Supposed sages in academe and beyond have been trying to create a schism between libertarianism and conservatism that need not exist.

“Freedom and virtue have declined together and must rise together,” author M. Stanton Evans wrote in 1964. At the time Evans was the editor of the Indianapolis News.

“So far are ‘value’ and ‘conformity’ from being identical that the second can rise to its current distasteful height only when the first declines,” Evans averred in an essay which appeared in the 1964 anthology, What is Conservatism? “A man without the interior armor of value has no defense against the pressures of his society.”

“It is precisely the loss of value which has turned the ‘inner-directed’ citizen of nineteenth-century America into the ‘other-directed’ automaton of today.” What makes that distinction particularly ironic it is the manner in which it previewed what was to come in the 1960s: So called “non-conformists” usually occupied about the same slice of the political spectrum, which generally favored big government.

“Men without values are more than willing to trade their freedom for material benefits,” Evans noted in 1964. “That the loss of moral constraint invites the rule of power is surely one of the best-established facts of twentieth-century history.” Evans would go on to write several books, including The Theme Is Freedom: the Religious Roots of American Liberty.
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Dear Reader,

This is the second cover story this year that we’ve devoted to the late author and commentator M. Stanton Evans, who passed away in March. The conservative icon had long been a friend of Accuracy in Academia and of mine personally.

Indeed, it was through my work with Stan while at the National Journalism Center that I came to know of AIA. The remarkable thing about Stan’s writing is how timeless it is.

This is particularly astounding since Stan spent most of his working life writing and editing timely copy. Countless times in editorial conferences at the NJC, where I served him as an editor, he would urge interns to “pick your reader up where he is.”

Even when he wrote his last three books, all histories, in the introductions he would “lead from the recent present.” I know of at least two professors who have used one of his books as a text.

That would be *The Theme is Freedom: The Religious Roots of American Liberty*. As a chronicle of a key aspect of American history, it is far superior to just about anything that university presses have to offer.

All the best,

Mal Kline,
Executive Director
“By their nature, all coercive systems require certain actions which we hold immoral: The arbitrary exercise of power over men by other men,” Evans noted in 1964. Indeed, even libertarians uncomfortable with discussions of morality should find government coercion immoral.

The Intercollegiate Studies Institute reprinted Evans’ 1964 essay in its magazine, The Intercollegiate Review. “Only when there is widespread adherence to a consensus of value, and only when that value is one which sanctions the continuance of freedom, can freedom endure,” Evans concluded in that essay. “As freedom is the condition of value, so is value the guarantor of freedom.”

Bias Watch: Georgetown University

By Malcolm A. Kline

Occasionally, students actually notice when they are in a biased course.

“I felt a certain idealistic giddiness upon enrolling in ‘Prisons & Punishment,’ a government course introduced during my senior year of college,” Danny Funt writes in the September/October issue of the Columbia Journalism Review. “It was exciting to attach a resonant cause to academic inquiry, and about 95 percent of my classmates—Republican and Democrat—identified as supporters of criminal justice reform.”

“Our professor had a childhood friend who was wrongfully imprisoned for murdering his parents and then exonerated 17 years later. ‘This will be the most important course you take in college,’ the professor said on the first day of class.”

“I was startled to learn that several classmates would later complain that the class featured liberal advocacy.” Before enrolling at the Columbia University School of Journalism, which, of course, publishes CJR, Funt attended Georgetown, where he served as editor-in-chief of The Hoya.

The Georgetown catalogue does indeed list the P & P course among its offerings, taught by Marc Howard.

We should note that Howard and the course received no feedback similar to that which Funt recorded. Funt’s web page shows he has published extensively on subjects such as The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe.
WELCOME TO “NO-MANS’LAND” AKA UNC, CHAPEL HILL

The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill recently published a “gender-inclusive language” writing guide, which advises students not to use “mailman,” “policeman,” “man-made” and other compound words that include “man,” according to UNC student Sumner Park in The College Fix.

Instead, the guide suggests substituting words like “person” or “individual,” and using “humanity” instead of “mankind, and postal carrier instead of “mailman.” “Congressmen” can be switched to “legislators,” according to the guide, published by the university’s Writing Center.

