



WOMEN FOR THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION NEWSLETTER

SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER 2021

VOLUME 2, #8



President CJ's Letter:

Dear Colleagues,

As we all know, “elections have consequences.” Who we elect DOES matter! Last year’s election has bestowed so many consequences on this nation. Looking back on the first 10 months of the Biden administration, I can’t imagine what more is yet to come.

I wonder how Biden voters now feel about a President who has opened U.S. borders to over a million illegal aliens who have no identification, have not been vetted, have no medical requirements – not even required to safeguard against Covid; how they feel about a President who abandoned the U.S. military and Americans in Afghanistan, leaving hundreds at the mercy of the Taliban, all while arming the enemy; a President who chose to fund the Russian pipeline while shutting down energy independence in his own country, requiring the U.S. now to beg OPEC for oil; a President who would borrow billions from China, leaving his own country in debt to a foreign enemy; a President who would pay tax dollars to millions of citizens to stay home rather than work to earn a living at jobs that are available; a President who is not accountable even to his beloved media, answering little to no questions ever; a President who ushers in inflation by flooding the market place with printed and borrowed money; a President who gives aid to enemy nations like Iran and Russia, and who chooses to insult U.S. allies by his foreign policy. One consequence of such was losing the French embassy. (France, our first foreign ally, helped us win the American Revolution.) Lastly, how could Biden voters, the Democrat Congress, or the president’s family allow a person with dementia to remain in office to be made a fool of on the international stage, all while dragging down their country?

Thanks to the Biden Administration, we are no longer on a path to socialism – it seems we have already arrived. And now there is even more to worry about – from the threat of

unconstitutional medical mandates, to destroying the sanctity of voting and election integrity, to teaching CRT (Critical Race Theory) in our public schools and outlawing parental participation in policy decisions (gender neutrality, etc.). How much more radical change can our nation endure? It is time to move forward to create a conservative defense mechanism to counter the socialist movement. And we have a golden opportunity to do this in the upcoming election.

Our Virginia election can possibly make a huge difference, by example, in the path to our nation’s recovery. “As Virginia goes, so goes the nation,” which is the silver lining for the Commonwealth – to lead as we once led the colonies. The future of Virginia and of the nation is at stake. We must replace the liberal hierarchy in Richmond with our sensible conservative GOP candidates for Governor, Lt. Governor, Attorney General, and the Assembly. I urge you to work at the polls, drive your neighbors to vote, do whatever you can to counter the radical leftist Biden machine.

Imagine it’s the bottom of the ninth, we have 2 outs, and the bases are loaded. We are in desperate need of a home run. On November 2nd, stand up for our Constitution so we, as a nation, can stand proud for another 245 years.

C. J. Hatcher, WAC President

Election Day is November 2nd!

If you haven’t already voted in-person or by absentee ballot, make sure to vote on Election Day! Also, if you are trained, please sign up to work at the polls as an election official or poll watcher, or in another capacity. We need an all-hands-on-deck approach to ensure the integrity of this election!



INSIDE CONTENTS

WAC Members Enjoyed Ice Cream in August.....	2
WAC Kicked Off Election Season with Our Red, White and Blue Picnic.....	2
Virginia Gave Us the American Revolution and May Do So Again, By Robert Knight.....	4
If There's No Truth, There Is No Injustice, By Paul Adams.....	5
Leftist Shadow Governments Control a Lot More than Just Our Elections, By Joy Pullmann.....	7
How Diversity Turned Tyrannical, By Lawrence Krauss.....	9
Alumni Unite for Freedom Of Speech, By Stuart Taylor Jr and Edward Yingling.....	10
A Quiet Attack on American Principles Is Going Unnoticed, By Bob Zeidman.....	11
America First Legal Blasts Biden's DOJ, DHS Effort to Codify Open Borders Policies Into Federal Regulations, By Stephen Miller.....	12
Board Members/Upcoming Events.....	12

WAC Members Enjoyed Ice Cream in August!

On August 19, WAC members enjoyed an ice cream social at Kohr Brothers. It gave everyone a great opportunity to get out of the heat and socialize with like-minded friends and colleagues! So much fun!!



WAC Kicked Off Election Season with Our Annual Red, White and Blue Picnic!!

On September 18, WAC hosted our annual Red, White and Blue Picnic! Everyone enjoyed eating Mission BBQ and listening to our featured speakers: local conservative radio broadcasters Joe Thomas and Rob Schilling, as well as conservative candidates for elective office Rob Bell, Nick Freitas, Philip Hamilton, Steve Harvey, Kristen Martin

(surrogate for the Youngkin campaign), and James August (surrogate for the Runion campaign). We also heard from former member of the State Board of Elections Clara Belle Wheeler, and several members (Juliana Marsh, Chris Daleo, Aidan Thies) of UVA's executive board of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). The speakers addressed many topics including the importance of voting early in this election, ongoing election integrity efforts including encouraging people to volunteer as an election official or poll watcher, the importance of supporting conservative candidates inside and outside of our local area, allegations of corruption in our local government and school board and the fact that the local press does not cover it, actions of the General Assembly, Critical Race Theory being taught in our schools, and the importance of electing people to office who will respect our founding principles embodied in the US Constitution. The YAF group spoke about the organization and their efforts at UVA to stick up for conservative principles and commemorate various occasions in our history that some progressives seek to erase including 9-11, the fall of the Berlin Wall, D-Day, Memorial Day, among many others. WAC also held a raffle to raise money, and paid tribute to the 13 members of the military who we recently lost when the US exited Afghanistan.







