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts at public colleges. [Model state legislation](#), written by scholars at the Manhattan and Goldwater Institutes, if passed, would prohibit colleges from hiring diversity, equity, and inclusion officers; bar trainings that instruct staff to identify and fight against systemic racism; eliminate requirements for employees to commit to diversity statements; and could disallow even institutional commitments to social justice and recommendations that students be addressed by their preferred pronouns. “This package is meant to reverse illiberal tendencies that have swept across higher education in the past decade,” said Ilya Shapiro, one of the authors of the model bill and a senior fellow and director of constitutional studies at the Manhattan Institute. It’s the means of the DEI efforts that are more of a problem than the goals of making campuses more diverse and inclusive, Shapiro wrote in an email. “Should colleges afford equal opportunity? Reach out to underprivileged communities to make sure otherwise qualified students aren’t being overlooked? Make students feel welcome and supported on campus? Of course — all of these are no-brainers,” he wrote. But institutions should pursue those outcomes, he added, in a way that doesn’t “determine and enforce hierarchies of privilege, compel speech, or extend preferential treatment based on race, gender, sexual orientation, etc.”

[UNC Chapel Hill to launch School of Civic Life to advance civil discourse, open inquiry](#), Jennifer Kabbany, The College Fix, January 30, 2023

“The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill will work to develop a School of Civic Life and Leadership to teach students in an age of cancel culture and censorship how to develop the knowledge and skills needed to advance and support a healthy democracy. The Board of Trustees voted 12-0 on Thursday to support the creation of the school, with Chair David Boliek stating prior to the vote the school would ideally embed within the campus community an environment in which to learn from one another rather than to see each other as “foes to vanquish.” “The curriculum would be anchored in the study of core texts with particular attention to the foundations of the American experiment and all that comes with it,” Boliek [said](#). “...The school would create the space for free speech [and] a culture of civil and open inquiry.””

[At UNC, More Good News on Free Expression](#), Jenna A. Robinson, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, January 30, 2023

“With new policies and a new school, the UNC System, the UNC Board of Governors, and UNC-Chapel Hill are making history. UNC is the first state university system in the country to consider a policy banning compelled speech. If the Board adopts the policy next month, it will put the UNC System, and UNC-Chapel Hill in particular, at the forefront of free-speech protections. On January 18, the governance committee of the UNC Board of Governors took the first step by voting to approve a new policy prohibiting employees from soliciting or requiring an “employee or applicant for academic admission or employment to affirmatively ascribe to or opine about beliefs, affiliations, ideals, or principles regarding matters of contemporary political debate or social action as a condition to admission, employment, or professional advancement. Nor shall any employee or applicant be solicited or required to describe his or her actions in support of, or in opposition to, such beliefs, affiliations, ideals, or principles.” ... With the adoption of this policy, the UNC System will be the public university leader in free-speech protection. Already, North Carolina has better free-speech policies than most states, including the [Campus Free Speech bill](#) passed in 2017, a systemwide commitment to free expression, and more “green lights” from FIRE than any other state. The new policy will add to those protections, ensuring that prospective faculty and students are evaluated based on the merits of their work, not their political or ideological commitments. This is an important step to creating a climate of free thought and expression on campus. With this policy, the UNC System could serve as a model for other systems and

institutions around the country. ... The UNC System and UNC-Chapel Hill are leading the way on free expression, viewpoint diversity, and academic freedom. Over the last 10 years, the changes across the UNC System have been the most comprehensive in the country. It is indeed a good day to be a Tar Heel."

'I'm flabbergasted': UNC leaders blindsided by trustees' decision on School of Civic Life and Leadership, Abby Pender, The Daily Tar Heel, January 30, 2023

"When UNC law professor Eric Muller first read the editorial headline, he said his eyes fell out of his head. On Jan. 26, the Faculty Executive Committee member was in a Zoom meeting when he saw a screenshot of a Wall Street Journal editorial titled "UNC Takes on the University Echo Chamber." "I thought: how on Earth? How on Earth could the Wall Street Journal know this," Muller said. The UNC Board of Trustees passed a resolution on Thursday to "accelerate" the creation of a new program — the School of Civic Life and Leadership. Provost Chris Clemens said at a Monday Faculty Executive Committee meeting that he didn't know the resolution was coming from the Board — "I was surprised," he said. Proposals for new schools, degrees and curriculums have historically come from faculty leaders and their vote is required for approval. ... According to the resolution, the trustees' requested to accelerate the development of the School for Civic Life and Leadership with the goal of promoting democracy and benefitting society. "The board doesn't have any ability to propose a class, to propose a degree, or — for God's sake — to propose a school," Holden Thorp, who served as UNC's chancellor from 2008 to 2013, said. He said the BOT's resolution is an example of the "worst governance" he thinks he's ever seen. ... The announcement of the School comes after a series of tensions regarding University leadership and many see the announcement of the School as a political decision. "If you get praised by the Wall Street Journal (Editorial) page, you're getting praised for being a conservative," Thorp said. ... Thorp said the current most "potent" Republican talking point is the "woke indoctrination" of higher education. He also noted the Program for Public Discourse is popular with the Republican Legislature and Republican-leaning trustees. Thorp said he thinks the BOT tipped off the Wall Street Journal Editorial Board for a "conservative perspective" on the resolution. The editorial was published hours after the BOT voted on the resolution with direct quotes from trustees. ... Thorp said that the BOT's development of the resolution is ironic considering trustees want UNC to excel in national rankings, yet they "alienate" the faculty allowing the University to succeed. "It's further erosion of trust between the faculty and the administration," Thorp said. ... In a tweet following the meeting, Thorp said it was significant that administrators were "surprised" by the resolution. No functional board would do this," he wrote. "Dark, dark times in Chapel Hill."

ACTA Lauds UNC Board of Trustees for Bold Commitment to Civic Values, Freedom of Expression, and Intellectual Diversity on Campus, American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA), Press release, January 30, 2023

"In a unanimous vote, UNC-Chapel Hill's Board of Trustees moved to establish the School of Civic Life and Leadership at the university. The School of Civic Life and Leadership will be a stand-alone program with its own dean and faculty and an ideologically balanced roster of courses, which will count toward UNC-Chapel Hill's core requirements. The board's vision does not entail removing or redeploying current faculty; rather, the board intends to recruit additional scholars to enhance the diversity of its faculty and broaden course offerings within the new school. The university's 30,000 students will have the opportunity to take courses on history, literature, philosophy, political science, and religion, taught with the multiplicity of perspectives that build mature understanding."

Should North Carolina Follow Ron DeSantis' Example on CRT?, Brittany Ramer, John Locke Foundation, January 31, 2023

“Gov. Ron DeSantis of Florida has announced that his state is expanding its efforts to remove diversity, equity and inclusion funding from public universities. It’s part of a broader Higher Education Reform legislation. In addition, underperforming professors are also going to fall under greater scrutiny. Is this an example that North Carolina should follow? When it comes to education, parents remain greatly concerned about Critical Race Theory (CRT) and how that curriculum has infiltrated classrooms from the elementary to the university level. Many states have debated or signed into law legislation against such indoctrination, especially for school-age children. Florida is leading the charge in many ways on this issue via its “Stop Woke Act,” and now it’s extended even further at the university level. It’s an important step as it will minimize CRT influenced diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) curricula from funneling into classrooms in the future via teachers. ... This effort by DeSantis is clearly having an impact on university education. Is it something that North Carolina should consider as well?”

[PETITION: North Carolinians Deserve Better Healthcare Than What DEI Provides](#), Color Us United, February 2023

“The doctor that treats you should be the most qualified doctor available to you, not the doctor that has received the most amount of social justice training. Yet that’s exactly what UNC Medical School is doing: replacing vital medical training courses with social justice courses and diminishing the quality of its doctors in the service of a false social justice agenda. ... To stop the woke invasion of the UNC Medical System, you need to let UNC Dean Wesley Burks know patients will not stand for it. In fact, you should demand that Dean Burks rescind this woke framework and make clear UNC’s sole focus is excellence in health care. You should also demand full transparency. UNC should be explicit about what standards for admissions have been changed and how. The school should be open about if and how they are making it easier for anyone to achieve a medical degree. ... Fortunately, we have given you an opportunity to easily make your voice known by signing the petition below. ...”

[New generation of leaders at UNC values thought diversity](#), Michael Jacobs, The Carolina Journal, February 6, 2023

“Recently, the BOT announced the creation of the School of Civic Life and Leadership, which will have its own dean and will hire at least 20 faculty members with diverse ideologies to teach courses such as political science, philosophy, religion, and history free from indoctrination. As expected, there has been significant blowback from the faculty. Now more than ever, the board and the administration need to work together to achieve a common goal. The goal of the new venture is not to become a conservative offset to the liberal bias on campus as many will claim. It is to allow students to pursue knowledge and learn critical thinking free from political bias. The new school will recruit faculty committed to free speech and open thought with the express goal of allowing students to hear and debate both sides of an issue before embracing a viewpoint. That is very difficult to accomplish when faculty members who are registered to vote as Democrats outnumber Republicans 16 to 1. Students who would rather be free from conflicting ideas are still welcome to take courses that already exist.”

[UNC Chapel Hill trustees vote unanimously to establish School of Civic Life and Leadership](#), Talia Barnes, FIRE News, Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, February 3, 2023

“A free speech culture — if you can keep it. That’s the challenge raised by University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill’s Board of Trustees, who voted 12-0 on Jan. 26 to establish the School of Civic Life and Leadership, a new academic unit featuring for-credit courses on history, literature, political science, and more. According to the [American Council of Trustees and Alumni](#), the school will provide a space for UNC students to “explore American civic values with the full freedom of expression, intellectual diversity, and open inquiry that such studies require.” An admirable goal. And it begs the question: Is such freedom currently lacking at UNC? In short, reports vary. While the school ranks relatively

favorably in FIRE's [2022 Free Speech Rankings](#) — placing 23 of 203 schools surveyed and boasting a rare “green light” speech code rating — its students reported in that survey only a limited degree of comfort expressing ideas: ... If this vision is realized, it will mark a decisive step toward cultivating a culture of free speech at the North Carolina university, which — as a public institution — is already legally obligated to protect the First Amendment rights of its students and faculty. Further, it will benefit all American institutions of higher ed, which may use it as a proof-of-concept in developing their own free speech-friendly initiatives.”

[UNC Trustees: Let's set the record straight on the new school at Chapel Hill](#), David L. Boliek Jr & John P. Preyer, The Charlotte Observer, February 8, 2023

“The overwrought reactions in some quarters to plans for a School of Civic Life and Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill show why it's so badly needed. Some history is in order: The idea of a UNC-CH curriculum in civic virtues and civil discourse has been under development since Barack Obama was president. The framework for a new school (or a new curriculum within an existing school) is a natural outgrowth of the university's Program for Public Discourse, founded four years ago. It also builds on the university's IDEAs in Action program, which strengthens students' ability to think critically, work collaboratively and communicate persuasively. ... As with any curriculum, the administration and faculty would devise the new school's courses. Our board has not dictated what to teach or whom to hire. We simply said: Get going — the need is urgent.... A recovery of the civic purpose of universities might be the path to earning back the broad trust of the people we serve. We think it should begin with our great public universities, starting in Chapel Hill.”

