

Third-Party Comment Form

HOW TO FILE A THIRD-PARTY COMMENT WITH WSCUC

1. Carefully read the ‘Submitting and Processing Third-Party Comments’ section of the WSCUC [Complaints and Third-Party Comments Policy](#) (pages 6-7).
2. Use the attached Third-Party Comment Form to submit a comment. You must complete all applicable sections of the form before the comment will be reviewed.
3. You may attach additional sheets of paper if you need more space. Include with the form any copies of documents and supporting materials that pertain to your comment. (50 page limit).
4. Mail or email your Third-Party Comment Form and any additional documentation or supporting materials to the address below.

Third-party identification

Please take careful note of the information in the Complaints and Third-Party Comments Policy regarding the declaration of identity on this form.

THIRD PARTY COMMENT REVIEW PROCESS

1. Third-party comments are reviewed by Commission staff after receiving the Third-Party Comment Form and supporting documents. Normally, no response is made to the commenter. If appropriate, staff may contact the commenter for clarification or additional information.
2. Commission staff will determine the appropriate course of review and action on the comment which may include, but is not limited to: sending the information to the institution, with or without the commenter’s name for its information or follow up; referring the information or a summary of issues to a future review team; holding the information in a file for future reference, or disregarding the information and taking no action.

If you have further questions, please contact:

WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)
985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100
Alameda CA 94501
Phone: 510-748-9001 x 300
Web: www.wscuc.org
Email: wscuc@wscuc.org

COMMENTER INFORMATION:

- I wish to remain anonymous
- I am identifying myself to WSCUC but do not wish to share my identity with the institution in question
- You may share my identity with the institution in question

Third-Party Commenter Name: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____

INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

University or college named in the complaint:

Complainant's relationship to the university or college named above:

- Student Faculty Staff
- Other (please state): _____

Current status of relationship with university or college:

- Enrolled Graduated Withdrawn On Leave
- Resigned Terminated Employed
- Other (please state): _____

What is the basis of your comment?

Please provide any comment about the institution's quality or effectiveness.

Date: _____

Los Angeles Times September 2, 2018

Op-Ed: UCLA's infatuation with diversity is a costly diversion from its true mission



UCLA students rally to express their concerns about the lack of racial diversity in the student body on November 15, 2006. (Los Angeles Times)

By Heather Mac Donald

Sep. 2, 2018

4:05 AM

If Albert Einstein applied for a professorship at UCLA today, would he be hired? The answer is not clear. Starting this fall, all faculty applicants to UCLA must document their contributions to “equity, diversity and inclusion.” (Next year, existing UCLA faculty will also have to submit an “equity, diversity and inclusion statement” in order to be considered for promotion, following the lead of five other UC campuses.) The mandatory statements will be credited in the same manner as the rest of an applicant’s portfolio, according to UCLA’s equity, diversity and inclusion office.

A contemporary Einstein may not meet the suggested evaluation criteria. Would his “job talk” — a presentation of one’s scholarly accomplishments — reflect his contributions to equity, diversity and inclusion? Unlikely. Would his research show, in the words of the evaluation template, the “potential to understand the barriers facing women and racial/ethnic minorities?” Also unlikely. Would he have participated in “service that applies up-to-date knowledge to problems, issues and concerns of groups historically underrepresented in higher education?” Sadly, he may have been focusing on the theory of general relativity instead. What about “utilizing pedagogies addressing different learning styles” or demonstrating the ability to “effectively teach and attract students from underrepresented communities”? Again, not at all guaranteed.

As the new mandate suggests, UCLA and the rest of the University of California have been engulfed by the diversity obsession. The campuses are infatuated with group identity and difference. Science and the empirical method, however, transcend just those trivialities of identity that UC now deems so crucial: “race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity and socioeconomic status,” to quote from the university’s Diversity Statement. The results of that transcendence speak for themselves: an astounding conquest of disease and an ever-increasing understanding of the physical environment. Unlocking the secrets of nature is challenge enough; scientists (and other faculty) should not also be tasked with a “social justice” mission.

It does not do UCLA’s students any favors to teach them to see bias where there is none.

But such a confusion of realms currently pervades American universities, and UC in particular. UCLA’s [Intergroup Relations Office](#) offers credit courses and “co-curricular dialogues” that encourage students to, you guessed it, “explore their own social identities (i.e. gender, race, nationality, religion/spirituality, sexual orientation, social class, etc.) and associated positions within the campus community.” Even if exploring your social identity were the purpose of a college education (which it is not), it would be more fruitful to define that identity around accomplishments and intellectual passions — “budding mathematician,” say, or “history fanatic” — rather than gender and race.

Intergroup Relations is just the tip of the bureaucratic diversity iceberg. In 2015, UCLA created a vice chancellorship for equity, diversity and inclusion, funded at \$4.3 million, according to figures published by the Millennial Review in 2017. (The EDI vice chancellor’s office did not have its current budget “at the ready,” a UCLA spokesman said, nor did Intergroup Relations.) Over the last two years, according to the Sacramento Bee’s state salary database, the diversity vice chancellor’s total pay, including benefits, has averaged \$414,000, more than four times many faculty salaries. Besides his own staff, the vice chancellor for equity, diversity and inclusion [presides over](#) the Discrimination Prevention Office; BruinX, the “research and development arm of EDI”; faculty “equity advisors”; UCLA’s Title IX office; and a student advisory board. Various schools at UCLA, including medicine and dentistry, have their own diversity deans, whose job includes making sure that the faculty avoid “implicit bias in the hiring process,” in the words of the engineering school’s diversity dean.

These bureaucratic sinecures are premised on the idea that UCLA is rife with discrimination, from which an ever-growing number of victim groups need protection. The Intergroup Relations

Office scours the horizon for “emerging social-identity-based intergroup conflicts,” according to its website. It has been hiring undergraduates and graduate students to raise their peers’ self-awareness of their “experiences with privilege and oppression.” These “diversity peer educators,” whose internship [salaries](#) come out of mandatory student fees, will host [workshops](#) on “toxic masculinity” and “intersectional identities” this fall. If UCLA is putting a comparable effort into organizing campus-wide workshops on the evolution of constitutional government or the significance of Renaissance humanism, it is keeping the effort out of sight.

Reality check: UCLA and the University of California are among the most tolerant, welcoming environments in human history for all races, ethnicities and genders. Every classroom, library and scientific laboratory is open to all qualified students on an equal basis. Far from discriminating against underrepresented minorities in admissions, UCLA and UC have sought tirelessly to devise surrogates for the explicit racial preferences banned in 1996 by Proposition 209. UCLA’s proportion of black undergraduates — 5% in 2016 — is less than one percentage point below the black share of California’s public high school graduates.

In 2016, 4% of UCLA’s faculty were black, 6.6% were Latino, 66% were white, and 18.6% were Asian. This distribution reflects the hiring pipeline, not hiring bias.

Blacks made up 4.7% of all doctorate recipients nationwide in 2006, 4.9% in 2010, and 5.2% in 2016, according to the National Science Foundation. But black PhDs have historically been concentrated in education; in the sciences, which make up a large proportion of the UCLA faculty, less so. In 2016, for example, 1% of all PhDs in computer science went to blacks, or 17 out of 1,659 doctorates, according to the Computing Research Assn. Many fields — nuclear physics, geophysics and seismology and neuropsychology, for instance — had no black PhDs at all.

Given such numbers, it is unrealistic to assume that every academic department at UCLA will perfectly mirror the state’s demographic makeup, absent discrimination. And yet the equity, diversity and inclusion office puts every member of a faculty search committee through time-consuming implicit bias training.

The ultimate solution to any absence of proportional representation in higher education is to close the academic skills gap. In 2015, only 14% of black eighth graders in California and 13% of Latino eighth graders scored as proficient or above on the [National Assessment of Educational Progress](#) math test, compared with 57% of Asians and 43% of whites. In reading, 16% of black eighth graders and 18% of Latino eighth graders were proficient or above, compared with 50% of Asians and 44% of whites. Such gaps have been constant over many decades.

It does not do UCLA’s students any favors to teach them to see bias where there is none. UC’s diversity bureaucracy is a costly diversion from the true mission of higher education: passing on to students, with joy and gratitude, the treasures of our cultural inheritance and expanding the boundaries of knowledge.

Heather Mac Donald is the Thomas W. Smith fellow at the Manhattan Institute. Her latest book, “The Diversity Delusion,” goes on sale Tuesday.

City Journal

EYE ON THE NEWS

Standing on the Shoulders of Diversocrats

The mania to achieve racial and gender equality in the hard sciences and tech will hurt American competitiveness.