Virginia Gave Us the American Revolution and May Do So Again

By Robert Knight, The Washington Times

Over the next three weeks, Virginia will be Ground Zero in the resistance movement to take back America from a socialist-dominated Democrat Party.

A victory for liberty in the Old Dominion would be fitting, given that the colony played a central part in the American Revolution 245 years ago. That's when Thomas Jefferson's draft of the Declaration of Independence listing unalienable rights granted by the Creator – not men – was adopted by the Continental Congress.

America became America because God-fearing Virginia patriots such as Jefferson, George Washington, James Madison, George Mason, and others hammered out limits on government to ensure maximum freedom under the law.

It just may be that Virginians will once again take the lead in fighting for liberty.

At stake on Nov. 2 are the governorship and the legislature, both now controlled by far-left Democrats. As soon as they took the governorship in 2017 and the legislature in 2019, Democrats rammed through a radical agenda that might as well have had a "Made in San Francisco" label stamped on it.

They quickly got rid of the voter ID law, expanded felon voting and early voting, and loosened other election integrity procedures. They added "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" to the civil rights statute, thus empowering transgender activists. The whole Democrat package is there: Higher taxes, assaults on gun rights, taxpayer funding of abortions to "birthing persons," and more statues hauled down.

Nothing epitomizes the stakes in this election more than what's happening in Loudoun County, where parents are staging a revolt against a school board that has imposed Critical Race Theory (by another name) and the LGBTQ agenda beginning in elementary school.

The insurgency began after the school system suspended teacher Tanner Cross for telling them at a May 25 hearing that he would not lie to children about their gender. Parents pushed back with recall efforts against six school board members. Now, the county is riven by a case that should awaken every parent in America.

Scott Smith, the father of a ninth-grade girl, was arrested on June 22 at a school board hearing that had been shut down after former state Sen. Dick Black received a standing ovation from outraged parents who oppose CRT, graphic sex "education," and transgenders in restrooms and locker rooms.

Why was Mr. Smith so animated, refusing to leave? Because his daughter had allegedly been raped on May 28 at Stone Bridge High School by a "gender fluid" boy wearing a skirt and was allowed into the girl's room because of the idiotic transgender mandate.

According to the Daily Wire, Mr. Smith's attorney Elizabeth Lancaster said that "a boy was charged with two counts of forcible sodomy, one count of anal sodomy, and one count of forcible fellatio, related to an incident that day at that school."

But it gets even more outrageous. Minutes before Mr. Smith's arrest, Loudoun Schools Superintendent Scott Ziegler said concerns over transgenders were misdirected because no bathroom assaults had been reported. The Sheriff's Office, however, said the May 28 incident had been reported. Democrat Commonwealth's Attorney Buta Biberaj, one of five Virginia D.A.'s who won her office with help from Democrat mega-donor George Soros, actually tried to have Mr. Smith jailed. She is the subject of another recall.

The Democrat-dominated school system continued the cover-up and transferred the suspect to another high school, Broad Run, where he allegedly victimized another girl four months later on Oct. 6 and was charged again.

Can it get any worse than this? Yes, if Virginia parents and other voters are clueless enough to vote Democrat.

The GOP has a powerful slate of candidates for the top offices, including two minority candidates who are the Democrats' worst nightmare.

The lieutenant governor candidate is Marine veteran and businesswoman Winsome Sears, the first black Republican woman elected to a state House seat. Vying to replace Mark Herring as attorney general is former prosecutor Jason Miyares, the first Cuban American elected to the state House.

Gubernatorial candidate Glenn Youngkin is a white, moderately conservative businessman who opposes vaccine mandates and the Democrats' radical tax, abortion, and school agendas.

Suppose the voters elect Mr. Youngkin, Ms. Sears, and Mr. Miyares, and Republicans retake the legislature. In that case, it will signal to the rest of America that the Democrats'

wicked game of exploiting minorities is over and that no amount of vote fraud will preclude a reckoning.

During a debate, Mr. Youngkin was handed a powerful issue after his opponent, Terry McAuliffe, said that he opposed parents having a say in what their children are learning and what books they should read. Mr. McAuliffe basically said, “Shut up. They’re the government’s kids, not yours.”

Add to that U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland’s order to the FBI to investigate dissident parents as potential sources of “domestic terrorism and hate crimes,” which may have been inspired by Mr. Smith’s arrest, and you have an alarming picture of the war on Virginia parents.