[A Power Game at UNC to Undermine Unwoke Governance](#), George Leef, National Review, February 9, 2023

“Last year, Cooper set up a commission to study UNC, and it was not clear what the point was. Now, however, the reason seems clear: to enlist the university's accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, to threaten sanctions if the board's reforms aren't overturned.”

[Gov. Cooper's UNC “Commission” Shows Its Hand](#), Jenna A. Robinson, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, February 9, 2023

“By enlisting the UNC-System's accreditor in its power grab, the new governance commission threatens legitimate board oversight. ... At the end of last year, Governor Roy Cooper surprised North Carolina higher-education leaders with his creation of a [Governor's Commission on the Governance of Public Universities in North Carolina](#). The commission has no official authority over the UNC System or the North Carolina General Assembly, so it's unclear what Cooper hoped to accomplish. Soon after the commission's creation, a legislative staffer in House Speaker Tim Moore's office [tweeted](#) that its recommendations would be “dead on arrival.” A WUNC reporter [concurred](#), saying, “The obvious shortcoming here is that @NC_Governor can't mandate anything. In order to systemically change how the UNC Board of Governors is chosen, the legislature would have to voluntarily give up appointing power. That ain't happening.”

[The University of North Carolina Fight Escalates](#), Editorial Board, Wall Street Journal, February 12, 2023

“The school's accreditor issues an implicit threat against the board of trustees for creating a new school to protect free inquiry. The kerfuffle we reported two weeks ago over a new school for free expression at the University of North Carolina keeps getting more complicated, and not in a good way. Opponents are now suggesting that UNC's accreditation could be in jeopardy over the board of trustees' plan to create the new School of Civic Life and Leadership without the blessing of the faculty. At a meeting Tuesday of the Governor's Commission on the Governance of Public Universities in North Carolina,

accreditation official Belle Whelan declared that the UNC board would be getting a letter from her agency. Ms. Wheelan is president of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS), which accredits UNC, and she referred to “a news article that came out” on the plan to create a new school. Ms. Wheelan and SACS have a history of political meddling in university governance. As the main accreditor for the Southern states, SACS has tangled with the University of South Carolina, schools in Florida, and Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis. In August Mr. DeSantis signed a bill requiring Florida universities to periodically change accreditors, in an effort to break the SACS stranglehold on state schools. Threatening UNC’s accreditation swings a hammer because schools can’t receive federal financial-aid dollars without it.”

[N.C. State Requires DEI Statements from Student Applicants](#), Carolina Partnership for Reform, February 14, 2023

“N.C. State University requires prospective students to explain how they intend to “contribute to a more diverse and inclusive N.C. State environment” if granted admission.... By our analysis, it’s the only university in the UNC System to include such a requirement on its undergraduate application. We can’t divine the intent of N.C. State’s application writers or the admissions officer who evaluates these statements to determine which students earn acceptance. But we can render a pretty good guess on the impact: N.C. State’s DEI prompt almost certainly stops qualified and intelligent high school students who would have applied but for that question from entering N.C. State’s applicant pool. More ominously, it may keep qualified and intelligent high school students who answer the question honestly, but in a way that doesn’t adhere to N.C. State’s DEI orthodoxy, from being accepted at all. A popular (and nonpolitical) podcast that offers parents advice for helping their children navigate college admissions called the question “the loudest, most vocal, bold, even brazen” example of a DEI statement requirement they’ve seen in the admissions process.”

[What Are Chapel Hill Faculty Afraid Of?](#), Michael Poliakoff, Inside Higher Ed, February 15, 2023

“The UNC Chapel Hill board is doing its job—and a good one at that—in proposing a new School of Civic Life and Leadership... At a time when public confidence in higher education has dropped sharply—14 percentage points in just two years—the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is moving forward with purpose, civility and a can-do attitude. It is sad, though hardly surprising, that at least some members of the UNC faculty are challenging rather than celebrating the prospect of the proposed School of Civic Life and Leadership. Critics of the Board of Trustees’ resolution to establish the new school have attacked it as a violation of shared governance. This could not be further from the truth. UNC Chapel Hill recognizes that the academic freedom of its faculty is essential to the university’s mission. But *shared* governance means that the duty of ensuring that students graduate prepared for career, community and citizenship comes from the partnership of board, administration and the faculty.”

[It’s time to separate government from race](#) (63min video), “Top Story with Jonathan Tobin,” with guest David Bernstein, Jewish News Syndicate, February 16, 2023

“While racism undoubtedly exists, obsessing over it and treating it as the single defining characteristic of our society and every individual in it is toxic, according to JNS editor-in-chief Jonathan Tobin. This focus on race is not only undermining the enormous progress America has achieved in the 60 years since the triumph of the Civil Rights movement, says Tobin, but is also widening the fissures between groups and making the country a more hostile and dysfunctional place. The rise of the Black Lives Matter movement and the imposition of woke commissars to enforce diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) rules, along with intersectional ideology and the growing influence of critical race theory teachings in academia, the arts and the government represent a revival of the worst aspects of Jim Crow America,

in which race was similarly declared to be both crucial and immutable, says Tobin. This isn't merely ironic, but is the defining tragedy of America in the third decade of the 21st century, he states. Tobin is joined by law professor and author David Bernstein to discuss his new book, "Classified: The Untold Story of Racial Classification in America." Bernstein explains that government classifying people by race has deep roots in American history, but its modern use to enforce civil rights laws has led to arbitrary and often illogical groupings that have little or nothing to do with redressing past racial injustice."

[Group advocating for 'race-blind America' demands woke UNC medical school stop injecting social justice issues into its curriculum - as it attempts to 'force doctors to be activists and politicize medicine'](#), Stephen M. Lepore, DailyMail.com, February 19, 2023

"A group advocating for 'race blind America' has launched a campaign to stop the University of **North Carolina**'s medical school integrating social justice issues into its curriculum. **Color Us United** is a non-profit that claims to fight for people who 'are upset by government, corporate and media claims that America is a hateful country'. Its most recent initiative is a bid to stop the UNC School of Medicine from implementing social justice into its teaching - which the school is attempting to do **via a task force** that gave recommendations in 2020 that is taking advisement from the Association of American Medical Colleges. ... The AAMC protocols also require medical students to study issues such as 'Unconscious Bias Awareness,' 'Understanding and Responding to Microaggressions' and 'Understanding that America's medical system is structurally racist.'"

[NC State reverses course on DEI application question](#), David N. Bass, Carolina Journal, February 21, 2023

"North Carolina State University will no longer require applicants to answer an essay question affirming the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) agenda, according to the school's media relations department. N.C. State has come under fire for the question, which tells students the university "is committed to building a just and inclusive community" and rejects "unjust or inhumane treatment" and will denounce it "clearly and loudly." The university then prompts students to write a maximum 250-word essay describing "what those words mean to you and how you will contribute to a more diverse and inclusive environment." In a statement emailed to Carolina Journal, NC State media relations head Mick Kulikowski said the essay question was made mandatory beginning with the 2021 admissions cycle, saying, "Students were not able to submit their applications without answering the question." But moving forward, "the question will no longer be required," Kulikowski said."

[Remarks to the UNC Board of Governors](#), UNC System President Peter Hans, February 23, 2023

"Last Friday, I met with chancellors and student health officials from across the UNC System to talk about one of the most important challenges facing parents and educators everywhere: the soaring rates of anxiety, depression, and loneliness among young people. For more than a decade now, we've witnessed a troubling trend among America's youth. Since 2010, the percentage of American teenagers who experience major depression has more than doubled. The percentage of American undergraduates diagnosed with anxiety or depression has more than doubled. And rates of self-harm and suicide have all risen sharply. I am strongly persuaded by the work of social scientists like Jonathan Haidt and Jean Twenge, who trace much of the problem to this [holds up phone]. Many of our young people now live through their screens, with social life mediated through intentionally addictive apps that are designed to devour attention and sell advertising."

[The Case for Teaching Students Constructive Dialogue at Scale: UNC's New School of Civic Life and Leadership](#), Mark McNeilly, Heterodox: The Blog, Heterodox Academy, February 23, 2023

“At the recent [Stanford Academic Freedom Conference](#), the subtext of the discussion was a debate about how to fundamentally fix the university. One speaker viewed universities’ academic freedom issues as fixable, whereas another saw the problems as beyond repair with the only solution being the creation of new alternatives ensuring free speech and viewpoint diversity for college students and faculty. Both models are on display everywhere: Groups like Heterodox Academy (HxA) and FIRE look to change from within, while University of Austin (UATX) and Ralston are building new institutions for brighter futures. Based on my experience at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), I am in the camp that believes universities are fixable if their leadership is willing to understand they have a problem and take action before it is too late. UNC has recently taken a number of actions to improve academic freedom, free expression, and constructive dialogue on campus, including”

[UNC Board now prohibits asking potential students and employees about personal beliefs](#). Josh Shaffer, The News&Observer, February 23, 2023

“The UNC Board of Governors on Thursday unanimously approved a policy that prevents any of its schools from asking applicants about personal political beliefs when they apply for admission or employment. The board backed the change to its policy manual without discussion and by unanimous vote, but it is not clear that any campuses in the UNC system are doing what is now prohibited. Until recently, N.C. State University had included this question on its undergraduate application: “NC State University is committed to building a just and inclusive community, one that does not tolerate unjust or inhumane treatment, and that denounces it, clearly and loudly. Please describe what those words mean to you and how you will contribute to a more diverse and inclusive NC State environment.” Mick Kulikowski, spokesman for the university, confirmed Wednesday that the question will not be required in the future. It became a requirement for the 2021 admissions cycle. Mick Kulikowski, spokesman for the university, confirmed Wednesday that the question will not be required in the future. It became a requirement for the 2021 admissions cycle.”

[Free Speech in The West](#) (74min video), Douglas Murray, UNC Alumni Free Speech Alliance, University of North Carolina, February 23, 2023

“It is no secret that free speech on college campuses is under attack. Students and professors alike experience pressure to either avoid or hyperfocus on controversial topics with limited room for honest and rigorous debate. What does this tell us about the future of Western civilization? Is the university no longer a marketplace of ideas, questions, argument, and discovery? Are the more difficult topics only an opportunity for complaint, or do we have something to be grateful for from our inheritance? Where do we go from here? UNC Alumni Free Speech Alliance brought best selling author and associate editor of The Spectator, Douglas Murray to the UNC campus on February 23, 2023 to discuss this and more with UNC Chapel Hill students.”