Heather Mac Donald

October 15, 2017

Education
The Social Order
California

Another academic year, another fattening of campus diversity bureaucracies. Most worrisomely, the STEM (science, technology, engineering, and math) fields are now prime targets for administrative diversity encroachment, with the commercial tech sector rapidly following suit.

The most significant new diversity sinecure has been established at the University of California, Los Angeles, where the engineering school just minted its first associate dean of diversity and inclusion. The purpose of this new position is to encourage engineering faculty to hire more females and underrepresented minorities, reports the *Daily Bruin*, UCLA's student newspaper. "One of my jobs," the new dean, Scott Brandenburg, told the paper, is "to avoid implicit bias in the hiring process."

The new engineering-diversity deanship supplements the work of UCLA's lavishly paid, campus-wide Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Jerry Kang, whose 2016 salary was \$444,000. Kang, one of the most influential proponents of the "[implicit-bias](#)" concept, already exerts enormous pressure throughout the university to hire for "diversity." Even before his vice chancellorship was created, any UCLA professor hoping for the top rank of tenure had to write a "contributions to diversity" essay detailing his efforts to rectify any racial and gender imbalances in his department. The addition of a localized diversity bureaucrat within the engineering school can only increase the focus on gender and race in hiring and admissions decisions. (Brandenburg, of course, expresses fealty to California's beleaguered ban on racial and gender

preferences in government. But it would be naïve to think that the ubiquitous mandate to increase “diversity” does not inevitably tip the scale in favor of alleged victim groups.)

No evidence exists that implicit bias is a factor in the engineering school’s gender and racial composition. Its percentage of female undergraduate and graduate students—about one quarter—matches the national percentage reported by the American Society for Engineering Education. I asked the school’s spokesman, Amy Akmal, if UCLA Engineering was aware of any examples of the most qualified candidate being overlooked or rejected in a hiring search because of implicit bias; she ignored this fundamental question. (She also ignored a question about the new dean’s salary.) Every science department in the country relentlessly strives to improve its national ranking through hiring the most prestigious researchers. It would be deeply contrary to their interests to reject a superior candidate because of gender or race. And given the pools of federal and private science funding available on the basis of gender and race, hiring managers have added incentive to favor “diverse” applicants. Contrary to the idea that females are being discriminated against in hiring, Wendy Williams and Stephen Ceci [found](#) that female applicants for STEM tenure-track positions enjoyed a two-to-one advantage over similarly qualified males in paired résumé experiments.

The director of UCLA’s Women in Engineering program trotted out the usual role model argument for gender-and race-conscious decision-making. Audrey Pool O’Neal told the *Daily Bruin* that she never saw anyone who looked like her (black and female) when she was an undergraduate and graduate student. “When I do teach classes, the female students let me know how much they appreciate seeing a woman in front of their classroom,” O’Neal said.

Why not appreciate seeing the best-trained scholar in front of your classroom? Any female who thinks that she needs a female in front of her in order to learn as much as she can, or to envision a career in a particular field, has declared herself a follower rather than a pioneer—and a follower based on a characteristic irrelevant to intellectual achievement. If it were really the case that a role model of the same gender is important to moving ahead, it would be impossible to alter the gender balance of a field, assuming such a mission to be worthwhile, which—absent a finding of actual discrimination—it is not. Marie Curie did not need female role models to investigate radioactivity; she was motivated by a passion to understand the world. That should be reason enough to plunge headlong into the search for knowledge.

The Columbia University Medical Center has just pledged \$50 million to diversify its faculty and student body, reports the *Wall Street Journal*, part of a new \$100 million

diversity drive across the entire university. Never mind that Columbia University has already fruitlessly spent \$85 million since 2005 toward the same end. Never mind that there is a huge gap between the MCAT scores of blacks and whites, which will affect the quality of subsequent hiring pools. Columbia's vice provost for faculty diversity and inclusion regurgitates another classic of diversity boilerplate to justify this enormous waste of funds. "The reality is that you can't really achieve excellence without diversity. It requires diverse thought to solve complex problems," says vice provost Dennis Mitchell.

Mitchell's statement is ludicrous on multiple fronts. Aside from the fact that the one thing never sought in the academic diversity hustle is "diverse thought," do Mitchell and his compatriots in the diversity industry believe that females and underrepresented minorities solve analytical problems differently from males, whites, and Asians? A core plank of left-wing academic thought is that gender and race are "socially constructed." Why then would females and underrepresented minorities think differently if their alleged differences are simply a result of oppressive social categories?

Columbia's science departments do not have 50/50 parity between males and females, which, according to Mitchell, keeps them from achieving "excellence." Since 1903, Columbia faculty members have won 78 Nobel Prizes in the sciences and economics. The recipients were overwhelmingly male (and white and Asian); somehow, they managed to do groundbreaking work in science despite the relatively non-diverse composition of their departments.

The only thing that the academic diversity racket achieves is to bid up the salaries of plausibly qualified candidates, and redistribute those candidates to universities that can muster the most resources for diversity poaching. The dean of UCLA Engineering, Jayathi Murthy, laments that of the 900 females admitted to the undergraduate engineering program in 2016, only about 240 accepted the offer. "There are (about) 660 women there that are going somewhere else and the question is . . . is there an opportunity for us to do something differently," she told the *Daily Bruin*. Presumably, those 660 non-matriculants are getting engineering degrees at other institutions. If the goal (a dubious one) is to increase the number of female engineers overall, then it doesn't matter where they graduate from. But every college wants its *own* set of "diverse" students and faculty, though one institution's gain is another's presumed loss.

The pressure to take irrelevant characteristics like race and sex into account in academic science is dangerous enough. But Silicon Valley continues to remake itself in the image

of the campus diversity bureaucracy. Dell Technologies announced in September a new “chief diversity and inclusion officer” position. Per the usual administrator shuffle, the occupant of this new position, Brian Reaves, previously served as head of diversity and inclusion for software company SAP. Reaves will engage the company’s “leaders” in “candid conversations about the role of gender and diversity in the workplace,” said Dell chief customer officer Karen Quintos in a press statement. “Candid” means: you are free to confess your white [cis-male](#) privilege. “Candid” does not mean questioning Dell’s diversity assumptions, as this [summer’s firing of computer engineer](#) James Damore from Google made terrifyingly clear to any other potential heretics.

According to the *Austin-American Statesman*, over the last three years Dell’s existing diversity programs have not changed the company’s gender and racial balance. Dell’s share of women (28 percent) and “people of color” (27 percent) is consistent with the academic pipeline. But magical diversity thinking holds that adding another administrator will somehow conjure forth previously overlooked “diverse” hires. If they don’t materialize, one can always fall back on racial and gender double standards.

Apple CEO Tim Cook has similar confidence in the power of diversity bureaucrats. Cook said in 2015 that diversity is a “readily solvable issue,” according to CNN, and announced that he would hire more women. Failing that, he can at least hire more diversity functionaries. In May, Apple created a new vice president of inclusion and diversity, who will report directly to Cook. This new executive position comes in addition to Apple’s existing director of inclusion and diversity.

Official scientific organizations have all turned obsessively to the diversity agenda. Any academic scientist who wants to move up in administration—or apply for grants, leave, or access to the conference circuit—must be on a crusade against his fellow scientists’ microaggressions and implicit bias. This is good news for the diversity industry, but bad news for America’s scientific competitiveness.

Heather Mac Donald is the Thomas W. Smith Fellow at the Manhattan Institute and a contributing editor of City Journal.

<https://www.thecollegefix.com/war-cops-author-heather-mac-donald-shouted-ucla-hysterical-black-lives-matter-protest/>

The College Fix

Original. Student reported. Your daily dose of *Right*-minded news and commentary from across the nation

FREE SPEECH LEGAL RACIAL ISSUES

‘War on Cops’ author Heather Mac Donald shouted down at UCLA by hysterical Black Lives Matter protest

JENNIFER KABBANY - FIX EDITOR • APRIL 6, 2017



Protester: ‘You have no right to speak!’

A speech by **Heather Mac Donald** at UCLA on Wednesday frequently descended into chaos as Black Lives Matter protesters stormed the stage and chanted their signature phrase over and over, and also took over portions of the Q&A with angry accusations and raucous shouting, a video of the event shows.

Mac Donald, a Manhattan Institute scholar who spoke on campus **at the behest** of the Bruin Republicans to give a “Blue Lives Matter” talk about her 2016 book “**The War on Cops**,” appeared to be able to largely get through the first half of her speech without much dissension.



But when she opened the floor to questions, the uproar began. The chants launched, with several people taking over the floor at the front of the room and continuing to yell over and over: “Black lives — they matter here! Black lives, they matter here!”