At the national level, Americans are outraged over literally millions of illegal aliens pouring over the southern border, unconstitutional COVID-19 vaccine mandates, raging inflation, a drop-off in jobs created, higher taxes on the way, and imposition of transgender insanity in schools and the military.

And those are just the lowlights.

Government-heavy Northern Virginia and vote fraud may swing the election for Democrats. Still, they know they are in a fight for their political lives this time around, with national implications. Both parties are pouring in resources and looking for paid volunteers.

As Halloween approaches, Democrats are in their usual costumes, pretending to be “moderates.”

Anyone paying attention should be able to see right through them.



If There’s No Truth There Is No Injustice

By Paul Adams, Epoch Times

Can there be injustice if there’s no truth?

Martin Luther King Jr. considered this question in his powerful letter from Birmingham Jail (1963). He was responding to fellow members of the clergy who opposed segregation, but rejected civil disobedience, which involved breaking the law. His central point was that laws may be just or unjust. We have a duty to obey just laws and to oppose, or even defy, unjust laws. We need to recognize that both kinds exist and learn how to tell the difference.

Referring to the examples of Nazi tyranny under Hitler and the 1956 Hungarian revolution against communist tyranny, King wrote:

“We should never forget that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was ‘legal’ and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was ‘illegal.’ It was ‘illegal’ to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler’s Germany. Even so, I am sure that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived in a Communist country where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would openly advocate disobeying that country’s antireligious laws.”

King gave examples—from the Bible, the martyrdom of early Christians, and the Boston Tea Party—of the refusal to submit to unjust laws.

Truth and Justice

Like the American Founders and the Declaration of Independence, King didn’t seek to abolish the rule of law, but to appeal to it. King saw, as Thomas Jefferson did, that it wasn’t enough to define law as whatever the sovereign power declared it to be. He saw, as did the Founders, that law defined as such provides no constraint on tyrants who want to reduce it to a matter of their own will and power.

So what distinguishes a just law from an unjust one?

In addressing this question, both King and the Declaration of Independence drew on a classical tradition that perceives law as rooted in objective reality, in the way that things are. It’s a tradition at least as old as Aristotle. King cited St. Augustine as stating the principle that “an unjust law is no law at all.” He cited St. Thomas Aquinas as teaching that “an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.”

In a similar way, the Declaration of Independence appeals to “the laws of nature and of nature’s God.” It bases itself on truths that it holds to be self-evident and affirms inalienable rights that are endowed by the Creator, rather than conferred by the state or sovereign:

“We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.”

No Truth, No Injustice

For some modern people, such appeals to truth or reality seem intrinsically intolerant, since your truth is different from my truth. We see a radical relativism pervading law, education, and media that turns out to be anything but tolerant. It’s not enough to accept that I have the right to proclaim my belief, however absurd, illogical, or contrary to the very nature of the human person or species it may be. It’s not enough that you tolerate it: You must now endorse it with all the visible enthusiasm of a Communist Party Central

Committee member applauding the statements of the Dear Leader.

Relativism is the ideology of tyrants. For Stalin and Hitler, history was on their side, victory was inevitable, and anyone who questioned their version of the truth was objectively an enemy of the state. “Truth” itself was a matter of the will and power of the ruler. If the outcome of their policies and edicts wasn’t what they promised, it wasn’t because they contradicted reality or the givenness and constraints of life. It was because enemies, within and outside of the ruling party, conspired to sabotage the program.

In the United States, we see such an unconstrained vision of reality, not in the full-blooded totalitarianism of a Stalin or a Hitler, but in the growing denial of reality itself. It’s a rejection of democratic processes, a refusal of argument or debate, and the censoring or suppression of speech or even of plain information, in the media and on campuses. Those who bravely speak up for truth and against injustice are more likely to face hateful mobs on Twitter than Red Guards or Brownshirts in the street.

Retired Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy often accompanied his most aggressive judicial activism with rhetorical flourishes about the right to make up our own reality. The rhetoric was a sign that Kennedy was going to ignore the Constitution and impose his own views in place of democratic political and legislative processes.

In the Casey abortion decision of 1992, Kennedy famously declared, “At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life.” Ed Whelan of the Ethics and Public Policy Center translated Kennedy’s words: “We justices have the unbounded authority to decide which matters you yahoo citizens should be prohibited from addressing through legislation.”

Kennedy’s purple prose signified in practice the inauguration of decades of the legalized killing of the vulnerable and innocent on an unprecedented scale, the denial of reality, and repudiation of the right to life of a whole class of human beings, the most vulnerable among us.

Transgender identity ideology appears in this light as an extreme case of truth-denying as a requirement for participation in polite society. The absurdity and incoherence of the claims that are being advanced as scientific by this quasi-religious pseudoscience, along with the catastrophism and zeal of adherents (you must accept my self-diagnosis or you will kill me; saying that is committing genocide) suggests that a fringe cult of extremists are behind the ideology. The numbers who identify as trans is small, even allowing for the craze among teen girls in the United States and the UK. But the rapid embrace of the ideology in left-

liberal parties, professional bodies, media, education, libraries, and the bureaucratic state has been extraordinary, and this despite the irreversible damage done to young people, their bodies, and their family relationships.