[School Choice Is Not Enough: The Impact of Critical Social Justice Ideology in American Education](#), Zach Goldberg & Eric Kaufmann, Manhattan Institute, February 23, 2023

“Critical Race Theory (CRT) and radical gender ideology are endemic in American schools, with 93% of American pupils reporting that they have been taught and/or have heard from an adult at school one or more Critical Social Justice (CSJ) concepts, including “white privilege,” “systemic racism,” or the idea that gender is a choice unrelated to biological sex. These are some of the findings of a new representative Deltapoll survey of 1,505 young people aged 18 to 20 who recently exited high school. CSJ is not being taught as one theory among others, but, in most cases, as the only respectable approach to race, gender, and sexuality in American society. CSJ instruction is not just window-dressing. As we will show, it is associated with a substantial leftward shift in the attitudes and policy preferences of pupils exposed to these ideas. The more intensively pupils have been exposed to CSJ, the more they lean left on identity

politics and the more white students feel guilty about their ostensible racial privilege. This is a disaster for those who endorse classical liberal ideals such as color-blindness, equal treatment, the scientific method of discovery, and free speech. These results represent a major defeat for those who believe it is important to cultivate pride in American achievements and attachment to American national identity.”

[University of North Carolina moves to ban ‘diversity, equity and inclusion’ statements in anti-woke backlash](#), Kendall Tietz, Fox News, February 24, 2023

““Practices prohibited here include but are not limited to solicitations or requirements for statements of commitment to particular views on matters of contemporary political debate or social action contained on applications or qualifications for admission or employment included as criteria for analysis of an employee's career progression.” Kenny Xu, President of Color Us United, which advocates for a race blind society told Fox News Digital that his organization has been leading a campaign to remove DEI from medical education practice, but he believes the move by UNC will have implications for higher education across the country. "We believe in a race blind, meritocratic society with high standards and that's what has traditionally produced excellence in the United States," Xu told Fox News Digital. "When we saw wokeness and DEI infiltrating the medical profession, that's when we became concerned because medicine is the one place where everybody knows, liberals, conservatives, independents, that you need the most qualified doctor to get the best outcome.””

[Two schools join to hire their first DEI director](#) (3min podcast), Denise Stroud, Carolina Connection, February 24, 2023

“Two schools at UNC have joined together to hire their first director of DEI, or Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. Anthony James is filling that role for the School of Education and the School of Information and Library Science. His hiring comes as DEI efforts have become more controversial in the UNC system.”

[University of North Carolina cancels woke diversity in hiring](#), Isabel Vincent, New York Post, February 25, 2023

“A non-profit that has been advocating for an end to DEI requirements in institutions across the country, took credit for the move. ... Kenny Xu, president of Color Us United, said his group has been behind the push to abolish DEI at UNC’S medical school, and started [a petition](#) that now has 614 signatures. ... The medical school’s [Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure](#) previously declared that “A statement for each area is required as part of the C.V.” and “should outline depth and breadth of efforts in each area, including but not limited to impact of work, philosophy and style, team-based projects, and mentee interactions.” Earlier this month, Florida Governor Ron DeSantis [announced an initiative](#) to ban DEI from state-funded schools.”

[University of North Carolina BANS WOKE: Board of Governors vote to prevent students and staff from being forced to make diversity, equity and inclusion statements](#), Andrea Cavallier, DailyMail.com,

February 26, 2023

“The decision was made at its Board of Governors meeting on Thursday. It comes just days after another North Carolina school - N.C. State University - reversed a requirement asking applicants to answer an essay question affirming the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) agenda. The school started including the question in 2021 on applications saying the university is 'committed to building a just and inclusive community' and rejects 'unjust or inhumane treatment' and will denounce it 'clearly and loudly.' The applicant is then asked to write a 250-word essay describing 'what those words mean to you and how you will contribute to a more diverse and inclusive environment.”

[Imposing Limits on the Woke?](#) (100min video), Chris Rufo interviewed by Peterson, The Dr. Jordan B. Peterson Podcast, February 27, 2023

“In this episode, Dr Jordan B Peterson and Christopher Rufo discuss the creative left, the world of documentary filmmaking, how ideology has seeped in and taken hold of academia, and how Rufo among others are taking an active role in fighting back through legislature. Christopher Rufo is a senior fellow and director of the initiative on critical race theory at the Manhattan Institute. He is also a contributing editor of City Journal, where his writing explores various issues, including critical race theory, gender ideology, homelessness, addiction, crime, and the decline of American cities. Christopher was recently appointed to the Board of Trustees at New College of Florida by Governor Ron DeSantis. Every week, Christopher is creating new videos on his Youtube channel exploring these topics and more. You can find them at <https://www.youtube.com/@christopherrufo>. [Christopher talks about the incipient defenestration of DEI at New College of Florida starting at ca. 1:04:00; quite relevant to beginning of this process at UNC-Chapel Hill]

[Surgeon explains why DEI is harmful to medical care](#), (120min video), Nche Zama, Color Us United, UNC Chapel Hill, February 27, 2023

“Dr. Nche Zama, MD, PhD shares his story about what it takes to be a world-renowned doctor and how black doctors don't need privileges. Dr. Zama received his General Surgery education at the Cleveland Clinic where he served as chief resident and was awarded the George and Grace Crile Traveling Fellowship Award for Exceptional Clinical Skills and Performance. Dr. Zama holds a PhD in Chemistry and a Master of Science degree in Management from Harvard university.”

[Questions for UNC's Accreditor](#), Editorial Board, Wall Street Journal, February 28, 2023

“A *bullying threat to Chapel Hill's trustees over the new School of Civic Life and Leadership may get a higher review. We told you recently about the University of North Carolina's [plans to establish a school for free expression](#) and its [accreditor's brisk announcement](#) that it would investigate that action. Now it looks like the accreditor may be the one answering questions about its bullying. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS) is the accreditor for UNC. SACS President Belle Wheelan told the Governor's Commission on the Governance of Public Universities last month that the UNC trustees' vote to create the school was “kind of not the way we do business” and that SACS would “talk to them . . . and either get them to change it, or the institution will be on warning with [SACS], I'm sure.” Ms. Wheelan is now learning that the accreditor has an accreditor too. In a letter to the Department of Education's National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI), committee member Michael Poliakoff requests a review of SACS and its actions surrounding the UNC School of Civic Life and Leadership.”*

[American Colleges Are Committing Suicide](#), Richard K. Vedder, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, March 1, 2023

“Self-inflicted wounds, not changing demographics, are undermining the higher-ed sector. The evidence is everywhere: American colleges and universities are dying. Not all will die very soon—indeed, probably only a modest portion will. But the trend is unmistakably downward. Why? ... So how *are* colleges killing themselves, committing unintentional suicide? Five ways. ... A third cause of the diminishing academy is the near abandonment on many campuses of a most unique collegiate characteristic: true academic safe spaces where any type of thought and opinion can be openly expressed without fear. Colleges are supposedly a “marketplaces of ideas,” where virtually all forms of non-violent expression are permitted and even encouraged. The search for truth and beauty that John Keats so eloquently wrote about just over 200 years ago (in his “Ode on a Grecian Urn”) is often being restricted. Today, on too many campuses, individuals are kept away or shouted down if they don't adhere to the prevailing campus

ethos—most often radically left and woke. This is despite the fact that most Americans don't want colleges brainwashing students into adopting a particular ideology, either liberal or conservative."

[The Commissars Will See You Now](#), Christopher F. Rufo, City Journal, March 1, 2023

"Florida International University, a public institution, has adopted a radical "diversity, equity, and inclusion" program that condemns the United States as a system of "white supremacy," segregates scholarships and student programs by race, and trains students for participation in left-wing protests and political activism. I have obtained a collection of documents through Sunshine Law requests that reveal a stunning bureaucratic transformation. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) officials at FIU, who serve a population of more than 40,000 undergraduate students, have steadily operationalized the principles of critical race theory and created a vast web of programming that wraps this ideology into nearly every process of academic life. The story begins with the May 2020 death of George Floyd in police custody. ... Following that summer of protest, the ideological programs at FIU intensified. The university's DEI officials implemented a heavy mass of programming designed to control language, thought, behavior, hiring, curriculum, and the distribution of resources according to the dictates of left-wing racialism. This project of ideological capture begins with language. The university's DEI bureaucrats have published an official "Inclusive Language Guide" that condemns some of the most common words in the English language, such as "husband," "wife," "mother," "father," "Mr.," "Mrs.," "she," and "he" as "non-inclusive." In their place, the university suggests, students should use gender-neutral substitutes such as "partner," "spouse," "parents," and "caregivers," and neologisms such as "Mx." and "they/them" for a singular person. The racial-categorization rules are even more arbitrary: "Chinese-American" is discriminatory, but "Chinese American" is acceptable; "Jews" is forbidden, but "People who are Jewish" is fine. The point is not to generate stable and accurate language, but to undermine the basic grammar of life, thus softening the ground for political change."

[Where's the Line?: On the Kalven Report, academic freedom, and the limits of institutional neutrality](#),

Joshua T. Katz, City Journal, March 2, 2023

"Students, faculty, administrators, and the wider public are all paying attention these days to two hot-button topics in higher education: free speech and academic freedom. Meantime, a third topic, institutional neutrality, is slowly rising to national prominence as well. A recent controversy over the invitation of an anti-Semitic speaker to Princeton University highlights a possible fault line between academic freedom and institutional neutrality and suggests that educational institutions would do well to adopt a robust form of the latter as an official stance. The phrase "institutional neutrality" is inexorably associated with principles enshrined in the so-called Kalven Report, adopted by the University of Chicago in 1967. Part of the "Chicago Trifecta," the report, which a faculty committee chaired by law professor Harry Kalven, Jr. issued in the midst of the Vietnam War and which has stood unmodified since, states that there is "a heavy presumption against the university taking collective action or expressing opinions on the political and social issues of the day, or modifying its corporate activities to foster social or political values, however compelling and appealing they may be." There is, however, an exception: the university may take a stand against actions that "threaten [its] very mission." The University of Chicago and UNC are models for other institutions to emulate. "

[Texas A&M University System bans diversity statements from job applications](#), Kate Mcgee, The Texas Tribune, March 2, 2023

"Texas A&M University System Chancellor John Sharp has directed leaders of its 11 universities and eight agencies to stop asking job candidates for statements about their commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion in their applications. Last month, Gov. Greg Abbott's office sent a letter to public universities and state agencies saying that DEI hiring practices violated federal and state employment

laws and barring them from hiring on factors “other than merit.” Legal experts have said the governor’s office mischaracterized the legal practices employers use when considering diversity in their hiring, Sharp said. Thursday he directed all A&M system universities and agencies to review their employment and admissions practices. He said he is standardizing hiring practices systemwide by limiting faculty and staff applications to a cover letter, curriculum vitae, statements on research or teaching philosophies and professional references. “No university or agency in the A&M System will admit any student, nor hire any employee based on any factor other than merit,” Sharp said in a directive sent to university leaders Thursday.”