Event organizers tried to calm the crowd and regain order. After the Black Lives Matter chant ended, several protesters remained at the front of the room, shouting and making gestures as a student organizer asked for calm. But they started up with more chants, including: “America was never great!”

After the uproar — which lasted about eight minutes — finally died down, Mac Donald (*pictured*) fielded questions from the audience, including from a black female who asked her to speak on whether “black victims killed by cops” mattered. “Yes,” Mac Donald replied. “And do black children that are killed by other blacks matter to you?”

At that the room erupted in gasps and angry moans and furious snaps, and the young lady who asked the original question began to yell at Mac Donald, pointing her finger and repeating the original question.

Mac Donald, known and admired for her unapologetic stance to report facts over emotion, doubled down on the infuriated young black woman.

“Of course I care, and do you know what,” Mac Donald said. “There is no government agency more dedicated to the proposition that black lives matter than the police.”

Again, gasps and moans filled the auditorium.

“Bullshit! Bullshit!” a young woman off camera could be heard screaming.

Mac Donald continued: “The crime drop of the last 20 years that came to a screeching halt in August 2014 has saved tens of thousands of minority lives. Because cops went to those neighborhoods and they got the dealers off the street and they got the gang-bangers off the street.”

Mac Donald took more questions and at times was able to articulate her points during the Q&A, but was also often interrupted by angry audience members shouting out things such as:

“I don’t trust your numbers.”

“Why do white lives always need to be put above everybody else? Can we talk about black lives for one second?”

“The same system that sent police to murder black lives ...”

“You have no right to speak!”

“What about white terrorism?!”

And when Mac Donald talked about how mass immigration is driving down wages, the shouting down started up again: “Say it loud! Say it clear! Immigrants are welcome here!” Over and over they repeated the chant, making hearing Mac Donald’s points on the matter impossible.

Mac Donald did acknowledge several problems with policing — including that police have a history of brutality toward blacks and that some officers need to act with more respect — but she added that policing is evolving to address those concerns, noting: “But I have not heard an answer for what we do with the 4,300 people who were killed in Chicago, or were shot last year in Chicago.”

Again the audience erupted in shouting, with one young man saying he was upset at her audacity to speak to the audience with such information.

But Mac Donald would not be bullied or intimidated, referencing black people who are thrilled when the cops arrive to protect them: “You say I do not speak for blacks. Maybe you do not speak for those law-abiding residents ... who are living daily [under the threat of violence] who want more police officers.”

As the last question was being asked, one young man in the audience shouted ominously: "Have you called the cops?" Indeed, Mac Donald was escorted off the campus.

In an email Thursday to *The College Fix*, Mac Donald said: "I made the argument that there is no government agency more dedicated to the proposition than the police and that policing today is data-driven and a function of crime. Police officers are in inner city high crime areas in order to save lives. But when they back off of proactive policing under the false Black Lives Matter narrative, innocent black lives are lost to the resulting rise in violent crime."

Mac Donald added that the disruptions made it difficult to answer questions thrown her way.

"For a long time, I was not given the chance to respond to either the screamers and hecklers or the people in the audience who wanted to ask questions peacefully. Even during the belated Q and A there were loud disruptions," she said, adding that according to what she overheard during parts of the disruption, protesters had not planned to storm the floor and apparently "hotter hotheads got out of control from their own perspective."

Mac Donald said in her email that it seems students did not discern all the facts she provided.

"Just to give you a sense of the attentiveness of the students, I had said quite explicitly that the history of racism in this country and the complicity of the police in maintaining slavery and Jim Crow segregation through the use of brutal and illegal force make every police shooting of a black man particularly and understandably fraught," she said. "Yet a female in the audience continued to scream at me 'why don't you talk about the history of racism and why don't you care about the loss of black life.'"

Attorney William Becker, an expert in free speech violations at publicly funded universities, recorded extensive video of the disruption, as well as escorted Mac Donald off the campus.

"Many students, including a number of black students, attended solely to disrupt the event," Becker told *The College Fix* via email Thursday. "A cluster of black students remained seated during the Pledge of Allegiance. Three students were well prepared to disrupt the event. I have their images on video. I also have pictures."

Mac Donald is **scheduled** to speak at Claremont McKenna College tonight and already plans are in the works to "shut down" the event, the *Claremont Independent reports*. The *Independent* cites a private Facebook page organizing the protest that state: "Heather Mac Donald has been vocally against the Black Lives Matter movement and pro-police, both of which show her fascist ideologies and blatant anti-Blackness and white supremacy. Let's show CMC that having this speaker is an attack on marginalized communities both on campus and off. Together, we can hold CMC accountable and prevent Mac Donald from spewing her racist, anti-Black, capitalist, imperialist, fascist agenda."

<https://www.thecollegefix.com/war-cops-author-heather-mac-donald-shouted-ucla-hysterical-black-lives-matter-protest/>

The College Fix

Original. Student reported. Your daily dose of *Right*-minded news and commentary from across the nation

Heather Mac Donald UNLEASHED: Scholar drops truth bombs on liberals at UCLA

JACOB KOHLHEPP - UCLA • APRIL 20, 2015



ANALYSIS: With wit, wisdom and bold one-liners, conservative scholar takes down leftist tenets

Well-known author and scholar Heather Mac Donald recently visited UCLA to talk about the idea of “microaggressions” on college campuses, but before she even went there, she had a few words to say about the people running the place.

The launch of her talk Thursday began with outlining the proliferation of the “massive diversity bureaucracy” at universities in general and UCLA in particular. She called out UCLA’s brand new Vice Chancellor for Equity and Diversity position by mentioning his salary alone could “pay...for 12 under privileged college students” to attend UCLA. She also chided UCLA Chancellor Gene Block for “selling out his faculty” and believing “that faculty need constant monitoring by a phalanx of chancellorettes and deanlettes.”

She went on to say university administrators have cast the diversity issue as an “epidemiological miasma,” because they never mention the exact perpetrators but allege that it is everywhere.

And she was just getting warmed up.

Mac Donald, a self-proclaimed “secular conservative” who is well known for her articulation of conservative views on crime, proceeded to describe a litany of academic horrors at the public campus.

First, she recalled an incident in the UCLA Education school where professor emeritus Val Dean Rust was subject to protests because of alleged microaggressions in his editing of student papers a few years ago.

Among the 81-year old professor emeritus's **alleged transgressions** were repeatedly requiring students to write "Indigenous" in lowercase form instead of uppercase, requiring students to capitalize "white" if they also chose to capitalize "black," and requiring students to use the Chicago Manual of Style instead of the style standards of the American Psychological Association.

Mac Donald called the result of the situation – in which Rust was forced to stay away from UCLA for six months and the student protester who led the cause was praised – as a "travesty of justice typical of this reign of terror."

She mentioned that she herself interviewed many of Rust's former students, and all of them had nothing but praise for the retired professor, who was well known for only wanting the best for his students. Her final verdict on the situation was that "UCLA grovels to protesters."

She also cited a viral video that **attacked** UCLA for grievances against black students. Mac Donald said the way the university responded to the video, which was public praise, defies the true narrative of the situation.

The video implies that current black students are as equally oppressed as black students on campus in 1969. But Mac Donald highlighted that although only 3.8 percent of the university is black, only "5 percent of UCLA applicants are black" and only 7 percent of California is black. She said interviews with Professor Richard Sander and Professor **Tim Groseclose**, UCLA whistleblowers on affirmative action, have revealed to her that "UCLA twists itself into knots to admit blacks." She went even further by claiming that the "UCLA Law school admits blacks at 400 times what their proficiency would predict."

In the closing moments of her lecture, Mac Donald implored students to reject what she calls a "cult of victimhood." She encouraged students instead "get revenge by acing your chemistry exam."

During the question and answers portion, Mac Donald fielded questions on a variety of topics, including the "campus rape epidemic."

She questioned the validity of the rape epidemic, postulating that if such an epidemic existed at elite universities, then there would be a strong movement for single sex schools, but instead there is a push for coed bathrooms. In an additional remark, she said that the idea that women are only victims at universities "makes her want to throw up." She cited the larger number of women at universities and the "frenzy to find qualified women and minorities" for professorships as evidence against such an idea.

The event drew attendance from both students and outside community members, and was organized by Bruin Republicans as part of their "Lectures on Conservative Thought" series.

There were no protests of the talk.

College Fix contributor Jacob Kohlhepp is a student at UCLA and vice president of the Bruin Republicans.

City Journal

FROM THE MAGAZINE

The Microaggression Farce

The latest campus fad, which sees racism everywhere, will create a new generation of permanent victims.