Live Not by Lies

Communism and Nazism both accept a relativism that reduces “truth” to a matter of will and power, while seeking to impose their own truth on others. They’re obviously tyrannical, if not totalitarian. But we see the same tendencies in ideologies and movements promoted by Western elites that deny objective truth and seek to suppress free speech, open debate, and democratic decision-making.

The tyranny of radical relativism is one of its paradoxes. It denies the very existence of objective reality while insisting on its own truth.

Must we surrender to this bullying out of fear that speaking the truth will elicit enraged Twitter mobs demanding that we be canceled, fired, refused admission to the college or job of our choice, or de-platformed from speaking engagements or denied future employment?

The witnesses of those who have survived the severest persecution in our times, under Nazis, communists, or the Jihadi terrorists of ISIS, offer an answer. Whether the surviving victims were Jews or Christians, the victims of slavery or religious persecution, they always insisted on the ultimate importance of telling and hearing the truth about what happened on the ground. The perspectives of concentration camp guards and their victims in the Holocaust were different, as were those of Christians in communist Eastern Europe and the agents of state repression who persecuted them.

To say this isn’t to assert that there’s only one true narrative of an event or that accusers must always be believed. The ruin of many lives and reputations by a pedophile fantasist, Carl Beech, whose false allegations led British police to conduct a sweeping historical sex abuse investigation (2014–2016), should give us pause before adopting the then-fashionable mantra “believe all victims” or junking due process and the assumption of innocence. Years later, in 2019, Beech was convicted on multiple charges of perverting the course of justice and one charge of fraud. He was sentenced to 18 years in prison. His false allegations against prominent individuals, some no longer living, led to a disastrously flawed investigation and immense damage to those he accused and their families, while discouraging true victims of abuse from coming forward.

Truth Matters

Justice can be perverted or denied by false allegations: by the failure to take real victims seriously (as happened notoriously

in Rotherham in the UK over several decades, where authorities failed to act on reports of actual sex trafficking and organized child sexual abuse) and by victims' fear of retaliation if they speak the truth—there were an estimated 1400 victims in Rotherham, many of whom weren't believed.

The point is simply that justice depends on recognizing the real, objective nature of truth (beyond what the state or party or leaders says it is at the moment), establishing the truth of the matter, and then telling it (or at least not lying about it), even when the cost of truth-telling is high in terms of job security or, in these days of doxxing, in terms of the risk to one's family. It's the priority of those who have witnessed such horrors as the Russian Gulag or the Nazi concentration camps. It should be ours as well. Without truth, there can be no injustice and hence, no justice.



Leftist Shadow Governments Control a Lot More Than Our Elections

This kind of tax-exempt political interference is now standard practice for the world's far-left ultra-rich, and it's affecting a whole lot more than elections.

By **Joy Pullmann**, *The Federalist*, condensed

Many Americans are awakening to the fact that we seem to have no local control of a lot of local things: public schools, our terms of employment, local governments, local elections...

[Independent reporting shows] that 2020 election chaos was part of an effective and well-funded plan to help Democrats win by rigging the playing field. One key strategy deployed to that end has become default on the left yet still often goes unremarked and unchallenged. It's called "advocacy philanthropy."

In the 2020 election, Facebook zillionaire Mark Zuckerberg used this strategy to deploy *nearly half a billion dollars* to help Democrat activists infiltrate local government election apparatuses, literally paying for election equipment and the salaries of partisans who counted ballots. This kind of tax-exempt political interference is now standard practice for the world's far-left ultra-rich, and it's affecting a whole lot more than elections. It's constructed essentially a shadow government that pits elected officials against their voters on behalf of moneyed interests.

How the Rich Influence Politics With 'Philanthropy'

In the past two decades, large foundations have begun to "engage more directly with the political process by supporting advocacy organizations, investing in the implementation of major policy reforms, and ensuring that their research investments are targeted to advance specific policy priorities," document politics professors Sarah Reckhow and Megan Tompkins-Stange in a 2018 paper. These large foundations are predominantly run by leftists, including Bill and Melinda Gates, Zuckerberg, and George Soros.

Their "advocacy philanthropy" strategy is a departure from the traditional philanthropy still largely practiced by the "local gentry" more modest donors close to local communities and causes.

Traditional charity focuses on clear, concrete human needs: Food. Clean water. Sports equipment. Teachers. Missionaries. And so forth. It also provides, say, funding for big projects that would be difficult for the non-rich to raise in a timely manner, such as capital funding for schools, churches, and libraries.

Advocacy philanthropy, on the other hand, focuses on not directing private money to charitable ends, but on using private money to affect what *government* entities do. In other words, it's tax-exempt political activism.

How Bill Gates Overrode Millions of Votes

One of the pioneers of this strategy has been Bill Gates. He used it extensively to control how states and the federal government run public schools, effectively using one man's trillions to outweigh the votes and voices of millions of American citizens. His crowning achievement was Common Core.