[In Loco Masculi: The feminization of the American university is all but complete](#), Heather Mac Donald, City Journal, March 5, 2023

“Mills is part of the Great Feminization of the American university, an epochal change whose consequences have yet to be recognized. Seventy-five percent of Ivy League presidents are now female. ... These female leaders emerge from an ever more female campus bureaucracy, whose size is reaching parity with the faculty. Females made up 66 percent of college administrators in 2021; those administrators constitute an essential force in campus diversity ideology, whether they have “diversity” in their job titles or not. ... Female students and administrators often exist in a co-dependent relationship, united by the concepts of victim identity and of trauma. For university females, there is not, apparently, strength in numbers. The more females’ ranks increase, the more we hear about a mass nervous breakdown on campus. Female students disproportionately patronize the burgeoning university wellness centers, massage therapies, relaxation oases, calming corners, and healing circles. ... Female dominance of the campus population is intimately tied to the rhetoric of unsafety and victimhood. ... when students claim to be felled by ideas that they disagree with, the feminized bureaucracy does not tell them to grow up and get a grip. It validates their self-pity. ... The most far-reaching effects of the feminized university are the intolerance of dissent from political orthodoxy and the attempt to require conformity to that orthodoxy. This intolerance is justified in the name of safety and “inclusivity.””

[The University of Michigan Is in a DEI Mess: Frederick Douglass Could Help Them Out of It](#), GianCarlo Canaparo, The Heritage Foundation, March 6, 2023

“Read many of America’s greatest writers about race and legal equality, and you’ll find a similar theme: policies that divide Americans by race, or increase their perception of racial differences, spawn tribalism, separation, and hatred. Frederick Douglass warned that policies fostering racial identity, rather than shared American values, sow “dangerous seeds of discontent and hatred.” Justice Thomas Cooley wrote that distinctions based on race would “assail the very foundations of [our] government.” Justice John Marshall Harlan said that nothing could “more certainly arouse race hate” and “a feeling of distrust between these races” than segregationist policies. And Justice Antonin Scalia, quoting Professor Alexander Bickel, called racially discriminatory policies “destructive of a democratic society.” Scores of others, like Thomas Sowell, Justice Clarence Thomas, and Shelby Steele, have said the same. The University of Michigan did not listen to them, and it is learning its lesson the hard way. As reported in The Michigan Review, one of the university’s student-run publications, the school launched a major Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) initiative in 2016 that made racial identity a key focus for all of the school’s programs and vastly increased the size of its DEI bureaucracy. At the same time, the school conducted Campus Climate Surveys of its students. Comparing those surveys to ones conducted in 2021 reveals some of the harmful effects of that initiative. Students are increasingly self-segregating. Although black and Hispanic enrollment rose slightly, students are increasingly avoiding students of other races, ethnicities, and political views. ... Students are also increasingly unhappy. ... The school is about to launch a new DEI initiative, and this time it ought to pay some attention to the great minds

quoted above. Frederick Douglass offered advice in a 1867 speech called "The Composite Nation." Much of his wisdom is directly applicable to modern universities. Let's hope they take it."

'Appalling Reality': Elite Alumni Set to Strike Down Mandatory Diversity Statements for University Hiring, Alexa Schwerha, Daily Caller, March 6, 2023

"The Cornell Free Speech Alliance (CFSA) is putting together a series of short, educational videos to inform fellow alumni about how diversity statements are used to hire faculty at the elite New York school, the email—sent to CFSA and Alumni Free Speech Alliance members by Carl Neus, a Cornell alum—reads. The series will be sent to "Cornell alumni members and followers to inform our many thousands of followers, supporters, and members regarding the atrocities now occurring at US universities." The course will allegedly include a 30-minute video featuring Daniel Ortner, former Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF) attorney, titled "How DEI (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion) Can Lead To Tyranny." The video was published July 2022 by California Insider. "Alumni should be aware that there is significant evidence already that DEI statements are having an effect of favoring prospective employees with certain viewpoints and excluding others and that this problem is growing," Ortner, who is now a Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) attorney, told the DCFNF."

North Carolina at the Crossroads, Liam Knox, Inside Higher Ed, March 7, 2023

"Early last month, the University of North Carolina system's Board of Governors approved a ban on "compelled speech," preventing colleges from requiring prospective students or employees to "affirmatively ascribe to or opine about beliefs, affiliations, ideals or principles regarding matters of contemporary political debate." The vote was taken in response to an application question that North Carolina State University introduced in 2021, which asked applicants to affirm their commitment to "building a just and inclusive community." N.C. State removed that question a few days before the board's vote. Nathan Grove, a chemistry professor at UNC Wilmington and the chair of the campus's Faculty Senate, said that vote served as a wake-up call for him and his colleagues. ... "We don't ask politically charged questions in our interviews. We just don't," he said. "Are we interested in hearing about how you view reaching out to underserved populations of North Carolina? Yes, we are. But that's also a big concern for the system." Art Pope, a member of the Board of Governors since 2020 and a prolific Republican donor, denied that the compelled speech vote was motivated by politics. "To say that a statute banning political speech requirements is part of a political agenda is absurd," he told *Inside Higher Ed*. "It is anti-political; it is protecting the rights of employees, including university faculty, so they cannot be compelled to subscribe to a political ideology.""

The Right Sort of Racism, Daniel Greenfield, Sultan Knish, March 8, 2023

"Next year a racist country will celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act. Segregation has made a comeback at colleges with racially separate dorms and graduation ceremonies. Corporate employees are expected to join the affinity groups of their race and employers and activists closely scrutinize the race, gender and sexuality of officials, executives and creatives. Call it wokeness, equity or anti-racism, they all amount to a country that has within a short span of time talked itself into constructing the most racist system since segregation. The sixties were trending away from racism while the twenties are rushing headlong into it. Boomers prided themselves on their tolerance while Zoomers make intolerance into their identity. Rodgers and Hammerstein had a point with "You've Got to Be Carefully Taught". Americans have been carefully taught to hate by the highest institutions of learning. No Southern educational institution at the height of slavery could have ever conceived of systemically dedicating entire departments and fields of study to asserting why an entire race must be hated.... Anti-racism appeared to have arrived with a precipitous suddenness, but that is only because it was quietly winning the debate that arose after the splintering of the segregation debate between the

integrationists, like Martin Luther King, and the black nationalists, like Malcolm X. To see who won the debate, don't bother looking at a calendar, look at the culture. MLK may have his holiday and his statues, but it's the black nationalist opponents of integration who won."

[How a Teachers Union Promotes Critical Race Theory](#), The Editorial Board, Wall Street Journal, March 8, 2023

"A toolkit tells teachers how to push radical ideology on children despite Gov. Youngkin's ban. Virginia Gov. Glenn Youngkin won election in 2021 in no small part on education policy, including a promise to ban critical race theory in schools. His first executive order instructed the Superintendent of Public Instruction to review curricula and end the use of "inherently divisive concepts, including Critical Race Theory." But that hasn't stopped the Virginia teachers union from using its pipeline to teachers to promote the teaching of a left-wing political agenda and activism. A "toolkit" pushed by the Virginia Education Association (VEA) shows how they do it. The Black Lives Matter at School organization promotes an annual "week of action," which took place Feb. 6-10 this year. The VEA encouraged its members to participate and offered an instruction manual "to be used as a resource guide for advancing racial justice in Virginia's schools," as Taisha Steele, director of the Human and Civil Rights division at the VEA, wrote in a memo with the materials. By "advancing racial justice," she means following the highly politicized agenda of the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement. The materials show this isn't an attempt to teach black history as part of American history, or to fill in the gaps in black history that no doubt have existed in instruction in the past. Instead, the toolkit promotes 13 "guiding principles" of the BLM movement. These include "working towards a queer-affirming network where heteronormative thinking no longer exists," and "the disruption of Western nuclear family dynamics and a return to the 'collective village' that takes care of each other." The idea that the "nuclear family" is a Western construct would certainly surprise Chinese, Indians or Koreans."

[Keep the SAT](#), The Editors, National Review, March 8, 2023

"Last Wednesday, Columbia University formally announced that it would no longer require SAT/ACT scores for its applicants. It will *permit* applicants to submit test scores, but its stated criteria for candidate evaluation has become . . . holistic. Or, in its words, "purposeful and nuanced — respecting varied backgrounds, voices and experiences — in order to best determine an applicant's suitability for admission and ability to thrive in our curriculum and our community, and to advance access to our educational opportunities." Columbia isn't the first institution of higher learning to make standardized-testing requirements optional, but it is the first Ivy League university to do so. To be clear: Everyone in the world of academia understands this to be a pretext, and a shabby one at that. What Columbia is doing, and what more elite universities may do in the immediate future, is preparing itself for the Supreme Court's upcoming ruling on *Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard* and *Students for Fair Admissions v. University of North Carolina*, cases argued jointly before the Court last October. The upcoming decision is expected, given the composition of the Court, to either strike down or severely limit the sorts of explicit affirmative-action regimes employed by college admissions ever since 2003's egregious *Grutter v. Bollinger* decision. At stake here is the possessiveness elite universities (both public and private) feel over their ability to directly shape the racial and social (and now even political) demography of their matriculating classes."

[The CRT Bans are Working](#), Max C. Eden, National Review, March 9, 2023

"For proof, just look at the best evidence against them offered by opponents. Coverage of public education in the *Washington Post* has developed a habit of making the opposite point of what the reporter appears to intend. In a December article about parental objections to the pornographic book *Lawn Boy*, reporter Hannah Natanson quoted the book's author admitting that his work was

profane and expressing surprise it had made its way into public-school libraries. And her most recent article, "[Slavery Was Wrong: And Five Other Things Some Educators Won't Teach Anymore](#)," actually suggests a more positive and salutary effect from "critical race theory bans" than their proponents could reasonably have hoped for. "For 14 years," the article states, "a North Carolina social studies teacher taught excerpts of Christopher Columbus's journal without incident." Assigned to read Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United States*, students discover that Columbus wrote of the Arawak natives, "They have no iron. Their spears are made of cane. . . . They would make for excellent servants." Students learned from this that Columbus's first thought was about enslaving natives. But as historian Mary Grabar has [documented](#), Zinn was profoundly dishonest here (as he was in so many other places). The ellipses in the quote cover days' worth of Columbus's journal entries. The ellipses hide that Columbus was not speaking his own opinion, but rather referring to the beliefs of the Arawaks' neighbors, who attempted to enslave them. Therefore, a parental complaint led to students no longer learning a false lesson — to which the only appropriate educational value judgment can be: "Great!"