Heather Mac Donald

Autumn 2014

**The Social Order
Education
California
Politics and law**

In November 2013, two dozen graduate students at the University of California at Los Angeles marched into an education class and announced a protest against its “hostile and unsafe climate for Scholars of Color.” The students had been victimized, they claimed, by racial “microaggression”—the hottest concept on campuses today, used to call out racism otherwise invisible to the naked eye. UCLA’s response to the sit-in was a travesty of justice. The education school sacrificed the reputation of a beloved and respected professor in order to placate a group of ignorant students making a specious charge of racism.

The pattern would repeat itself twice more at UCLA that fall: students would allege that they were victimized by racism, and the administration, rather than correcting the students’ misapprehension, penitently acceded to it. Colleges across the country behave no differently. As student claims of racial and gender mistreatment grow ever more unmoored from reality, campus grown-ups have abdicated their responsibility to cultivate an adult sense of perspective and common sense in their students. Instead, they are creating what tort law calls “eggshell plaintiffs”—preternaturally fragile individuals injured by the slightest collisions with life. The consequences will affect us for years to come.

UCLA education professor emeritus Val Rust was involved in multiculturalism long before the concept even existed. A pioneer in the field of comparative education,

which studies different countries' educational systems, Rust has spent over four decades mentoring students from around the world and assisting in international development efforts. He has received virtually every honor awarded by the Society of Comparative and International Education. His former students are unanimous in their praise for his compassion and integrity. "He's been an amazing mentor to me," says Cathryn Dhanatya, an assistant dean for research at the USC Rossiter School of Education. "I've never experienced anything remotely malicious or negative in terms of how he views students and how he wants them to succeed." Rosalind Raby, director of the California Colleges for International Education, says that Rust pushes you to "reexamine your own thought processes. There is no one more sensitive to the issue of cross-cultural understanding." A spring 2013 newsletter from UCLA's ed school celebrated Rust's career and featured numerous testimonials about his warmth and support for students.

It was therefore ironic that Rust's graduate-level class in dissertation preparation was the target of student protest just a few months later—ironic, but in the fevered context of the UCLA education school, not surprising. The school, which trumpets its "social-justice" mission at every opportunity, is a cauldron of simmering racial tensions. Students specializing in "[critical race theory](#)"—an intellectually vacuous import from law schools—play the race card incessantly against their fellow students and their professors, leading to an atmosphere of nervous self-censorship. Foreign students are particularly shell-shocked by the school's climate. "The Asians are just terrified," says a recent graduate. "They walk into this hyper-racialized environment and have no idea what's going on. Their attitude in class is: 'I don't want to talk. Please don't make me talk!'"

Val Rust's dissertation-prep class had devolved into a highly charged arena of competing victim ideologies, impenetrable to anyone outside academia. For example: Were white feminists who use "standpoint theory"—a feminist critique of allegedly male-centered epistemology—illegitimately appropriating the "testimonial" genre used by Chicana feminists to narrate their stories of oppression? Rust took little part in these "methodological" disputes—if one can describe "Chicana testimonials" as a scholarly "method"—but let the more theoretically up-to-date students hash it out among themselves. Other debates centered on the political implications of punctuation. Rust had changed a student's capitalization of the word "indigenous" in her dissertation proposal to the lowercase, thus allegedly showing disrespect for the student's ideological point of view. Tensions arose over Rust's insistence that students use the more academic *Chicago Manual of Style* for citation format; some students felt that the less formal American Psychological Association conventions better reflected their political commitments. During one of these heated discussions, Rust

reached over and patted the arm of the class's most vociferous critical race-theory advocate to try to calm him down—a gesture typical of the physically demonstrative Rust, who is prone to hugs. The student, Kenjus Watson, dramatically jerked his arm away, as a burst of nervous energy coursed through the room.

After each of these debates, the self-professed “students of color” exchanged e-mails about their treatment by the class's “whites.” (Asians are not considered “persons of color” on college campuses, presumably because they are academically successful.) Finally, on November 14, 2013, the class's five “students of color,” accompanied by “students of color” from elsewhere at UCLA, as well as by reporters and photographers from the campus newspaper, made their surprise entrance into Rust's class as a “collective statement of Resistance by Graduate Students of Color.” The protesters formed a circle around Rust and the remaining five students (one American, two Europeans, and two Asian nationals) and read aloud their “Day of Action Statement.” That statement suggests that Rust's modest efforts to help students with their writing faced obstacles too great to overcome.

The Day of Action Statement contains hardly a sentence without some awkwardness of grammar or usage. “The silence on the repeated assailment of our work by white female colleagues, our professor's failure to acknowledge and assuage the escalating hostility directed at the *only* Male of Color in this cohort, as well as his own repeated questioning of this male's intellectual and professional decisions all support a complacency in this hostile and unsafe climate for Scholars of Color,” the manifesto asserts. The Day of Action Statement denounces the class's “racial microaggressions,” which it claims have been “directed at our epistemologies, our intellectual rigor and to a misconstruction of the methodological genealogies that we have shared with the class.” (Though it has only caught on in recent years, the “microaggression” concept was first coined in the 1970s by a black psychiatrist.) Reaching its peroration, the statement unleashes a few more linguistic head-scratchers: “It is, at its most benign, disingenuous to the next generations of Scholars of Color to not seek material and systematic changes in this department. It is a toxic, unsafe and intellectually stifling environment at its current worse.”

The Ph.D. candidates who authored this statement are at the threshold of a career in academia—and not just any career in academia but one teaching teachers. The Day of Action Statement should have been a wake-up call to the school's authorities—not about UCLA's “hostile racial climate” but about their own pedagogical failure to prepare students for scholarly writing and advising. Rust is hardly the first professor to be criticized for his efforts to help students write. “Asking for better grammar is inflammatory in the school,” says an occasional T.A. “You have to give an A or you're a racist.”

The authorities chose a different course.

As word of the sit-in spread in the press and on the Internet, the administration began its sacrifice of Rust. Dean Marcelo Suárez-Orozco sent around a pandering e-mail to faculty and students, announcing that he had become “aware of the last of a series of troubling racial climate incidents at UCLA, most recently associated with [Rust’s class]”—thus conferring legitimacy on the preposterous claim that there *was* anything racially “troubling” about Rust’s management of his class. Suárez-Orozco went on: “Rest assured I take this extremely seriously. I humbly dedicate myself to listening and to learning from this experience. As a community, we will work towards just, equitable, and lasting solutions. Together, we shall heal.”

Of course, the very idea of taking “this” “extremely seriously” presupposes that there was something to be taken seriously and solved, as opposed to a mere outburst of narcissistic victimhood. The administration announced that Rust would not teach the remainder of the class by himself but would be joined by three other professors, one of whom, Daniel Solórzano, was the school’s leading proponent of microaggression theory and critical race theory. This reorganization implicitly confirmed the charge that Rust was unfit to supervise “graduate students of color.”

Unsatisfied with the administration’s response, the protesters posted an [online petition](#) riddled with a new crop of grammatical puzzlers. “Students consistently report hostile classroom environments in which the effects of white supremacy, patriarchy, heteronormativity, and other forms of institutionalized oppression have manifested within the department and deride our intellectual capacity, methodological rigor, and ideological legitimacy,” limped one typical sentence.

A few weeks later, a town hall convened to discuss the Day of Action’s charge of a “hostile and toxic environment for students of Color.” Professor Solórzano presented his typology of microaggressions to explain the school’s racial tensions. Protest organizer Kenjus Watson read a long bill of particulars justifying the Day of Action. Another black student argued that no reconciliation in the school was possible because Rust had not apologized for his transgressions. Several of Rust’s faculty colleagues in the Division of Social Sciences and Comparative Education attended; none publicly defended him.

After the meeting, Rust approached the student who had berated him for not seeking forgiveness and tried to engage him in conversation. Ever naive, Rust again reached out to touch his interlocutor. The student, a large and robust young man, erupted in anger and eventually filed a criminal charge of battery against the 79-year-old professor. Rust’s employers presented him with a choice: if he agreed to stay off the education-school premises for the remainder of the academic year, they would not

pursue disciplinary charges against him. The administration then sent around a letter to students, alerting them that the school would be less dangerous—for a while, at least—with Rust out of the picture.

The dean and his assistants were just warming up. They formed a committee charged with “examining all aspects of the [school’s] operations and culture from the perspective of race and ethnic relations.” Oblivious to conflicts of interest, they appointed Watson, leader of the anti-Rust protests, as “graduate student researcher” for the committee. None of the allegedly racially “hostile” students who had been penned inside the protest circle was invited to participate. Solórzano would chair the committee.