"For years, Bill Gates focused his education philanthropy on overhauling large schools and opening small ones. His new strategy is more ambitious: overhauling the nation's education policies," The New York Times reported in 2011 after the Common Core project was already locked in at the federal level. "...In some cases, Mr. Gates is creating entirely new advocacy groups. The foundation is also paying Harvard-trained data specialists to work inside school districts, not only to crunch numbers but also to change practices. It is bankrolling many of the Washington analysts who interpret education issues for journalists and giving grants to some media organizations."

"We've learned that school-level investments aren't enough to drive systemic changes," Allan C. Golston, the president of the foundation's United States program, told the Times. "The importance of advocacy has gotten clearer and clearer."

Like Zuckerberg with the 2020 elections, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation spent hundreds of millions of dollars to write Common Core, write tests and curriculum matching it, successfully lobby federal and state officials to make it mandatory (including with former Gates Foundation staffers inside the Obama administration, in violation of Obama's own ethics rules), and create a media and activism "echo chamber" that surrounded the entire process with Astroturfed, paid promoters praising the effort.

"It's easier to name which groups Gates doesn't support than to list all of those they do, because it's just so overwhelming," graduate researcher Ken Libby told the Times in 2011 of the Gates Foundation's tax-exempt education activism.

Just like Zuckerberg, Gates funneled beaucoup bucks through shell nonprofits, using them as "intermediate organizations" to carry out his political mission. Just like Zuckerberg, Gates sent millions of private dollars to government agencies like the Kentucky Department of Education, effectively directing government priorities single-handedly instead of these government agencies carrying out the will of the voters as directed by state legislatures or Congress.

Just like Zuckerberg, Gates provided partisan consultants to state agencies to help them do what he wanted, completely sidelining the voices and input of voters. Because nonprofits conducted the majority of this lobbying and policy work, their funding, personnel, communications, and meetings are closed to the public, unlike identical activities conducted through government entities.

Outsourcing Government Away from Voters

Common Core and Zuckbucks elections are but two examples of this now endemic use of private billions to thwart local and individual self-government. The 2017 book, "[Deconstructing the Administrative State](#)," gives numerous case examples of big business and big government interests constructing advocacy organizations that submerge citizen voices by claiming falsely to represent "stakeholders," allowing minority views to dominate public affairs. But, just as Gates funded the majority of people testifying at state legislatures in favor of Common Core, the majority of so-called "stakeholders" in public affairs are really just sock puppets manufactured and controlled by the same special interests behind the scenes.

This kind of private monopoly on public discussion is typical of, for example, transportation projects, housing, education, and business development projects, hamstringing actual local control of what are obviously local issues. From start to finish, private interests that benefit big from government contracts — and by this point, that's most nonprofits and millions of so-called

private employees — work with politicians and agencies to deny true public debate and local self-government.

Congress and state legislatures use a similar method of forcing states and local governments to ignore their voters ever since Progressive Era legal changes made this effective privatization of government activities possible. Just like the billionaires, to accomplish what the Constitution bars legislatures from doing, they simply do an end-run around Americans' rights by outsourcing government: They pay private interests public dollars to do it.

All this incestuousness between government and "private" interest effectively deprives Americans of their constitutional rights and representation, and manifests in a variety of ways. Columbia Law scholar Philip Hamburger's new book, "Purchasing Submission," explores the phenomenon in great detail, focusing on how today's administrative state privatizes government as well. "When government takes a private sideline around the Constitution's avenue for regulation, it all too often pursues policies that, perhaps for good reason, would not survive the Constitution's more regular and public process," Hamburger writes.

If You Don't Have Lawyers, You Don't Have Rights

Here's just one more illustration of this essentially fascist dynamic. It's called "sue and settle." "Sue and settle" is a lawfare tactic that the Obama administration massively expanded. It's another avenue for billionaire-funded leftist activists to get what they want without the pesky political problem of convincing voters to elect people who will do it.

"Sometimes, regulators are only too happy to face collusive lawsuits by friendly 'foes' that are aimed at compelling government action that would otherwise be difficult or impossible to achieve," explains a Heritage Foundation report on the tactic. "Rather than defend these cases, regulators settle them in a phenomenon known as 'sue and settle.'"

And now we've come full circle, because this "sue and settle" tactic was another one Democrats employed like crazy in 2020 to get courts to essentially suspend state election laws. This created complete chaos and undermined millions of Americans' faith in the election outcome and our entire system of government.

Why did Democrats want election chaos? [Here is my take on it]: It's for the exact same reason the left pushes *all* these strategies to circumvent voters and the Constitution. They don't believe in natural rights, the rule of law, or even elections. They believe in the unchecked exercise of unlimited power, and they are willing to do *anything* to get it.

It's past time for elected officials who claim to be defending our rights and constitutional way of life to wake up to this reality and start leading us out of it instead of spending decades promising to do that to donors and TV cameras while things just keep getting scarier.