[The Great Feminization of the American University](#) (31min video), Christopher F. Rufo, Substack.com, March 10, 2023

"A response to Heather Mac Donald's provocative new essay on the "mass nervous breakdown on campus." My Manhattan Institute colleague Heather Mac Donald has published a provocative new [essay](#) in *City Journal*.... Mac Donald begins by pointing out that women now constitute the ruling majority on campus: 75 percent of Ivy League presidents, 66 percent of college administrators, and 58 percent of recent graduates are now female. ... In my new video essay, I analyze this cultural shift and explain how the modern university has become a "therapeutic institution," which, according to my recent reporting on university DEI programming, is characterized by the following trends:

- The left-wing victim narrative has moved from an economic axis to a psychological axis, with "traumatizer" and "traumatized" replacing "oppressed" and "oppressed."
- Individual pathology is valorized as a form of marginalized identity.
- This new social system incentivizes trauma, disorder, and emotional displays.
- The ideology expresses itself through a therapeutic bureaucracy that operates according to political ideology.

And the final point: what is the solution? Well, I think it is to put balance back into university life, to restore a balance between these two modes of governance, to restore a balance between empathy and hierarchy. ... So, will we see this? I don't know. I know I'm going to be trying over the course of this year, both as a trustee at a public university and also as a public intellectual, to get this debate back into our culture."

[Unpopular, Polarizing, and Ineffective: Affirmative action's days may finally be numbered](#), Jason L. Riley, *City Journal*, Winter 2023

"In a 1977 Gallup poll, a majority of blacks expressed opposition to special treatment. In a 1997 *New York Times*/CBS News poll that asked how "equally qualified college applicants" should be treated by admissions officials, 69 percent of all respondents and 63 percent of blacks said that "race should not be a factor." A 2001 *Washington Post* survey asked: "In order to give minorities more opportunity, do you believe race or ethnicity should be a factor when deciding who is hired, promoted, or admitted to college, or that hiring, promotions, and college admissions should be based strictly on merit and qualifications other than race or ethnicity?" Ninety-two percent of all respondents and 86 percent of blacks said that such decisions "should be based strictly on merit and qualifications other than race/ethnicity." A Pew Research Center poll from 2019 found that 73 percent of respondents, including 78 percent of whites, 65 percent of Hispanics, 62 percent of blacks, and 58 percent of Asians, say that "colleges should not consider race in admissions." In 1996, voters in California, not only the most

populous state but also one of the most racially and ethnically diverse, approved a ballot initiative that barred the use of race in admissions at public universities. Over the next quarter-century, eight other states adopted similar restrictions. And in 2020, Californians soundly rejected a ballot referendum that would have overturned the 1996 ban. When it comes to skepticism of affirmative-action policies, the issue isn't whether today's college students are "left-wing activists who aren't in touch with the real world" but rather whether that description better applies to *New York Times* journalists and other liberal elites. If, as many who follow this issue expect, the Supreme Court sides with the plaintiffs in *Students for Fair Admissions (SFFA) v. Harvard* and the companion case, *SFFA v. University of North Carolina*, it will not only strike a blow for constitutional color blindness but also align with public opinion as expressed in polling and at the ballot box. As important, the High Court has an opportunity to correct judicial and administrative-state distortions of antidiscrimination law that date back more than a half-century and do much to fuel racial division. ... Duke economics professor Peter Arcidiacono, who authored an expert report on behalf of the plaintiffs in the cases, has demonstrated empirically that an applicant to Harvard with typical credentials has a 25 percent chance of admission if he is Asian. If you leave the credentials the same and change his race to black, his likelihood of admission skyrockets to 95 percent. For out-of-state applicants to UNC, racial gaps in the chances of admission are even wider. Notwithstanding past warnings from the Supreme Court, these schools are obviously using race as a large and decisive factor."

[Diversity director fired for questioning California college's anti-racism policies, she claims](#), Katherine Donlevy, New York Post, March 12, 2023

"A black director of a "woke" California college's Office of Equity, Social Justice and Multicultural Education claims she was fired for questioning the institution's anti-racism "orthodoxy" and what the term "anti-racism" even means. Dr. Tabia Lee said De Anza College, a community college in Cupertino, retaliated after she objected to several campus policies aimed at inclusion. "I was working in a California community college, and I noticed that there was a lot of resistance to my even asking questions about anti-racism, policy efforts and language," Lee told nonprofit [Foundation Against Intolerance and Racism](#). "And I just purely wanted to know what folks meant when they were using those terms. And I encountered a lot of hostility a lot of resistance to me even asking question." She [told Higher Ed](#) she was canned after declining to join a "socialist network," objected to the college's land acknowledgments for an Indigenous tribe and questioned why the word "Black" was capitalized but not "white." Additionally, Additionally, Lee said she refused to use the gender-neutral terms "Latinx" and "Filipinx" because of her belief they only fuel racism. "I find that the same toxic ideologies around race ideologies are now being advanced under gender ideologies," Lee said, according to the outlet. "I also find that the constant obsession with pronouns and declaration of pronouns causes deep discomfort for individuals who identify as gender fluid or who struggle with gender dysphoria.""

[Universities must change course 'while time remains,' North Korean defector warns America](#), Maggie Kelly, The College Fix, March 13, 2023

"One of the very few North Korean defectors to become an American citizen wrote a new book warning our academic and other elites to correct their slide into dangerous woke ideologies, and encouraging ordinary Americans to resist. If we fail, human rights activist [Yeonmi Park](#) warned, our country may increasingly resemble the socialist dictatorship she escaped. "Because I love America so much, and because I'm committed to resisting any encroachments on its freedoms, I do draw on my knowledge and experience of North Korea to illuminate — not exaggerate — threats to liberty in America," Park wrote in "While Time Remains," her second [book](#), released last month by Simon & Schuster. ... She entered Columbia's campus on the Upper West Side of New York with wonder and gratitude, its beauty and grandeur seeming to her even greater than the lights and skyscrapers of Times Square. "What an

unbelievable honor to start my studies as an Ivy League student!” she described herself as thinking. However, Park quickly encountered an environment that she found hostile to liberal learning and excellence and replete with ideological absurdities. ... Nonetheless, Park still considers America to be “nothing less than a miracle.” She advises Americans to participate in a new “founding” of the country, a reaffirmation of “personal responsibility and local government.” She tells her readers to get involved in their city councils, school board meetings, and houses of worship. If so, she tells us, “the light of your example will shine so brightly that no woke mob will be able to extinguish it.””

[‘A Huge Red Flag’: How Florida Colleges’ Controversial Statement on Diversity Came Together](#), Francie Diep, Chronicle of Higher Education, March 13, 2023

“As Ron DeSantis, Florida’s Republican governor, was taking fresh aim at diversity initiatives in higher education, the state’s college presidents put out an unusual statement. Some diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives “have come to mean and accomplish the very opposite and seek to push ideologies such as critical race theory and its related tenets,” said the statement, which was dated January 18 and stamped with the logos of the 28 state and community colleges that belong to the Florida College System. (These don’t include the four-year public universities, which are part of the separate State University System of Florida.) The 28 Florida college presidents promised not to “fund or support” any practice “that compels belief in critical race theory or related concepts such as intersectionality.” They pledged to find and remove instruction, training, and policies, though it was difficult to parse what exactly they would get rid of. They said they’d excise anything “opposed to the forms of discrimination described in this statement.” The statement prompted outrage from faculty members and academic-freedom organizations. Irene Mulvey, president of the American Association of University Professors, lamented to Inside Higher Ed that the statement didn’t “defend academic freedom or challenge the false narrative put forth by DeSantis and others that discussing important topics in the classroom is somehow akin to indoctrination.”

[Stanford Law School disgraces itself](#), Jeff Jacoby, Arguable: Globe Opinion Newsletter, March 15, 2023

“The University of North Carolina announced recently that applicants for academic admission or employment at any of its 17 campuses will no longer be compelled to submit personal “diversity, equity, and inclusion” statements as a condition of being admitted or hired. Texas A&M University and the University of Houston announced similar policies this month, removing DEI statements — which have been likened to “woke loyalty oaths” — from their hiring procedures. In Des Moines, the Iowa Legislature is weighing a bill to curb spending on DEI mandates at the state’s public universities. At the New College of Florida, the board of trustees has ended mandatory “diversity” exercises and the campus DEI bureaucracy. These are encouraging signs that the pendulum has started to swing against the reigning DEI orthodoxy in higher education. Far from promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion, DEI policies on campus and the infrastructure created to perpetuate them have tended to promote just the opposite: a rigid ideological *uniformity*, blatant *inequity* in the treatment of political minorities, and the *exclusion* of points of view disfavored by the left. “The imposition of DEI bureaucracy upon the academy has too often come at the expense of academic freedom and freedom of expression,” notes the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, a respected defender of intellectual liberty. Especially pernicious are “DEI administrators [who] have been responsible for repeated campus rights abuses.” A fresh example of such abuse erupted at Stanford Law School last week when Judge Kyle Duncan of the US Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit attempted to deliver an address at the invitation of the school’s chapter of the Federalist Society. Nearly a hundred students showed up to disrupt Duncan’s speech, repeatedly drowning his words with shouted epithets like “Scumbag!” and “You’re a liar!””

[The Untold Story of Racial Classification in America](#), Janet Levy, American Thinker, March 15, 2023

“Americans have been living with the idiosyncrasies of arbitrary racial classifications for almost five decades. These are now deeply entrenched and serve to drive political agendas while understandably fomenting divisiveness and resentment. That is the subject of [David E. Bernstein’s](#) impeccably researched book [Classified: The Untold Story of Racial Classification in America](#). ... While first publishing the classification, the OMB asserted it wasn’t “scientific” or “anthropologic” and wasn’t to be used to determine eligibility for government programs. All categories except Hispanic were based on race, rather than religion, national origin, or the protected classes under the 14th Amendment and civil rights laws. Only the Hispanic category – an American construct alien to people from Spanish-speaking countries – was based on ethnicity. Bernstein says the classification wasn’t viewed then as particularly consequential. Later, it was required, and eventually enforced, that data collected by government agencies, universities, financial institutions, and medical care and research facilities be sorted under those categories. It also came into use for determining eligibility for affirmative action. So, it has substantive legal consequences. ... Bernstein concludes by wondering whether racial classification, a poor substitute for genetic differences, makes sense today, and if heightened race consciousness is good for America. The muddled domain of self-identification, he points out, is the result of a convoluted classification system that has entrenched itself because of political forces. He disagrees with fellow law professors writing from a Critical Race Theory perspective that “racial divisions will be a permanent part of the American landscape” and is optimistic that, like many older interethnic conflicts, they will fade into distant memory. But before that happens, the state must stop dividing people by race, given the “horrendous history” of Nazi Germany and South Africa. The government, as the late Justice Antonin Scalia said, must see people as just one race: American.”