During an interview with the College Fix, Vicki Behrens, assistant director of The Writing Center, explained that “gender-inclusive modifications were recently made to the guide to reflect modern language.”

“It is wise to be sensitive and aware of choices that are gender inclusiveness,” Behrens said. “We are glad to have a handout to help people navigate and make informed choices.”

HARVARD STUDENTS MOUNT ATTACK ON WIKIPEDIA

The inter-connected world we live in has inspired some inventive new ways to take out frustrations. One of the most unusual methods is observed by certain Harvard students who occasionally go on a hyperactive editing spree on Wikipedia.

During their last session over Labor Day weekend, a group of about eight students spent several hours removing offensive phrases, in addition to changing and adding Wikipedia pages related to feminist, BGLTQ and human rights issues. (BGLTQ = bi-sexual, gay, lesbian, transgender and queer) The stated purpose of this effort was to “dismantle the patriarchy.”

This annual project has developed a certain amount of cachet among media and gender profs, who now “pitch in to add their two cents to the edited text so they can influence the path of Wikipedia.” And that’s not all.

Ask about internships at the American Journalism Center, a joint program of Accuracy in Media and Accuracy in Academia. The AJC offers 12 weeks of research, reporting and writing experience in our nation’s capital. Stipends or scholarships are available to program participants. For more information, e-mail Mal Kline at mal.kline@academia.org or visit us at www.aimajc.org

The AJC is a joint project of Accuracy in Media and Accuracy in Academia
• Schools including Yale, Brown and Penn State now offer college credit to students who “write feminist thinking” into Wikipedia.

• In 2014, feminist groups at more than a dozen universities held a mass “edit Wikipedia day” to “combat sexism.”

• Last year, the government also handed over $200K to “study why Wikipedia is sexist. So if you start finding words like ‘heteronormative’ and ‘patriarchalism’ randomly dispersed throughout the next Wikipedia article you read, now you know why.”

MORE RIDICULOUS COURSES

Amazingly enough, The Daily Caller discovered there are still some off-the-wall college courses that haven’t received the attention they deserve, including the following:

• “Tree Climbing,” offered by Cornell University, is described as promoting “safe and environmentally responsible tree climbing techniques for recreation, education, and research,” and even promises to teach students how to “climb from one tree to another without touching the ground.”

• Georgia State is offering a course called “Kanye Versus Everybody,” which explains that his intellect exemplifies the critical perspective of our, modern generation of public thinkers.

• Other schools currently offer courses on “The American Vacation,” and “Wasting Time on the Internet.”

BANISHING SOUTHERN RELICS DESTROYS HISTORY

Chris Queen, a Georgia native, and U. of Georgia graduate, recently observed that the urge to destroy relics of the Confederacy is misguided and “presents a danger to the preservation and study of history,” according to Nathan Rubbelke, a student at Saint Louis University.

A freelance writer and author of Football, Faith, and Flannery O’Connor: A Love Letter to the South,” Queen expressed his views on the current situation to The College Fix regarding the “flurry of demands by
college students and faculty to remove from campuses reminders of the Old South – such as statues and flags.”

“I believe that completely getting rid of these symbols does present a danger to the preservation and study of history. Any genuine understanding of the South — good and bad — must include an understanding of the culture of the era of slavery,” Queen said via email.

To those who say that “Southern relics of slavery and oppression belong in museums,” Queen responds that “My gut reaction is that those rationales are based on hypersensitivity and thin skin,” adding that “many of these people see the love of Southern culture in the wrong light.”

Queen believes that “An accurate understanding of the South must include and realize the South’s history of slavery instead of removing it or pretending it never existed.”

“There’s a lot about the antebellum South that we as a country need to acknowledge and heal from, even a century and a half later. But stripping the aspects of the culture that are beautiful and meaningful doesn’t foster healing,” he said. During the past several months, several “symbols and namesakes of the Old South and Confederacy have either been targeted by students and university faculty for removal,” or actually removed, such as a University of Texas statue of Confederate President Jefferson Davis.

In Kentucky, “72 historians representing 16 Kentucky colleges and universities have called for the state to remove a statue of Davis from its capitol rotunda. For some historians and professors, the statue offers a visceral and potent miseducation.