The committee’s final report unctuously thanked the student protesters for their brave stand against racial oppression: “Recently, a group of our students have courageously challenged us to reflect on how we enact [the school’s social-justice] mission in our own community. We owe these students a debt of thanks,” opened the report. Watson, in other words, was thanking himself. To laud the students as courageous is absurd: they faced no prospect of negative repercussions from their protest.

The committee said nothing about the students’ embarrassing writing skills, perhaps because it had almost as much difficulty as they did crafting clear prose: “We welcome the opportunity to step up to the leadership role that accompanies our social justice mission to work on remedying the unsafe and not brave learning spaces within our community and pledge to improving our pedagogical practices and classrooms so that all our students feel their work is valued,” the committee announced.

If UCLA were serious about preparing its graduate students for a life of scholarship, it would have rebutted the protesters’ assumption that their work should be off-limits to questions. (According to the Day of Action Statement, “the barrage of questions by white colleagues and the grammar ‘lessons’ by the professor have contributed to a hostile class climate.”) Intellectual debate is essential to the academic endeavor and in no way constitutes a “microaggression,” the administration should have said. There is no likelihood that the class discussions were motivated by racism; virtually every American student in the education school embraces its “social-justice” mission. A graduate student who defended Rust in the UCLA student newspaper opened her [op-ed](#) on the dispute with the observation that racism “is deeply embedded within the institutions that make up UCLA” before denouncing Rust’s “unjust . . . demoniz[ation] as a symbol of white male oppression.”

But the most stunning failure of the committee’s report and of the school’s leadership more generally is the unwillingness to make any public effort to rebut the students’ calumny against Rust. Surely Rust’s colleagues know that he lacks any trace of racial

condescension or “hostility.” As one of his students put it: “He is pure of heart.” No more poisonous charge can be lodged against someone in today’s university than racial bias or insensitivity. Yet the education-school administration sacrificed Rust’s honor and feelings, not to mention the truth, to avoid further inflaming the protesters. This is not just a moral lapse; it is also an educational one. Rust’s “students of color” profoundly misinterpreted the dynamics of the classroom, seeing racial animus where none existed. Not only did the adults at the education school not correct the students’ misperceptions; they celebrated those students as heroes. The administration and complicit faculty have thus all but guaranteed that the protesters and their supporters will go through life lodging similar complaints against equally phantom racism and expecting a similarly laudatory response.

I asked Dean Suárez-Orozco whether his administration believes that Rust was an appropriate target of a racial protest; he refused to answer, citing through a spokesman “personnel privacy rights.” In light of the open humiliation of Rust, as well as the administration and committee’s existing public comments, it is cowardly to hide behind alleged “privacy rights” to avoid answering questions about a painfully public affair.

The closest that the administration came to acknowledging the possibility that the protesters had misconstrued the classroom dynamics was a brief passage in the Race and Ethnic Relations Committee report. According to the committee, there exists no right or wrong interpretation in alleged racial incidents—just different perspectives, each equally valid: “Any incident or experience shared by a community will always generate multiple narratives, each of which has the right to be respected and validated as an experience of events. No single version of any incident is a full explanation of a complex situation, particularly one that carries the heavy weight of issues emotionally charged by historical legacies of racism, power imbalance, and systematic abuses that often go unrecognized and without articulation in our culture.” Though the committee gave no indication that it had considered, much less “validated,” a narrative about Rust’s class that *discounted* the claim of racism, implicit in its invocation of “issues emotionally charged by historical legacies of racism” is the hint that there may be another side to the protesters’ portrayal of Rust’s class. That’s cold comfort, though, to Rust or anyone who cares about the truth. In fact, the committee’s seemingly evenhanded gesture of epistemological inclusiveness is even more of a moral dodge than it first appears. It lets the committee sidestep its responsibility of deciding whether the racial accusation was justified; in practice, the racism charge will always trump a denial of racism. Once such a charge is launched, every campus administration will act as if it were true and will introduce a host of measures to counteract the alleged bias.

The committee concluded by congratulating itself and the school's leadership for identifying "the racial climate challenges that emerged in the Fall Quarter and mov[ing] quickly and decisively to address them." The authors lacked the integrity to name these "racial climate challenges" or to specify how the school addressed them, but presumably the administration did so by cordoning off the school from Rust's dangerous presence. The report goes on to recommend the bureaucracy inflation that is every school's default response to racial protest: in this case, a new associate dean for equity and diversity, a permanent committee on equity and diversity, diversity training for the faculty, and a beefed-up grievance process for lodging complaints of racial discrimination, among other measures lifted directly from the protesters' petition.

Kenjus Watson, the "*only* Male of Color" in Rust's class and lead protest organizer, went on to codirect the "Intergroup dialogue program" at Los Angeles's Occidental College the following summer. In fact, Watson has been a font of "Intergroup dialogue" across the country, the latest content-free academic fraud. "Intergroup dialogue" courses, in the words of the Occidental catalog, seek to "enhance students' knowledge, understanding, and awareness about diversity and social justice while nurturing the development of constructive intergroup relations and leadership skills"—all for academic credit. Watson has taught "Intergroup dialogue" courses at Penn State, St. Louis University, and the University of Michigan, covering such topics as "Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Black Masculinity." Arguably, someone who felt so offended by Rust's arm pat—"this singling out of this Male Student of Color reached an inexcusable culmination when the professor physically shook this student's arm in a questionable, patronizing and facetious effort to remind student of the importance of dialogue," proclaimed the Day of Action Statement—is not the ideal candidate for promoting "constructive intergroup relations," even if that were a legitimate academic field. But Watson has undoubtedly spread his version of "dialogue" and "social justice" to numerous receptive "Students of Color," who will have learned to see everything through a lens of racial offense.

Barely a week after the Day of Action at the education school, a different microaggression incident convulsed UCLA's law school. Once again, the administration failed to push back against clearly ungrounded student claims of racial injury.

UCLA law professor Richard Sander taught an enthusiastic group of students in his first-year property class in the fall of 2013. Building on that class spirit, he proposed a softball match between his students and the other first-year property-law section. Sander's students wanted to make team T-shirts and came up with a design featuring

the logo #teamsander and a picture of their professor holding a baseball bat, embellished with such property terms as “replevin” and “trover.” A few days before the tournament, half of Sander’s students wore their T-shirts to class. An e-mail storm immediately broke out among the first-year black students, charging Sander’s class with microaggression.

Sander, you see, is the progenitor of an empirically sophisticated critique of affirmative action known as [mismatch theory](#), which holds that racial preferences in academic admissions harm their purported beneficiaries by placing them in schools for which they are inadequately prepared. The work has not endeared Sander to the academic establishment, deeply committed as it is to its role as the dispenser of racial noblesse oblige. And UCLA’s minority law students saw in the Team Sander T-shirts a racial slight against them. In the words of the school’s Diversity Action Committee on Campus Climate, the students “felt triggered” by the shirt—an au courant phrase of campus victimology meaning that the shirt had engendered traumatic recollections of other racist abuse that the students had experienced. The shirts were a manifestation of “white privilege,” according to a Facebook commenter, consistent with “racist/classist/sexist comments made inside and outside of the classroom.”

This racial interpretation was wholly fanciful. Affirmative action had never come up during Sander’s class; some of his students were undoubtedly not even aware of mismatch theory. Their choice of team name was solely an expression of gratitude for his property-law instruction. Nevertheless, the first-year black students called a meeting for the next day to discuss their response to the alleged microaggression. Several of Sander’s property-law students attended, in the hope of rebutting the idea that the T-shirt was a political statement; some of the minority students objected to their presence, and the meeting devolved into a shouting match.

Sander’s students left the T-shirts at home for the softball game, but tensions remained high. Several students notified the legal gossip blog Above the Law about the T-shirt offense, and the blog gleefully ran a series of posts about “racism” at the UCLA law school. One post included an anonymous claim from a black student that the law school no longer assigns blacks to Sander’s first-year property classes (there were none that year in his section) because taking a class taught by an opponent of racial preferences is too “awful.” The anonymous source claimed that black students wouldn’t feel comfortable seeking additional help from Sander for fear of “contributing to his research” on mismatch theory by admitting that they didn’t understand a concept. This is an understandable, if unfortunate, reaction to Sander’s work, but it’s hard to see any way around the dilemma. Sander pursues his research on racial preferences in good faith and goes where the facts lead him. He happens to be a committed liberal, passionately dedicated to racial equality, who has come to the

conclusion that affirmative action impedes black academic progress. No one has ever alleged that he treats all his students with anything other than respect. In any case, the creation of the Team Sander T-shirts had nothing to do with mismatch theory.