[Stop the Chaos: Law Schools Need to Crack Down on Student Disrupters Now](#), James C. Ho & Elizabeth L. Branch, National Review, March 15, 2023

“Administrators who promote intolerance don’t belong in legal education. And students who practice intolerance don’t belong in the legal profession. Law schools like to say that they’re training the next generation of leaders. But too many institutions of legal education have become laboratories of divisiveness, not leadership. A series of recent videos from law schools, including Yale and [Stanford](#), captures screaming students insulting and disrupting accomplished litigators, legal scholars, even federal judges. Evidence is rapidly accumulating that law schools across America are failing in their basic mission to teach students how to become good citizens — let alone good lawyers. ... Fortunately, this problem may be surprisingly easy to solve. Most universities already have rules in place ensuring freedom of speech and prohibiting campus disruptions. The problem is that the rules aren’t enforced. Students disrupt without consequence. Administrators tolerate or even encourage the chaos. That’s not because most students or faculty *support* these tactics. When we visit campuses across the country, we’re always told it’s just a small fraction of students who practice intolerance. But the majority *tolerates* it, because faculty don’t want to become controversial, and students just want to graduate, get a job, and move on with their lives. It shouldn’t be on the students to police other students. It should be on the grown-ups to lead, to teach, and, where necessary, to punish. But everyone’s scared to do anything. We’re the opposite of the Greatest Generation. We’re leaving our country worse off, not better, for the next generation.”

[Kenny Xu got UNC to ax DEI and now he wants it gone at every medical school](#), Dana Kennedy, New York Post, March 16, 2023

“The young conservative activist Kenny Xu is not just *talking* about a revolution. He’s dead serious about ensuring that Americans are treated by qualified doctors — not those accepted to med schools because of their victim status or the color of their skin, he told The Post. “Medicine is the one place where

everyone agrees DEI should not be a criteria,” Xu, 25, told The Post. The son of highly educated Chinese immigrants, Xu is determined to end what he sees as dangerous and hypocritical “anti-racism” and woke-ism policies in higher education, especially in medical schools, and bring back academic meritocracy. He and his campaign group, [Color Us United](#), had their first big win last month when the medical school at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill [voted to ban](#) diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) statements from hiring and tenure decisions. He has also [lobbied against discrimination against Asian Americans](#) by elite colleges like Harvard. Now he plans to take his campaign nationwide — at a time when Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis is targeting all things woke at his state’s public universities. “Hopefully, we can start this revolution at UNC that can spread across the country,” Xu said from his home in Raleigh, NC.”

[Davidson College Affirms Free Speech](#), Jenna A. Robinson, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, March 16, 2023

“By approving its own version of a noted free-expression statement, the liberal-arts institution takes a major step in the right direction. Last week, faculty at Davidson College affirmed their commitment to free expression on campus by approving their own version of the [Chicago Principles](#). It’s a step that the pro-free-speech organization Davidsonians for Freedom of Thought and Discourse (DFTD) has been promoting for five years and a major free-speech milestone for the college. In an email to the Martin Center, DFTD founder John Craig described the statement as “a landmark document for Davidson.”

The [statement](#) affirms: *True free speech, free expression, and academic freedom are not generational or preferential. In pledging to honor these ideals, we must recognize that this task can be arduous and precarious. Davidson has a professed commitment to free inquiry and to the inclusion of diverse persons and communities. We admit that these obligations have historically been more aspirational than actual. Acknowledging the intentional and unintentional exclusion of ideas and identities is both honest and constructive. Individuals and groups have been marginalized and their voices muted based on race, ethnicity, sexuality, gender, disability, class, ideology, citizenship, and religious or political affiliation.*”

[OSU requires DEI statements from mechanical, aerospace engineer job applicants](#), Therese Joffre, The College Fix, March 20, 2023

“Scholars seeking a job in Ohio State University’s College of Engineering must pledge their allegiance to diversity, equity and inclusion as part of the process. University officials ask applicants to provide a statement that [describes](#) their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion, along with “specific examples such as teaching and/or mentoring students from underrepresented backgrounds, outreach activities to underrepresented groups, or conducting research that address social inequities,” according to a copy of the application rubric recently [tweeted](#) by John Sailer with the National Association of Scholars.... Some example questions ask candidates to share demonstrated or committed acts toward increasing awareness of DEI, what each term of DEI means to the candidate, and what DEI initiatives the candidate has been involved in. Many of the questions ask about mitigating biases and how the candidate would advocate DEI “with colleagues who don’t understand its importance.” The document includes rubrics for search committees to score candidates. These rubrics score on awareness or understanding of DEI, experience promoting DEI, and plans to advance DEI. High scores are given to candidates who have a “sophisticated understanding of differences stemming from ethnic, socioeconomic, racial, gender, disability, sexual orientation, and cultural backgrounds and the obstacles people from these backgrounds face in higher education.” Candidates will also score high if they provide many examples of how they have mitigated bias in their careers or share plans to promote DEI within their department, according to the rubric.”

[The DEI Trojan Horse Is a University Leadership Failure](#), Dorian S. Abbot & Ivan Marinovic, Newsweek, March 21, 2023

“Fifth Circuit Court judge Kyle Duncan was recently invited to speak at the Stanford Law School, only for a mob of about 100 students to insult the judge and shout him down. There was something surreal about this incident: the law school's administration had been forewarned, but the administrator who was sent to maintain order—the dean of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI)—first did nothing, and then took the podium to humiliate the judge, behaving as another protester. ... One might be tempted to view this disaster as an isolated incident, a campus administrator gone rogue because of a “lack of protocols.” But the problem is far deeper. This incident is a striking example of how a Trojan horse ideology, labeled DEI, has been introduced, promoted, and institutionalized by universities' own leadership. ... Stanford recently created a system called “Protected Identity Harm Reporting,” which allows students and professors to report on one another anonymously for words or actions that the accuser perceives as offensive. Using the incorrect pronoun, issuing a politically incorrect opinion, or stating that the U.S. is a land of opportunity can cost one an accusation maintained in a database. There is no notice and no right to face the accuser, challenge facts, or defend one's reputation. It is reminiscent of one of the most repellent aspects of the totalitarianism of the 20th century, and stimulates some of the worst tendencies of human beings: resentment, envy, revenge. About 56 percent of American universities have adopted similar systems.”

[UNC Chapel Hill opens academic program up to all races after civil rights complaint](#), Heidi Reed, The College Fix, March 27, 2023

“The University of North Carolina Chapel Hill recently amended an academic program to accept applicants of all races as the result of a civil rights complaint. Initially the Fellowship for Exploring Research in Nutrition program, or FERN, was only open to undergrads “from Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) populations.” However, after the complaint was filed by the watchdog group Do No Harm, university officials amended the application to eliminate any wording about the race of applicants. “Within 24 hours of receiving the courtesy copy of my complaint, UNC scrubbed the website and changed the eligibility requirements to be more ‘inclusive,’” Mark Perry, University of Michigan Flint emeritus professor and a senior fellow at Do No Harm, told *The College Fix* via email March 6. ... According to Perry, there are many other schools that have illegal single-sex or single race programs, scholarships, fellowships, awards and internships. Perry said he has now filed 785 complaints against colleges and universities for more than 2,000 violations of Title VI, Title IX or both. “Unfortunately, higher education routinely violates their legal obligation to enforce federal civil rights laws,” Perry told *The Fix*. “Either because they are inexcusably unaware they are illegally discriminating, or they are inexcusably unconcerned about violating the civil rights of certain groups of students.” ... Do No Harm describes itself as a diverse group of healthcare providers and professionals who believe every patient deserves access to the best possible healthcare, but “the radical ideology of ‘anti-racism’ is creating new barriers and bad practices that are endangering the health and well-being of everyone – including the people it claims to help.””

[Meet the man trying to end affirmative action](#), Henry Gass, Christian Science Monitor, April 5, 2023

“Getting even one case before the United States Supreme Court is challenging. You need sound arguments, good plaintiffs, significant resources – and at least four justices willing to hear the case. Getting eight cases before the high court is another level of potency, especially for someone who, like Edward Blum, isn’t a trained lawyer. Raised in a “very liberal” home in Houston, the Republican candidate-turned-stockbroker-turned-conservative policy activist has spent the past two decades quietly reshaping American civil rights law.” BLUM: “So my opinion of race-based preferences, race-based

classifications – race-based affirmative action, if you will – was born out of the opening lines of the Declaration of Independence to leading up to our Civil Rights acts. My views on affirmative action are not controversial. In poll after poll after poll – when asked, “Should race be an element in college admissions?” – significant majorities of African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, whites, Democrats, Republicans are against the use of race in college admissions. ... We believe that there should not be a racial classification box on a student’s application, that universities at the undergraduate and postgraduate level should never use race as an element in college admissions. They will argue that, well, race isn’t the predominant factor, but it is a factor. We believe that it should never be a factor. It shouldn’t be a big factor, a medium factor, or a small factor. Race has no place in American life and law.”

[UNC Doctors Slam ‘Hurtful’ Surgeon Who Denounced Affirmative Action in Medical Schools](#), Kenny Xu, The Federalist, April 10, 2023

“In January 2023, the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS), a society of the leading heart surgeons in the nation, held a conference where the outgoing president, Dr. John Calhoun, emphasized merit as the primary indicator of success in the profession... Immediately, medical news outlets called Calhoun a racist, white privileged, and other monikers of derision, but they weren’t the only ones. The Society for Thoracic Surgeons condemned Calhoun’s slide in a statement, describing his talking points as ‘inconsistent with STS’s core values of diversity, equity, and inclusion.’ Mind guards at some surgery clinics also issued their own internal responses, and my organization Color Us United has found a particularly egregious one.”

[What N.C.’s “REACH” Act Gets Right](#), Shannon Watkins, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, April 10, 2023

The General Assembly has an obligation to encourage civic literacy on UNC campuses. UNC students aren’t getting a solid foundation in civics. UNC-Chapel Hill, for example, does not require its students to take a course in American government. It does, however, require them to take a three-credit course called Global Understanding and Engagement. A course in American history or government isn’t even required for majors where knowledge of civics is particularly important. UNC history majors, for instance, aren’t required to take a course in U.S. Government. But they are required to take “at least one History Department course in the area of African, Asian, and Middle Eastern History or in Latin American History.” For the journalism major, an American Government class is one of seven courses students may choose from. Unfortunately, as noted in our Blueprint for Reform on Civics Education, civic ignorance among college students is a national problem. ... Filed on February 13, House Bill 96, entitled the “North Carolina Reclaiming College Education on America’s Constitutional Heritage” (or the “NC REACH Act” for short), would ensure that the state’s public two- and four-year institutions graduate students with foundational civic knowledge. ... To meet the course criteria, institutions must require students to read the following historical documents:

1. The Constitution of the United States of America
2. The Declaration of Independence
3. The Emancipation Proclamation
4. At least five essays from the Federalist Papers, as determined by the instructor
5. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s “Letter from Birmingham Jail”
6. The Gettysburg Address
7. The North Carolina State Constitution

Students must also take a cumulative final exam on the principles contained in those documents.”

[In Defense of Merit in Science](#), Dorian Abbot & 28 others, Journal of Controversial Ideas 3(1), April 28, 2023

“ABSTRACT: Merit is a central pillar of liberal epistemology, humanism, and democracy. The scientific enterprise, built on merit, has proven effective in generating scientific and technological advances, reducing suffering, narrowing social gaps, and improving the quality of life globally. This perspective documents the ongoing attempts to undermine the core principles of liberal epistemology and to replace merit with non-scientific, politically motivated criteria. We explain the philosophical origins of this conflict, document the intrusion of ideology into our scientific institutions, discuss the perils of abandoning merit, and offer an alternative, human-centered approach to address existing social inequalities.”