How Diversity Turned Tyrannical

By Lawrence Krauss, Wall Street Journal

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology was supposed to host Thursday's John Carlson Lecture on climate. MIT's department of earth, atmospheric and planetary sciences canceled the event because the speaker turned out to have expressed a dissenting opinion—though not about climate science. University of Chicago geophysicist Dorian Abbot argued in a Newsweek piece that universities' obsession with "diversity, equity and inclusion," or DEI, "threatens to derail their primary mission: the production and dissemination of knowledge." If MIT wanted to prove Mr. Abbot's point, it could hardly have done better. (His lecture will be hosted instead by Princeton's conservative redoubt, the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions.)

DEI efforts have been under way for decades, but recently they have come to dominate teaching and research agendas, including in the hard sciences. Many scientific disciplines, including my own area of physics, had too few women and minorities in the 1970s and '80s. Newly established diversity offices developed procedures to counter the possibility that underlying issues might interfere with ensuring both excellence and diversity. As chairman of a physics department in the 1990s, I had to write a statement justifying each appointment we made that went to a white man.

Once entrenched, the DEI offices began to grow unchecked. They became huge and expensive offices not subject to faculty oversight and now work to impose "equity" not only by discriminating in favor of female and minority candidates but by demanding and enforcing ideological commitments from new faculty.

Traditionally, applicants for a science faculty position submit published articles, recommendations from mentors and colleagues, and a statement of their proposed research and teaching interests. University selection committees use this information to assess their qualifications for research and teaching.

Several years ago, one began to see an additional criterion in advertisements for faculty openings. As a recent Cornell

ad puts it: "Also required is a statement of diversity, equity and inclusion describing the applicant's efforts and aspirations to promote equity, inclusion and diversity through teaching, research and service." This sort of requirement became more common and is now virtually ubiquitous. Of the 25 most recent advertisements for junior faculty that appeared in Physics Today online listings as of Oct. 15—from research institutions like Caltech to liberal-arts colleges like Bryn Mawr, and even in areas as esoteric as quantum engineering and theoretical astrophysics—24 require applicants to demonstrate an explicit, active commitment to the DEI agenda.

This isn't merely pro forma; it's a real barrier to employment. The life-sciences department at the University of California, Berkeley reports that it rejected 76% of applicants in 2018-19 based on their diversity statements without looking at their research records. A colleague at a major research institution, who asked to remain anonymous to protect her students, wrote to me: "I have a student on the market this year, agonizing more on the diversity statement than on the research proposal. He even took training where they taught them how to write one. It breaks my heart to see this." Other colleagues relate that their white male postdocs aren't getting interviews or have chosen to seek jobs outside academia.

This is happening not only in universities. Last week the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, a biomedical research charity, announced a \$2.2 billion initiative aimed at reducing racial disparity, made possible by a contraction in its funding of significant research for senior investigators. The initiative includes \$1.2 billion in grants for early-career researchers. Science magazine reports that because antidiscrimination law prohibits disqualifying applicants on the basis of race and sex, the recipients will be chosen based on their "commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion," in the words of the institute's president, Erin O'Shea. How? "Diversity statements," she says, are "a very promising approach."

The DEI monomania has contributed to the crisis of free speech on campus. As Mr. Abbot's cancellation illustrates, even tenured senior faculty aren't immune. Stephen Porter, a North Carolina State education professor, has sued the school, alleging that it "intentionally and systematically excluded him from departmental programs and activities that are necessary for him to fulfill his job" for speaking out against the DEI agenda.

All this creates a climate of pervasive fear on campus and shuts down what should be an important academic discussion. After I wrote an article in these pages about the intrusion of ideology into science, I heard from faculty around the country who wrote under pseudonyms that they

were afraid of being marginalized, disciplined or fired if administrators discovered their emails.

Beyond these fearful faculty members, and talented would-be scientists who will be dissuaded or excluded from academic research, DEI offices are working to indoctrinate incoming students. This year at Princeton, the New York Post reports, freshmen were required to watch a video promoting “social justice” and describing dissenting debate as “masculine-ized bravado.” If such efforts succeed, a new generation of students won’t have the opportunity to subject their own viewpoints to challenge—surely one of the benefits of higher education.

Critics have likened DEI statements to the loyalty oaths of the Red Scare. In 1950 the University of California fired 31 faculty members for refusing to sign a statement disavowing any party advocating the overthrow of the U.S. government. That violated their freedom of speech and conscience, but this is worse. Whereas a loyalty oath compels assent to authority, a DEI statement demands active ideological engagement. It’s less like the excesses of anticommunism than like communism itself.



Alumni Unite for Freedom of Speech

By Stuart Taylor Jr
and Edward Yingling, Wall Street Journal

Readers of these pages are well aware that free speech, academic freedom and viewpoint diversity are in big trouble at U.S. universities. But many of those worried over the state of campuses are almost resigned to the idea that the forces of illiberal intolerance have won. The fight is far from over. On Oct. 18, five alumni groups are announcing the creation of an organization to stand up for open inquiry: the Alumni Free Speech Alliance.