The day after the softball game, which the first-year black students and a few others in the opposing property-law section boycotted, law school dean Rachel Moran sent an e-mail to the first-year class about the T-shirt incident and the “hurt feelings” that it had caused. Rather than rebutting the idea that the T-shirts were racially disrespectful, Moran took refuge in epistemological agnosticism. She urged students to be “respectful of one another’s feelings and open to understanding different points of view.” In theory, this is anodyne advice, but unless Moran believed that the T-shirts were justifiably viewed as a racial insult, she should have corrected the students’ misperception and helped them gain some perspective on what constitutes a true racial offense. Moreover, if T-shirts with Sander’s name and picture could legitimately be seen as an attack on black students, then Sander’s very presence on campus must also constitute an attack on black students. Moran let that possibility hang out there.



DAMIAN DOVARGANES/AP PHOTO

Students occupy a UCLA admissions office, demanding an increase in minority students.

The rest of Moran’s e-mail signaled where her heart lay. She promised that her administration would “facilitate constructive conversations in safe spaces for all of our students.” This melodramatic “safety” rhetoric, deployed so promiscuously during the Rust incident (and constantly thrown around by campus feminists as well), lies at the heart of academic victimology. Any college bureaucrat who uses it has cast his lot with the fiction that his college is dangerous for minority and female students outside a few places of sanctuary.

Meanwhile, Sander asked a dean if the school had, in fact, stopped assigning black students to his class, as Above the Law had reported. The school has no such policy, the dean told him. Another T-shirt-inspired rumor held that Sander somehow penalizes blacks in grading, even though grading throughout the school is blind to

students' identities. To the contrary, Sander learned, his first-year black students do better in his classes than in their other classes, earning a B on average, compared with a B-minus elsewhere. Sander asked the administration to put those facts out there to rebut the various falsehoods; it declined to do so, for fear of stirring up more protest.

Racial agitation continued into the new semester. The Black Law Students Association held a demonstration in February 2014, protesting the fact that there were only 33 blacks out of 1,100 students at the law school—apparently, the law school is to blame for the small pool of black college graduates nationwide and in California with remotely competitive LSAT scores and grades. The school twists itself into knots trying to admit as many black students as possible without violating California's ban on racial preferences so flagrantly that even the press takes notice. In fact, both UCLA and UC Berkeley law schools admit blacks at a 400 percent higher rate than can be explained on race-neutral grounds, according to a recent paper by a pro-affirmative-action economist at Berkeley, Danny Yagan. No matter. The protesters wore T-shirts with 33/1,100 on them and made a YouTube video titled “33,” containing personal testimonials about the stress of being one of UCLA's black law students: “It's so far from being a safe space that it would be better for my mental health if I stayed at home,” said one girl. Other students complained that they were looked to in class to represent the black perspective—precisely the role that the “diversity” rationale for racial preferences assigns to minority students.

At the same time, a string of robberies near UCLA had prompted a discussion on the law school's student Facebook page about self-defense tips. The school's most vociferous critic of alleged white privilege and institutional racism, first-year student Alexis Morgan Gardner, argued that the robbery perpetrators were “clearly victims to life circumstances (and probably poverty) as well” and that the discussion should address the root causes of crime, not just “reactionary” measures. After a few other students responded that a “root causes” discussion, however important, was secondary to the security issue, Gardner posted: “I FEAR FOR MY SAFETY MORE HERE (at the law school) in this hostile space where the future ‘leaders of America’ are so intolerable to alternative perspectives” than she does in her own home, with “extremely higher” crime statistics. “It sounds like a lynch mob in the making,” she added.

Several days later, a male student unknown to Gardner accosted her on a school elevator and asked her how she could feel at greater risk of physical harm at the law school than in a high-crime area. Gardner wrote about the encounter on Facebook as an example of why she felt unsafe at the school, adding a string of other purported abuses that suggest a paranoid streak: “people . . . publicly mock, disrespect, and

dismiss me when it appeals to the majority. . . . everyone knows exactly who I am and stares at me when I walk through the halls because essentially, I am a fly in the milk. . . there's some deep-seated abhorrence and intolerance of me among the masses, but they hide it in their microaggressions and behind their keyboards.”

A day later, Gardner published on Facebook an anonymous hate-mail note that she said had been left in her mailbox: “stop being such a sensitive [n—r].” Gardner added: “And to all those of you who disrespectfully took part in that fb thread [presumably the one about crime and root causes], who liked comments and encouraged our classmates detestable behavior (on and off of fb), YOU actively contributed to this racially hostile campus environment. . . . I hope you are all proud of yourselves.”

The school immediately went into crisis mode, outstripping its T-shirt response. After the Black Law Students Association presented Dean Moran with a petition denouncing the school's “lack of institutional commitment to student of color presence and safety,” she wrote to the student body that she was “personally sensitive to and aware of the kinds of challenges faced by students of color, in and out of the classroom.” In a breathtakingly condescending gesture, Moran announced that the school would be holding seminars “to help students with cross-cultural competency and communication skills,” an agenda later expanded to include “practical strategies for becoming a better ally.” This increasingly popular “ally” mission may come as a surprise to the average student, who thought that he had enrolled in college to get an education, not to be enlisted in the allegedly titanic struggle of black and Hispanic students against hostile academic forces. The school encouraged incoming first-year law students in the fall of 2014 to be tested for unconscious bias, for which they could receive counseling at the school's expense. The faculty needed an antiracism tune-up as well, in Dean Moran's eyes: the school would offer a faculty workshop on the neuroscience of unconscious bias and its impact on legal education, followed by workshops on “facilitating classroom discussions about race, diversity, and discrimination.” Of course, the administration trotted out the usual parade of additional diversity initiatives, including a new Director of Student Learning Environment and Academic Affairs, tasked with “promoting and supporting diversity,” and a new grievance procedure for student-bias complaints.

The chance that the hate-mail note was real is far lower than the chance that it was a hoax, to apply David Hume's test for miracles. UCLA's law students, like law students everywhere, are almost obsessively career-oriented. They have most likely spent the previous four years strategizing about law school admissions, with the hope of landing a lucrative job down the road with their newly minted J.D. It would be an act of utter folly, contrary to the future orientation that helped land them at UCLA, to

put their future career in jeopardy by sending so crude and juvenile a note, one that would simply serve as a pretext for more racial agitation. Dean Moran had announced on February 20 that a police investigation into the origin of the note was under way. That was the last mention of the investigation from the administration. Rumors circulated among the faculty that the note had proved a hoax, but the administration did not publicize that finding, if true. I asked a law school spokesman what the police had uncovered; she ignored the question while disgorging diversity boilerplate. The UCLA police department would only say that the investigation was ongoing. But in the unlikely event that the note *was* real, Moran's reaction was still excessive. Even if one law student sent a hate note, that aberrant behavior doesn't represent the daily reality at the school. It is ludicrous to suggest that UCLA's white and Asian students need "cross-cultural competency" training in how to talk to blacks and Hispanics. The Facebook comments defending a self-help discussion in response to the local robberies were civil and reasoned, contrary to Gardner's characterization of them as "disrespectful" and "detestable." As for the faculty, no evidence exists that they are guilty of "unconscious bias" in their teaching, and it is an insult to imply otherwise. The entire law school environment is a paragon of racial tolerance, as any fair-minded administrator should recognize.

Moran should have condemned the hate note, if real, as the action of one immature, unmoored individual who grossly violated everything that the law school embodies, promised an investigation, and left it at that. Instead, she chose to feed the patent delusion that black students are under siege and "unsafe" at the school, thus encouraging in them a lifetime disposition toward similarly baseless perceptions. (Moran announced without explanation at the start of the 2014 fall semester that she would be leaving her position as soon as a replacement could be found.)

UCLA's third outbreak of racial complaint, in November 2013, prompted a response from the head of the university itself. A maudlin student-made video blamed UCLA for the allegedly low number of black male undergraduates at the school—3.3 percent—in a state with only a 6 percent black population. The film has received more than 2 million views on YouTube.

Black Bruins opens with a shot of the names of two Black Panthers killed by a rival radical at a UCLA student meeting in 1969. Implication: UCLA is responsible for their deaths. Apparently, that shooting was just the start of UCLA's long war against men of color. The camera pans to a group of hostile-looking black male students standing outside a campus building behind the filmmaker, third-year African-American Studies major Sy Stokes. Accompanied by ominous music, Stokes recites a frequently unintelligible rap denouncing UCLA as a "fraudulent institutionalized

racist corporation” that deliberately excludes blacks and that “refuses to come to [their] defense.” One particularly confusing passage concerns black paint, which Stokes claims black children were taught to avoid and which symbolized the melanin in their skin. Since black paints are only used to write words on a white background, Stokes proposes, and “if words are all we are good for, then don’t you dare tell us to silence our voices when we dare to speak.” We are left to wonder not just at the passage’s logic but also at who is telling blacks to silence their voices.