“At Yale, students have petitioned to rename Calhoun Hall, named after the seventh U.S. vice president, John C. Calhoun. At Clemson, the faculty senate has pushed to rename Tillman Hall, named after former South Carolina Governor Benjamin Tillman.

“People who embrace the culture of Nazi Germany today appear to do so expressly for the hate, while the vast majority of devotees of the Old Southern culture express their affection for that era minus the terrible evils of slavery and racism. For some reason, I think some folks can’t (or won’t) make that distinction,” said Queen. “The recent push to remove Southern and Confederate symbols was inspired by the Black Lives Matter movement, and other Southern traditions have become targets as well.”

For example, at Dartmouth, a group of demonstrators protested outside the Kappa Delta Epsilon sorority house, which hosted this year’s invitation-only Kentucky Derby Party, accusing the event of being “a bastion of racism, exclusion and oppression,” according to The Daily Caller.
BOOK REVIEW: 'TRUTH OVERRULED' AND THE CASE FOR TRADITIONAL MARRIAGE

by Spencer Irvine

Marriage quality, gay rights and “love is love” are common refrains that the Left uses in order to dismantle traditional marriage as we know it. Heritage Foundation marriage scholar Ryan T. Anderson’s latest book, Truth Overruled: The Future of Marriage and Religious Freedom, serves as an answer to many of these arguments.

Anderson quoted Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts’ oral arguments to make one of his major points, namely that “You’re [gay activists] not seeking to join the institution, you’re seeking to change what the institution is.” Anderson pointed out four harmful consequences of radically changing the definition of marriage:

• “The needs and rights of children will be subordinated to the desires of adults.”
• “The marital norms of monogamy, exclusivity, and permanence will be weakened.”
• “Unborn children will be put at even more risk than they already are.”
• “And religious liberty – Americans’ ‘first freedom’ – will be threatened.”

“Judicial tyranny” was also addressed by Anderson in his book, and States’ Rights to define traditional marriage were tossed aside by five unelected court justices. In turn, the legal foundation for reversing marriage definitions is on shaky ground, since additional legal challenges surrounding bigamy and polygamy laws will inevitably be filed. Instead of respecting state law and upholding the Constitution and limited government, the Obergefell v. Hodges ruling actually increased the government presence in the bedroom by fundamentally changing the definition of marriage, Anderson argued.

The author turned to Roberts’ dissent, where the chief justice pointed out how previous marriage-related cases (such as striking down interracial marriage bans) did not try “to change the core definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman,” which was what the majority used as legal precedent and basis in their ruling.

With each argument and rebuttal, Anderson substantiated his arguments with social science studies that uphold the value of traditional marriage and therefore, a traditional nuclear family. He also took time to outline over a half dozen instances in which religious liberty and freedom were overruled by the gay movement, ranging from the firing of Mozilla CEO Brendan Eich, the outrage over Indiana’s Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) and how the government has fined small businesses such as Sweet Cakes by Melissa, to name a few. Anderson correctly noted how there is less tolerance and more government coercion in the public space regarding marriage beliefs, due to the lack of religious liberty protections.

Anderson delved into the victims of the redefinition of marriage movement, the implications of denying religious freedom for religious charities, adoption agencies and other charitable efforts, and ended on a high note. He encouraged the formation of a grassroots movement, similar to the pro-life response to Roe v. Wade, to work toward the goal of maintaining religious freedom and the traditional definition of marriage.

All in all, this is a great and insightful book for those who are curious about what supporters of traditional marriage believe in, addressed in a precise and direct manner which is easily digestible for the modern reader.

Ryan Anderson is tentatively scheduled to speak at Accuracy in Academia’s author’s night on November 5, 2015 from 6-8 PM in the Van Andel Center at the Heritage Foundation.
To show what college and university English Departments are really teaching, Accuracy in Academia compiled *The REAL MLA Stylebook*, filled with quotes from a recent convention of the Modern Language Association (MLA) where thousands of English professors gather to push their politically correct, radical agenda. Outsiders who attend this event expecting to learn more about Chaucer, Milton and Shakespeare are in for a rude awakening when they discover that panels are more likely to focus on topics such as “Marxism and Globalization;” “What’s the Matter with Whiteness,” and “Queering Faulkner.”

This book is must-reading for anyone interested in learning more about the mindset of faculty members who are tasked with teaching the great works of the English language to our nation’s students.