AFSA’s founders are groups of graduates of Cornell University, Davidson College, Princeton University (our alma mater), the **University of Virginia** (emphasis added), and Washington and Lee University. Our allied organizations are the Cornell Free Speech Alliance, Davidsonians for Freedom of Thought and Discourse, Princetonians for Free Speech, the Jefferson Council (composed of UVA alumni) and the Generals Redoubt (W&L alumni).

AFSA’s member groups are nonpartisan and will protect the rights of faculty and students across the ideological spectrum. The groups will pool ideas and information as well as promote and mentor similar groups of alumni from

other schools. Our goal is to ally with scores of as-yet-uninformed alumni groups around the country.

Why alumni? Because with rare exceptions, everyone else may feel too exposed to attacks to take a stand against campus culture. Our experience is that the few student free-speech groups don’t have many members (Princeton’s has about 20). Champions of free speech among faculty are badly outnumbered, even as many left-of-center professors are starting to realize that they too can be brutally canceled by the mob. Those few students and faculty who speak up often feel isolated and exposed.

University trustees, presidents and other administrators are also usually mired in the toxic campus environment, which responds to heresy with attacks. Most have either been cowed by or genuinely believe in a woke orthodoxy that sees free speech as an inconvenient disruption.

That leaves alumni as the only university stakeholders with the numbers and clout to lead the defense of free speech, academic freedom and viewpoint diversity in campus environments. Free speech and academic freedom are fundamental to the advancement of knowledge and to the success of our colleges and universities. Will all teaching and research at these schools soon be subject to a mandated orthodoxy? Will parents keep paying to send their children places where the fundamental elements of learning are suppressed? These institutions constantly seek alumni involvement and contributions. Alumni have the ability and duty to demand that their schools maintain the reasons for which they were created. But to be effective, alumni need to organize.

In a recent survey by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, more than 80% of students reported self-censoring their views at least some of the time, with 21% saying they censor themselves often. The survey, of more than 37,000 college students on 159 campuses, shows growing support among students for various forms of censorship, especially of conservative speakers, with 66% of students saying that shouting down speakers on campus may be justified. Other polls report similar results.

Tolerance for free speech among faculty appears to be marginally greater, but it is in decline; and left-tilted ideological litmus tests in faculty hiring have become common while moderate and conservative professors have become scarcer.

Hundreds of articles in numerous publications have reported on the harassment, suspension and even dismissal of faculty and students for expressing opinions, many quite reasonable, that offend woke activists. Meanwhile, university presidents often do nothing, even when their schools’ free-speech rules would seem to require action.

Alumni—and that may include you—must act. Our five allied alumni groups stand ready to help.



A Quiet Attack on American Principles Is Going Unnoticed

An underreported result of the trial of police officer Derek Chauvin is upending American ideals of justice

By Bob Zeidman, Epoch Times, condensed

The sanctity of American justice is predicated on the right to a fair trial. Trial by jury was one of the most important American principles at its founding, guaranteed in the body of the Constitution in Article III, Section 2, and in the Sixth Amendment. It was instituted as a protection of individuals against abuses by the government.

Earlier this year, police officer Derek Chauvin was convicted of the murder of George Floyd. Chauvin's attorneys had hired highly experienced and respected retired forensic pathologist Dr. David Fowler as an expert witness. Fowler testified that Floyd died of "a sudden cardiac arrhythmia due to his [underlying] heart disease ... during his restraint and subdual by the police" and not because of lack of oxygen. Despite Fowler's testimony, the jury convicted Chauvin of murder.

Many trials end in decisions that seem wrong, and you may or may not agree with the conviction of Chauvin. But whether we agree with any particular decision or not, the American system of justice requires us to abide by it. Otherwise, the system falls apart.

The whittling away of the American justice system in this instance is not the government's attempt to change a jury's verdict; the government got the conviction that it wanted. In a dangerous precedent, the government is now attempting to ensure that future cases are more likely to result in the verdict it wants by making it clear that witnesses with whom it disagrees will be punished, ostracized, and have their careers destroyed.

Fowler, Chauvin's expert witness, was Maryland's chief medical examiner from 2002 to 2019. According to his resume on the website of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, Fowler was trained in forensic pathology at the University of Cape Town. He was an adjunct associate professor at the University of Maryland in the departments of pediatrics and pathology, and on the faculty at the National Study Center for Trauma and Emergency Medical Systems. Fowler is a past president of the National Association of Medical Examiners. He has authored numerous book

chapters, scientific journal articles, and formal presentations. He currently serves as the National Association of Medical Examiners representative to the Forensic Science Standards Board.

Shortly after the trial, Maryland Attorney General Brian Frosh "received a letter from D.C.'s former chief medical examiner Roger Mitchell, and signed by 431 doctors from around the country, saying Fowler's conclusions were so far outside the bounds of accepted forensic practice that all his previous work could come into question," according to the Associated Press. Within 24 hours, Frosh, in consultation with Maryland Gov. Larry Hogan's chief legal counsel, announced an investigation into Fowler's prior in-custody death examinations. In September, Frosh announced the members of the audit design team. This development is very troubling.