According to *Black Bruins*, UCLA is as much at fault for the 74 percent black-male graduation rate as it is for the 3.3 percent black-male enrollment rate. Never mind that the school has poured millions into academic support services and the usual panoply of multicultural programming. Never mind that the school has come up with scheme after scheme to get around California’s constitutional ban on governmental racial preferences, admitting black students at more than double the rate than can be explained by their credentials and socioeconomic status, and at three times the rate of much poorer Asians under an additional admissions process known as “supplemental review.” Never mind that *all* males—at less than 45 percent—are underrepresented in the undergraduate population and that whites—at 28 percent—are also underrepresented compared with their 39 percent share of California’s population. UCLA’s overall black enrollment—3.8 percent, when females are included—is actually higher than one would expect, given blacks’ low level of academic preparedness and high rates of truancy. (And it is virtually identical to black enrollment in the entire University of California system.) In 2013, only 11 percent of black eighth-graders in California were proficient in math, compared with 42 percent of whites and 61 percent of Asians; 15 percent of black eighth-graders were proficient at reading, compared with 44 percent of whites and 51 percent of Asians. Black elementary school students in California are chronically truant at nearly four times the state average. Only 5 percent of applications to UCLA even come from black students. *Black Bruins* mentioned none of these facts, of course, but they show that UCLA has used every possible lever, legal or not, to boost its black student population.

Stokes includes a typically nonsensical swipe at Sander: “According to Professor Sander, 3.3 percent is far too many black kids; on his perfectly paved roads there are far too many black skids.” (Los Angelenos would love to know where they could find some “perfectly paved roads.”) The video concludes on a lachrymose note, as the silent witnesses behind Stokes portentously remove their UCLA sweatshirts: “So with all my hopes and dreams that this university has tried to ruin, how the hell am I supposed to be proud to call myself a Bruin?”

UCLA's administrators couldn't line up fast enough to thank Stokes for his work and praise its artistic qualities. Janina Montero, UCLA's vice chancellor for Student Affairs, was first out of the gate. "In their video 'Black Bruin [The Spoken Word],' a number of UCLA students eloquently and powerfully expressed their frustration and disappointment with the low number of African-American male students on campus," she said in a published statement. "As a public institution that values a diverse student body, we share their dissatisfaction and frustration." Was UCLA a "fraudulent institutionalized racist corporation" that tries to ruin the "hopes and dreams" of black students and that "refuses" to come to their "defense"? Apparently so, given Montero's fulsome "Amen" to the entirety of Stokes's message. Montero provided none of the academic or demographic data that would explain the 3.3 percent black-male enrollment figure. The only cause of that "low" number, according to Montero, is California's ban on "considering race in the admissions process." Montero eagerly reminded readers that the University of California was trying to overturn that ban in the Supreme Court. Why it should be necessary to consider race in the admissions process to achieve "diversity" went unexplained.

UCLA soon concluded that a mere vice chancellor was insufficient to respond to Stokes's masterpiece. Chancellor Gene Block stepped up to the plate. "We are proud every time we hear [our students] convey their thoughts, experiences and feelings—as they have done recently in several now viral videos," Block wrote in a campus-wide memo. These students' "powerful first-hand accounts" testify to the "true impacts" of California's ban on racial preferences, the chancellor said. As Stokes had done, Block painted a dire picture of black student life at UCLA: "Too often, many of our students of color feel isolated, as strangers in their own house. Others feel targeted—mocked or marginalized, rather than recognized and valued." Were "students of color" *right* to "feel targeted—mocked and marginalized"? It would appear so. Block left unsaid who was doing the "mocking" and "marginalizing," but he seems to believe that he presides over a student body and faculty of bigots. Block went on to chastise UCLA for its reluctance to have "conversations about race." "Make no mistake: [such conversations] can be very difficult. They are inevitably emotional. They can make people defensive. They sometimes lead to accusations. But we cannot be afraid to have these conversations, because they are so critically important not just to our university, but to society."

Pace Block, UCLA spends vast amounts of time having "conversations about race." But if he wants to engender even more, a good place to start would be with some facts. He could rebut the baseless allegation that UCLA deliberately destroys blacks' "dreams." He could lay out the vast academic-achievement gap, whose existence demolishes the claim that the absence of racial proportionality in the student body or

faculty results from bias. Most important, he could provide a dose of reality. “This campus is one of the world’s most enviable educational institutions,” he could say, “whose academic splendors lie open to all its students. You will never again have as ready an opportunity to absorb knowledge. Exploit the privilege. You are surrounded by well-meaning, compassionate faculty who only want to help you. Study, write, and immerse yourself in timeless books. Apply yourself with everything you’ve got, and you will graduate prepared for a productive, intellectually rich life.”

Rather than opting for the truth, Block groveled further. “I also appreciate that trust is earned and, among our critics, we must and will work harder to earn it,” he wrote, in closing. He did not explain why UCLA should be mistrusted. Had it misled its black students? Discriminated against them? Block did not say. He did, however, remind them of UCLA’s soon-to-be-hired new vice chancellor for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion and the two inaptly named “diversity prevention officers,” the latter of whom would “investigate . . . racial and ethnic bias or discrimination among our faculty as well as providing education and training.” And he bludgeoned the faculty yet again to pass a “diversity” course requirement for undergraduates, something of a sacred crusade for Block. (The faculty [finally caved](#) in at the end of October and passed the mandate, after voting it down three previous times.)

More layers of diversity bureaucracy won’t have the slightest effect on black high schoolers’ inadequate academic skills, which is the sole reason that blacks are not proportionally represented in the college student body. Stokes came closer to this fact than the administration has in an [MSNBC interview](#) following the breakout video: “I feel the focus is, you know, there’s this general consensus within the black community, mostly, you know, the lower socioeconomic-status areas, that you either become a rapper, or a basketball player, or football player to become successful,” he said. “The stress on academics isn’t there anymore—or it actually never was.” Stokes immediately obliterated this inadvertent acknowledgment of personal responsibility with more victimology, however: “It’s used against us to keep us at that low point,” he said. The problem, in other words, is not blacks’ lack of engagement in school; it’s that society somehow “uses” that lack of engagement to keep blacks down.

Other colleges embrace the academic-racism fiction just as fervently. In March 2014, Harvard’s black students posted their own viral photo series, “[I, Too, Am Harvard](#),” displaying the alleged microaggressions to which Harvard’s own eggshell plaintiffs have been subject (the series’ creator, the daughter of two critical race theory law professors, explained: “We have to show that, like, these little daily microaggressions are just, like, part of the bubbling up of greater tensions that are, like, underlying this whole, like, post racial, this, like, post racial surface”). Students at Oberlin, Fordham,

and numerous other schools have created webpages to catalog their racial slights at the hands of other students.

The adult indulgence of this fiction is far from innocuous. Any student who believes that the university is an “unsafe,” racially hostile environment is unlikely to take full advantage of its resources and will likely bear a permanent racial chip on his shoulder. Becoming an adult means learning the difference between a real problem and a trivial one. Being asked: “So, like, what are you?” (a Fordham “microaggression”) belongs in the trivial category, especially in a world that has been taught for the last three decades that the most important thing about an individual *is* his racial and ethnic identity. The time spent agitating about such innocent, if clumsy, inquiries would be far better dedicated to studying for an organic chemistry or a French literature exam. The equally **preposterous conceit** that the university is “unsafe” for females has similarly distorting effects, creating more perpetual victims whose fragile egos are constantly threatened by the ordinary give-and-take of life and who see a “war on women” at every turn.

The universities’ encouragement of victimology has wider implications beyond the campus. The same imperative to repress any acknowledgment of black academic underachievement as the cause of black underrepresentation in higher education is more fatefully at work in repressing awareness of disproportionate black criminality as the cause of black overrepresentation in the criminal-justice system. When a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, shot an unarmed black teen in August 2014, for example, the media suppressed any information about the incident that complicated its favored narrative about police brutality, all the while pumping out strained stories about racism in law enforcement and public life more generally. The result was days of violence, looting, and arson, from a populace that had been told at every opportunity that it is the target of ubiquitous discrimination.

Colleges today are determined to preserve in many of their students the thin skin and solipsism of adolescence, rather than turning them into dispassionate adults. They build ever more monumental bureaucracies to indulge those traits. By now, of course, many of the adults running colleges are indistinguishable from their eggshell plaintiff students. The rest of us bear the costs, in the maintenance of public policies founded on an equally spurious victimology.