[Critical Race Theory: Its Origins and Infiltration of California’s Public Schools](#), Sheridan Swanson, California Policy Center, May 2023

“For decades, critical theory was generally viewed as a university-level subject, but in the twenty-first century it has made its way into elementary and high school classrooms. Today, programs and curriculum for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) and ethnic studies are platforms for CRT. There is an important distinction between constructive ethnic studies and liberated ethnic studies... As Izumi, Wu, and Richards, authors of *The Great Parent Revolt: How Parents and Grassroots Leaders are Fighting Critical Race Theory in America’s Schools* explain: ‘Under classical Marxism, people were separated into categories based on their economic class status...Under critical race theory, economic class is replaced by racial categories.’ In California, the teaching of critical race theory in K-12 schools has become widespread as school districts, virtually en masse, have adopted DEI and ethnic studies curricula laden with CRT...”

[Universities are losing the battle on free speech](#), Eric Kaufmann, UnHerd, May 2, 2023

“Progressive illiberalism is not going anywhere because it is baked into the demography of tomorrow’s professors... Conservative media attention also focuses centrist liberals on the need for internal reform rather than the prospect of further embarrassment. The Right has been a vital ingredient in the new liberalism. But in the long run, liberalism is giving way to progressivism in elite spaces. The new cultural liberalism in the media reflects the views of senior staff members, and is opposed by affinity groups and young employees... Over 8 in 10 undergraduates at 150 leading US colleges say speakers who say BLM is a hate group or transgenderism is a mental disorder should not be permitted to speak on campus. What’s more, 7 in 10 think a professor who says something that students find offensive should be reported to their university. Young academics are twice as censorious as those over 50.”

[Top public high school hit with civil rights complaint for race-based program](#), Jeremiah Poff, Washington Examiner, May 4, 2023

“The top-ranked public high school in the nation is facing a federal civil rights complaint over a summer program that only solicits applications from black, Hispanic, and Native American students. The complaint, filed with the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights by the parent activist group Parents Defending Education, accuses the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics of violating federal civil rights law by restricting eligibility for its summer “Step Up to STEM” program to only black, Hispanic, and Native American students. “As the Department of Education is no doubt aware, discrimination on the basis of race raises concerns that the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics has received federal funds in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which declares that ‘no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance,’” the complaint reads.”

[The Juice is Worth the Squeeze](#), Wenyan Wu, Minding the Campus, May 9, 2023

“At a time when 63% of college and university students think that it’s at least “somewhat acceptable” to shout down a speaker, many academic administrators, and even faculty members, are emboldened to erode freedom of expression under the banner of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI). ... Alas, the California Community Colleges (CCC)—America’s largest system of higher education, which oversees 116 community colleges throughout the Golden State—is joining the onslaught on free speech. In 2022, the CCC Board of Governors adopted a new regulation to incorporate diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) criteria in the evaluation and tenure review of all faculty members. ... In 2023, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) introduced several resolutions to expand the definition of “academic freedom” due to changing context and demographics in higher education. The ASCCC argues that an updated definition must be “in support of the equity driven mission of the California Community Colleges.” ... During the same period, the ASCCC also approved its “Resolution in Support of Academic Freedom/Solidarity with Faculty Across the Nation” (13.04 S23). Hiding behind the pretext of supporting academic freedom as an “indispensable requisite for unfettered teaching and research in institutions of higher education,” the resolution goes on to reveal its true intention: to condemn legislation and policies that restrict the inculcation of “Critical Race Theory and racial and social justice,” not only at the collegiate level but also in K–12 education. For the Academic Senate, attempts by independent school boards and conservative lawmakers to curtail the proliferation of CRT through race-essentialist and race-divisive teaching are attacks on DEIA, anti-racism, and free speech.”

[DEI Brings Kafka to My Law School](#), Scott Gerber, Wall Street Journal, May 9, 2023

Ohio Northern University is trying to banish me for lack of ‘collegiality’ but won’t say what I’ve done. Around 1 p.m. on Friday, April 14, Ohio Northern University campus security officers entered my classroom with my students present and escorted me to the dean’s office. Armed town police followed me down the hall. My students appeared shocked and frightened. I know I was. I was immediately barred from teaching, banished from campus, and told that if I didn’t sign a separation agreement and release of claims by April 21, ONU would commence dismissal proceedings against me. The grounds: “Collegiality.” The specifics: None. Like many universities, ONU is aggressively pursuing “diversity, equity and inclusion” initiatives. I have objected publicly as vice chairman of the University Council, an elected faculty governance body, and in newspaper op-eds and on television, to DEI efforts that don’t include viewpoint diversity and would lead to illegal discrimination in employment and admissions. ... The same week I was led out of my classroom by police and campus security, I published an op-ed defending Justice Clarence Thomas’s right to have friends—even rich ones. The week before that, I gave a TV interview in which I criticized DEI programs that discriminate against white men in the name of “racial and social justice” and for being indifferent to the type of diversity higher education should value most: viewpoint diversity. The week prior, I published op-eds in a national newspaper and an Ohio one making the same points. I requested during a University Council meeting earlier this semester that ONU’s DEI program address viewpoint diversity. The administration responded, brusquely, that viewpoint diversity is “not part of our diversity, belonging and inclusion plan.””

[In Defense of Merit: Is it too late?](#), J. Scott Turner, Minding the Campus, May 23, 2023

“In late April 2023, twenty-nine scientists published a manifesto titled “In Defense of Merit in Science.” The authors (I will call them the “Twenty-Niners”) noted with irony that a defense of merit could only find a home in the *Journal of Controversial Ideas*. Merit is controversial? Never mind—the piece is a high-minded and vigorous defense of Enlightenment values against the diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) mania that is sweeping through our society. I agree with everything the Twenty-Niners wrote. ... The Twenty-Niners are no Pollyannas. They correctly lay out the many ways in which DEI opposes the scientific worldview and, indeed, endangers science itself. They are clear-eyed about the damage DEI has done: some of the manifesto’s authors have experienced this damage first-hand. While they are not

the first to point out the danger, they have, in my opinion, done the best job to date of explaining how DEI endangers the future of science. The Twenty-Niners' remedy for the DEI ailment falls naively short, though. ... What the Twenty-Niners seem not to realize is the nature of the fight they (we) are in. Nice-sounding words notwithstanding, DEI is a political project, which means it is motivated *only* by the pursuit of power. Its proponents are not interested in philosophical discussion. While scientists have been busy at their benches, DEI ideologues have been playing the long game, and they have taken over all the systems that scientists long thought would defend the autonomy and intellectual independence that are essential to their craft. ... The unfortunate reality is that scientists, even scientists of the Twenty-Niners' caliber, have lost control of their professions. To restore science to what it should be, scientists need to wrest control back. Not urge, *wrest*. Furthermore, they will not be able to do so from within the hollowed-out husk that the academic ecosystem has become."

[‘Race-Blind’ Group Claims Victory Over DEI at UNC, But the Truth is More Complex](#), Jon Edelman, Diverse Issues in Higher Education, May 24, 2023

"Color Us United, a nonprofit that advocates for a "race-blind" America, declared a "historic victory" over DEI efforts at the University of North Carolina's School of Medicine (UNC). In a press conference Thursday, the organization took credit for the university's February decision that it would not require DEI statements from job and tenure candidates, as well as the school's recent confirmation that a task force to integrate social justice into curricula had been disbanded and its recommendations not taken. However, a closer look reveals a more complicated picture: DEI may be far from dead at UNC. ... At the press conference, Color Us United described the moves by UNC as the first time that a public institution had renounced its own DEI framework. Color Us United's president, Kenny Xu, attributed these decisions to a four-pronged campaign launched in January to put pressure on the university, focusing on alumni, the board of trustees, the state legislature, and the public. "

[Department of Education swamps Duke University with civil rights investigations](#), Jeremiah Poff, Washington Examiner, May 27, 2023

"Duke University is facing a fresh federal civil rights investigation for a racially exclusive program at its medical school days after resolving a separate civil rights matter over excluding women. Last week, the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights informed Mark Perry, a senior fellow with the medical watchdog group Do No Harm, that Duke University was no longer excluding men from two programs the school had organized, one for high school girls interested in orthopedic surgery and engineering, and another for female medical students. But on Tuesday, in response to a complaint from Perry about a program at the Duke University School of Medicine that was reserved for black men, the Office for Civil Rights revealed that it had launched a second investigation into the school just days after resolving the previous one. Perry and Do No Harm had accused the medical school of violating federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex and race through its Black Men in Medicine initiative."

[Are Diversity Statements Illegal?](#), Adrienne Lu, Chronicle of Higher Education, May 31, 2023

"As a growing number of colleges around the country have stopped using diversity statements, a lawsuit filed against the University of California system in May appears to be the first to directly challenge their legality. Experts are divided on whether the use of such statements by public colleges will pass legal muster. John D. Haltigan, the plaintiff, is being represented pro bono by the nonprofit Pacific Legal Foundation. He is arguing that the University of California system's use of diversity statements in hiring violates the First Amendment and represents unconstitutional viewpoint discrimination. Haltigan wants to apply for a tenure-track position in the psychology department at the

University of California at Santa Cruz and is asking the court, among other things, for an injunction that would allow him to apply without submitting a diversity statement.”

[The DEI Industry Needs to Check Its Privilege](#), Conor Friedersdorf, The Atlantic, May 31, 2023

“The worst of the industry is expensive and runs from useless to counterproductive. And even people who highly value diversity and inclusion should feel queasy about the DEI gold rush that began in 2020 after the murder of George Floyd. A poor Black man’s death became a pretext to sell hazily defined consulting services to corporations, as if billions in outlays, mostly among relatively privileged corporate workers, was an apt and equitable response. A radical course correction is warranted—but first, let’s reflect on how we got here. On rare occasions, a depraved act captures the attention of a nation so completely that there is a widespread impulse to vow ‘never again’ and to act in the hope of making good on that promise.”