I work as an expert witness in technology cases. I've participated in over 240 cases over 25 years. I've seen unethical behavior by expert witnesses, a small number of whom can be paid to say almost anything to support their client's position. I've written about this unethical behavior and about the need to set stricter standards for expert testimony and more significant consequences for those who purposely misrepresent facts, use unaccepted processes, change testimony, or participate in other unscrupulous behavior. The key, though, is that I challenge expert results in court after I've seen all the evidence, produced my own rigorous analysis, and come to my own conclusions. Many times, another expert will examine the same evidence, produce an analysis, and come to different conclusions. There's no crime in being wrong. The jury listens to the experts, guided by the lawyers, weighs the evidence, and comes to a decision. Our justice system is far from perfect, but for the system to work and be as fair as possible, we all must abide by the judicial outcomes.

If any of the armchair medical "experts" in the world are allowed to bring down the career of Fowler, then few people will ever have the courage to testify contrary to the government's case or the public's desires. There may be no stronger or more serious undermining of the American justice system than this one. For the American justice system to survive, people must be free to testify honestly and without outside pressure.

For the sake of basic American principles of justice, honest expert opinions must be given openly, without coercion, and without the belief that the government could destroy your reputation and career if you testify the "wrong" way. This is one more move by those on the left who are working against American principles and attempting to destroy the very basis of our society. We must all work to stop it, especially in its most subtle forms.



America First Legal Blasts Biden DOJ, DHS Effort to Codify Open Borders Policies into Federal Regulations

[America First Legal, an organization created by President Trump’s former Senior Advisor Stephen Miller, issued a press release last week strongly condemning the Biden Administration’s efforts to codify its open border policy through the regulatory rulemaking process in a blatant attempt to make an end run around the Congressional legislative process. The substance of the press release is below:]

“[I]n a formal comment submitted as part of the rulemaking process, America First Legal blasted a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking from the Biden Administration’s Department of Justice and Department of Homeland Security. The Biden Administration’s proposal unlawfully overturns federal statutes to protect its destructive and radical catch-and-release policies and to eviscerate any tiny shred of remaining integrity in the asylum system.

“Among other things the Biden Administration intends to:

“– Formalize its radical catch-and-release policies under the guise of its “parole” power for aliens encountered along the border. Rather than following the law and exercising “parole” on a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit, the Administration aims to release into the United States nearly every single alien apprehended along the border. This will achieve their intended goal of permitting as many illegal aliens as possible to enter into the United States, obtain work authorization, and remain here in perpetuity.

“– Eliminate immigration court hearings for aliens apprehended at the border who express a desire to apply for asylum. Currently these hearings are held before an immigration judge where aliens are subject to cross examination and fraudulent or frivolous claims are exposed. The rule would do away with that in favor of what amounts to a simple conversation with a sympathetic asylum officer where claims largely go untested. Historically, nearly all asylum cases lack merit and are overwhelmingly rejected by immigration judges. The rule bypasses federal law to grant immediate asylum without limit or legal basis.

“– Improperly ignore the potential adverse impact of a flood of illegal aliens on American citizens and legal immigrants, especially with respect to working class and Black Americans’ access to jobs, health care, and K-12 education.

“The timing of this proposed rule could not be worse. In the midst of a pandemic and a deeply troubled economy, the Biden Administration has opened up the southern border. Now, with this rule, it aims to build a “welcome” sign inviting migrants to cross the border unlawfully, promising they will be released into the interior of the United States with full amnesty in the form of asylum and eventual citizenship.

“America First Legal will not stand by as the Biden Administration demolishes our sovereignty.

Statement From America First Legal President Stephen Miller:

“This regulation is an abomination. It is a codification of open borders. If it goes into effect, it will allow the Biden Administration to functionally mint new citizens at the border — turning border patrol stations into a green card factory. Far-left asylum officers will be able to simply approve meritless demands for asylum lodged by illegal border-crossers, which in turn confers permanent residency, a path to full citizenship, and access to welfare, the voting booth, and chain migration. This regulation is Biden’s most lawless, extreme and radical open borders edict to date — indeed, the most radical in history,” Stephen Miller said.”

Board Members

President C.J. Hatcher:

cj@cjhatcher.net

Vice President Tamara Thies:

tamaramct@yahoo.com

Secretary Donni Long:

g_long@comcast.net

Treasurer Madeleine Chandler:

mbc4z@earthlink.net

Bylaws Chair Tanya Skeen:

tanyaskeen@yahoo.com

Membership Chair Rena Snow:

renasnow@hotmail.com

Fundraising Chair Christy Lloyd:

Christy_n_lloyd@comcast.net

Upcoming Events/Announcements

- **November Luncheon** – Mark your calendars for Thursday, November 18, 2021, Speaker: Flint Engleman, Americans for Prosperity, Greencroft Club
- **WAC Action Committees Sign-Up** – We need members to be involved! Contact: Rena Snow (renasnow@hotmail.com)