[The Failed Affirmative Action Campaign That Shook Democrats](#), Michael Powell, New York Times, June 11, 2023

“The Supreme Court will soon rule on race-conscious college admissions, a core Democratic issue. But an analysis of a California referendum points to a divide between the party and voters. The 2020 campaign to restore race-conscious affirmative action in California was close to gospel within the Democratic Party. It drew support from the governor, senators, state legislative leaders and a who’s who of business, nonprofit and labor elites, Black, Latino, white and Asian.... A commercial noted that Kamala Harris, then a U.S. senator, had endorsed the campaign, and the ad also suggested that to oppose it was to side with white supremacy. Supporters raised many millions of dollars for the referendum and outspent opponents by 19 to 1. ... Gloria Romero, a Democrat and former majority leader of the State Senate, was term-limited and left politics in 2010 out of frustration with the poor health of public education and her party’s opposition to charter schools. Ten years later, she voted against affirmative action. “Why are we going back to the past?” she said. “We’re no longer in a ‘walk over the bridge in Selma’ phase of our civil rights struggle.” Like many Hispanic voters interviewed, Ms. Romero worried less about blatant discrimination and more about health care, education and housing. The Hispanic populations is at an inflection point in California, progress vying with lingering disparity. Slightly more than half of public school students are Hispanic, and the percentage of Hispanic undergraduates in the elite University of California system is roughly half that. The well-regarded if less competitive California State system has 23 four-year campuses and almost 460,000 students, and those who are Hispanic make up almost half of the total. “We’re debating affirmative action when we have more Latinos than ever in college,” Ms. Romero said.”

[Thorny Trade-Offs After the Harvard and UNC Rulings](#), Wenyan Wu, Minding the Campus, June 13, 2023

“Many academic observers have high hopes that the expected Supreme Court rulings in the Harvard and University of North Carolina cases will settle the race question in college admissions once and for all. But Robert VerBruggen of the Manhattan Institute is unconvinced by this rosy vision. Instead, in a recent brief, VerBruggen highlights “thorny trade-offs” in the era when race-conscious admissions may be banned. According to the report, so long as racial diversity, racial representation, and other lofty ideals remain top priorities for American universities and colleges, race-neutral alternatives in a “post-race-consciousness” future are “anything but race-blind in their construction.” However, these alternatives hold bipartisan appeal for both affirmative-action friends who are looking to circumvent the anticipated ban on race-based admissions and affirmative-action foes eager to prove that “diversity is possible without the use of race.” The paradoxical nature of race-neutral alternatives has far-reaching ramifications not only for college admissions but also for American higher education in toto. As

VerBruggen concludes, “the fights over race and enrollment in higher education will be far from over when the Court rules.” ... Employed to accomplish the same ideological mandate of racial diversity, race-neutral preferences are subterfuges that select facially non-racial determinants as proxies for race. Even though Supreme Court rulings and federal law forbid race-neutral policies from being implemented for racial purposes that result in disparate impact, most players are reluctant to apply restrictions on race proxies. Given the opportunity, as demonstrated by oral arguments in the UNC case, admissions officers would always choose the kind of race-neutral preference that can yield the largest gains in racial diversity.”

VICTORY: FIRE forces Berkeley to turn over records related to DEI hiring policy after two-year delay

Kelley Bregenger, Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, June 14, 2023

“The University of California, Berkeley used diversity statements to weed out candidates for faculty positions, according to public records the university finally released more than two years after FIRE requested them. Many universities now require or invite current or prospective faculty to demonstrate their commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion — often through written statements that factor into hiring, research, evaluation, promotion, or tenure decisions. As FIRE explained in a public statement last year, these diversity statement requirements can too easily function as ideological litmus tests and cast a pall of orthodoxy over campuses. Berkeley is no exception. The university expects all new faculty hires to “be committed to advancing diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging[.]” During the 2018-19 academic year, Berkeley’s life sciences departments launched an initiative to advance faculty diversity. As part of the initiative, applicants for full-time faculty positions were required to submit statements on their “contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion,” including information about their “understanding of these topics,” “record of activities to date,” and “specific plans and goals for advancing equity and inclusion.” These statements informed the hiring committee’s first round of review: If applicants’ contributions to DEI did not meet a high standard, they were eliminated from consideration.”

Chapel Hill’s Latest DEI Push, Harrington Shaw, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, June 19, 2023

“In January 2023, UNC-Chapel Hill launched its “DEI Strategic Plan” for the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The DEI Strategic Plan is an offshoot of Chief Diversity Officer Leah Cox’s “Build Our Community Together” initiative, itself part of a 2020 program entitled “Carolina Next.” ... In fact, the terms “diversity,” “equity,” and “inclusion” are themselves euphemistic in nature. ... Once one understands the clandestine insidiousness of DEI terminology, it becomes clear that the action items listed in UNC’s “DEI Strategic Plan” are not so benign. For example, examination of “recruitment and retention” action items reveals potential plans to discriminate in hiring. In its effort to “improve diversity,” the university will “create annual cluster hires, expand existing cluster hires, and adopt hiring strategies to augment diversity among faculty.” Given the university’s superficial understanding of diversity, this action item likely implies employing overt racial or gender discrimination in hiring to meet administrators’ DEI goals. ... The strategic plan’s aim to introduce “innovative approaches to admissions” is likewise worrisome. Given that UNC is currently under Supreme Court scrutiny for its use of racial preferences, perhaps these “innovative approaches” are designed to flout potential forthcoming restrictions on racial discrimination in admissions. ... Due to the pervasive ambiguity of the “DEI Strategic Initiative,” however, it remains unclear whether administrators are making an honest attempt to keep DEI initiatives legal and in line with university policy, rather than attempting to circumvent anti-discrimination laws—existing or forthcoming—to achieve their DEI ends.”

Medical Education Is Infected with DEI, Stanley Goldfarb, Martin Center for Academic Renewal, June 28, 2023

“few months ago, I was summarily fired as an editor-in-chief of the kidney section of the most widely used medical reference. ... So why did they fire me? Over the previous four years, I had publicly questioned the rise of “diversity, equity, and inclusion,” or DEI, in health care, expressing particular concern about its ubiquity in medical schools. That included the institution where I taught and served as an administrator for decades, the University of Pennsylvania’s Perelman School of Medicine. I thought I was engaging in a respectful discussion about the purpose of medical education and the role of medical professionals. Turns out, I was questioning a religious dogma, the adherents of which brook no debate, much less dissent. ... It quickly became apparent that my beloved medical profession, to which I had devoted more than 50 years, was spiraling downward even faster than I had realized. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the decline, as did the death of George Floyd in 2020. Suddenly, medical schools were loudly proclaiming that health care is “systemically racist,” that “medical reparations” are urgently needed, and that medical education and practice must fundamentally change. Whereas DEI and social justice were frequently discussed in 2018, by the end of 2020 they were the central facets of medical education, where they remain to this day. Amid it all, I spoke with countless physicians and medical educators who told me they were terrified to speak up. So I tried to say what they could not, protected by my retirement. I wrote a [book](#), using the same title as my infamous *Wall Street Journal* op-ed. And in 2022, I founded [Do No Harm](#) to draw public attention to the corruption of medicine. Do No Harm points out that medicine is rushing down a dangerous road. Medical schools are further undermining standards in the name of diversity, leading to lower-quality students who will provide worse care as physicians.”

[Supreme Court strikes down affirmative action programs in college admissions](#), Amy Howe, SCOTUSblog, June 29, 2023

“In a historic decision, the Supreme Court severely limited, if not effectively ended, the use of affirmative action in college admissions on Thursday. By a vote of 6-3, the justices ruled that the admissions programs used by the University of North Carolina and Harvard College violate the Constitution’s equal protection clause, which bars racial discrimination by government entities. Writing for the majority, Chief Justice John Roberts explained that college admissions programs can consider race merely to allow an applicant to explain how their race influenced their character in a way that would have a concrete effect on the university. But a student “must be treated based on his or her experiences as an individual — not on the basis of race,” Roberts wrote. The majority effectively, though not explicitly, overruled its 2003 decision in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, in which the court upheld the University of Michigan Law School’s consideration of race “as one factor among many, in an effort to assemble a student body that is diverse in ways broader than race.” Justices Clarence Thomas, Samuel Alito, Neil Gorsuch, Brett Kavanaugh, and Amy Coney Barrett joined the Roberts opinion.”

[UNC leaders, faculty and political leaders react to U.S. Supreme Court decision on admissions](#), Joe Killian, NC Newsline, June 29, 2023

“Reaction to the [U.S. Supreme Court’s 6-3 decision](#) against race in admissions at UNC-Chapel Hill and Harvard University was swift Thursday, with opponents decrying a fundamental change in higher education as UNC-Chapel Hill and UNC System officials said they would follow the ruling.

“We are closely reviewing today’s decision and will follow the law,” said UNC System Peter Hans in a statement shortly after the ruling. ... ““Every student in North Carolina should know that the UNC System welcomes their talent and ambition. The most important work of higher education is not in deciding how to allocate limited admissions slots at highly competitive schools, but in reaching and encouraging more students to take advantage of our 16 remarkable public universities.” ... UNC-Chapel Hill Chancellor Kevin Guskiewicz called the decision “not the outcome we hoped for” in [a message to the campus community](#), but said the university will follow the high court’s guidance. ... Marty Kotis, a current member of the UNC Chapel-Hill Board of Trustees, was a named party in the original suit as he

was then a member of the UNC System Board of Governors. For that reason, he said Thursday, he felt compelled to speak out on the decision. “My reaction would be, ‘I told you so,’” Kotis said. Kotis has for years pushed for policies and statements that would oppose consideration of race in admissions and employment with the university system and its individual campuses. ... U.S. Sen. Thom Tillis, a Republican, made a succinct statement on Twitter. “The Supreme Court made the right decision today,” Tillis wrote. “Colleges should not be able to discriminate against applicants based on the color of their skin.” U.S. Rep. Valerie Foushee, a Democrat who represents the state’s fourth congressional district, called the ruling “a step backwards. “Today’s ruling is devastating and will dismantle the race-conscious admissions efforts to ensure that higher education is accessible to all students – especially Black students and students of color who are historically disadvantaged,” Foushee said in a statement ... N.C. Rep. Jon Hardister (R-Guilford), House Majority Whip and co-chair of the N.C. House Education – Universities committee, applauded the decision in his own statement Thursday. “People should be treated equally, regardless of immutable characteristics,” wrote Hardister, who is currently running for the Republican nomination for Labor Commissioner. “We should judge people on their merits, not the color of their skin.”

California voters may again vote on whether to bring back affirmative action, but in limited form,

Mikhail Zinshteyn, CalMatters, June 29, 2023

“While other states are still absorbing the impact of today’s U.S. Supreme Court ruling to stifle affirmative action at colleges and universities, California voters may soon vote on whether they support using state money to fund programs that improve the health, education or economic well-being of specific racial, ethnic and sexual or gender groups. ... The latest effort, known as Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7, wouldn’t fully overturn Proposition 209, which created the country’s first ban on affirmative action 27 years ago. Instead, it would allow state agencies to send the governor a waiver request to avoid some of Proposition 209’s restrictions, as long as the exception is based on scholarly research. ... “If passed, this amendment will significantly weaken California’s constitutional principle of equal treatment for all,” wrote Wenyuan Wu, executive director of Californians for Equal Rights Foundation, in a letter to lawmakers last week. She told CalMatters she expects state Democrats to prevail in placing the measure on the ballot, but her group will fight it — and has the experience. Wu and other foundation officials played key roles in successfully campaigning against Proposition 16. The foundation she leads recently sued various city and state agencies for using race and sex as a factor in eligibility for public social programs.”