Heather Mac Donald is a contributing editor of City Journal, the Thomas W. Smith Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, and the author of [The Burden of Bad Ideas: How Modern Intellectuals Misshape Our Society.](#)

City Journal

FROM THE MAGAZINE

Multiculti U.

The budget-strapped University of California squanders millions on mindless diversity programs.

**[Heather Mac Donald](#)
[Spring 2013](#)**

**Education
California**

In the summer of 2012, as the University of California reeled from one piece of bad budget news to another, a veteran political columnist sounded an alarm. Cuts in state funding were jeopardizing the university's mission of preserving the "cultural legacy essential to any great society," Peter Schrag warned in the *Sacramento Bee*:

Would we know who we are without knowing our common history and culture, without knowing Madison and Jefferson and Melville and Dickinson and Hawthorne; without Shakespeare, Milton and Chaucer; without Dante and Cervantes; without Charlotte Brontë and Jane Austen; without Goethe and Molière; without Confucius, Buddha, Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr.; without Mozart, Rembrandt and Michelangelo; without the Old Testament; without the Gospels; without Plato and Aristotle, without Homer and Sophocles and Euripides, without Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky; without Gabriel García Márquez and Toni Morrison?

Schrag's appeal to the value of humanistic study was unimpeachable. It just happened to be laughably ignorant about the condition of such study at the University of California. Stingy state taxpayers aren't endangering the transmission of great literature, philosophy, and art; the university itself is. No UC administrator would dare to invoke Schrag's list of mostly white, mostly male thinkers as an essential element of a UC education; no UC campus has sought to ensure that its undergraduates get any exposure to even one of Schrag's seminal thinkers (with the possible exception of Toni Morrison), much less to America's founding ideas or history.



ILLUSTRATION BY ARNOLD ROTH

Schrag isn't the only Californian ignorant about UC's priorities. The public is told that the university needs more state money to stay competitive in the sciences but not that the greatest threat to scientific excellence comes from the university's obsession with "diversity" hiring. The public knows about tuition increases but not about the unstoppable growth in the university's bureaucracy. Taxpayers may have heard about larger class sizes but not about the sacrosanct status of faculty teaching loads. Before the public decides how much more money to pour into the system, it needs a far better understanding of how UC spends the \$22 billion it already commands.

The first University of California campus opened in Berkeley in 1873, fulfilling a mandate of California's 1849 constitution that the state establish a public university for the "promotion of literature, the arts and sciences." Expectations for this new endeavor were high; Governor Henry Haight had predicted that the campus would "soon become a great light-house of education and learning on this Coast, and a pride and glory" of the state.

He was right. Over the next 140 years, as nine more campuses were added, the university would prove an engine for economic growth and a source of human progress. UC owns more research patents than any other university system in the country. Its engineers helped achieve California's midcentury dominance in aerospace and electronics; its agronomists aided the state's fecund farms and vineyards. The nuclear technology developed by UC scientists and their students secured America's Cold War preeminence (while provoking one of the country's most cataclysmic student protest movements). UC's physical infrastructure is a precious asset in its own right. Anyone can wander its trellised gardens and groves of native and exotic trees, or browse its library stacks and superb research collections.

But by the early 1960s, UC was already exhibiting many of the problems that afflict it today. The bureaucracy had mushroomed, both at the flagship Berkeley campus and at the Office of the President, the central administrative unit that oversees the entire UC system. Nathan Glazer, who taught sociology at Berkeley at the time, wrote in *Commentary* in 1965: "Everyone—arriving faculty members, arriving

deans, visiting authorities—is astonished by the size” of the two administrations. Glazer noted the emergence of a new professional class: full-time college administrators who specialized in student affairs, had never taught, and had little contact with the faculty. The result of this bureaucratic explosion reminded Glazer of the federal government: “Organization piled upon organization, reaching to a mysterious empyrean height.”

At Berkeley, as federal research money flooded into the campus, the faculty were losing interest in undergraduate teaching, observed Clark Kerr, UC’s president and a former Berkeley chancellor. (Kerr once famously quipped that a chancellor’s job was to provide “parking for the faculty, sex for the students, and athletics for the alumni.”) Back in the 1930s, responsibility for introductory freshman courses had been the highest honor that a Berkeley professor could receive, Kerr wrote in his memoirs; 30 years later, the faculty shunted off such obligations whenever possible to teaching assistants, who, by 1964, made up nearly half the Berkeley teaching corps.

Most presciently, Kerr noted that Berkeley had split into two parts: Berkeley One, an important academic institution with a continuous lineage back to the nineteenth century; and Berkeley Two, a recent political upstart centered on the antiwar, antiauthority Free Speech Movement that had occupied Sproul Plaza in 1964. Berkeley Two was as connected to the city’s left-wing political class and to its growing colony of “street people” as it was to the traditional academic life of the campus. In fact, the two Berkeleys had few points of overlap.

Today, echoing Kerr, we can say that there are two Universities of California: UC One, a serious university system centered on the sciences (though with representatives throughout the disciplines) and still characterized by rigorous meritocratic standards; and UC Two, a profoundly unserious institution dedicated to the all-consuming crusade against phantom racism and sexism that goes by the name of “diversity.” Unlike Berkeley Two in Kerr’s Day, UC Two reaches to the topmost echelon of the university, where it poses a real threat to the integrity of its high-achieving counterpart.

It’s impossible to overstate the extent to which the diversity ideology has encroached upon UC’s collective psyche and mission. No administrator, no regent, no academic dean or chair can open his mouth for long without professing fealty to diversity. It is the one constant in every university endeavor; it impinges on hiring, distorts the curriculum, and sucks up vast amounts of faculty time and taxpayer resources. The university’s budget problems have not touched it. In September 2012, for instance, as the university system faced the threat of another \$250 million in state funding cuts on top of the \$1 billion lost since 2007, UC San Diego hired its first vice chancellor for equity, diversity, and inclusion. This new diversocrat would pull in a starting salary of \$250,000, plus a relocation allowance of \$60,000, a temporary housing allowance of \$13,500, and the reimbursement of all moving expenses. (A pricey but appropriately “diverse” female-owned executive search firm had found this latest diversity accretion.) In May 2011, UCLA named a professional bureaucrat with a master’s degree in student-affairs administration as its first assistant dean for “campus climate,” tasked with “maintaining the campus as a safe, welcoming, respectful place,” in the words of UCLA’s assistant vice chancellor and dean of students. In December 2010, UC San Francisco appointed its first vice chancellor of diversity and

outreach—with a starting salary of \$270,000—to create a “diverse and inclusive environment,” announced UC San Francisco chancellor Susan Desmond-Hellmann. Each of these new posts is wildly redundant with the armies of diversity functionaries already larding UC’s bloated bureaucracy. UC Two’s worldview rests on the belief that certain racial and ethnic groups face ongoing bias, both in America and throughout the university. In 2010, UCLA encapsulated this conviction in a “Principle of Community” (one of eight) approved by the Chancellor’s Advisory Group on Diversity (since renamed the UCLA Council on Diversity and Inclusion, in the usual churn of rebranding to which such bodies are subject). Principle Eight reads: “We acknowledge that modern societies carry historical and divisive biases based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation and religion, and we seek to promote awareness and understanding through education and research and to mediate and resolve conflicts that arise from these biases in our communities.”

The idea that a salient—if not the most salient—feature of “modern societies” is their “divisive biases” is ludicrously unhistorical. No culture has been more blandly indifferent than modern Western society to the individual and group characteristics that can still lead to death and warfare elsewhere. There is also no place that more actively celebrates the characteristics that still handicap people outside the West than the modern American campus. Yet when UC Two’s administrators and professors look around their domains, they see a landscape riven by the discrimination that it is their duty to extirpate.

Thus it was that UC San Diego’s electrical and computer engineering department found itself facing a mandate from campus administrators to hire a fourth female professor in early 2012. The possibility of a new hire had opened up—a rare opportunity in the current budget climate—and after winnowing down hundreds of applicants, the department put forward its top candidates for on-campus interviews. Scandalously, all were male. Word came down from on high that a female applicant who hadn’t even been close to making the initial cut must be interviewed. She was duly brought to campus for an interview, but she got mediocre reviews. The powers-that-be then spoke again: her candidacy must be brought to a departmental vote. In an unprecedented assertion of secrecy, the department chair refused to disclose the vote’s outcome and insisted on a second ballot. After that second vote, the authorities finally gave up and dropped her candidacy. Both vote counts remain secret.

An electrical and computer engineering professor explains what was at stake. “We pride ourselves on being the best,” he says. “The faculty know that absolute ranking is critical. No one had ever considered this woman a star.” You would think that UC’s administrators would value this fierce desire for excellence, especially in a time of limited resources. Thanks to its commitment to hiring only “the best,” San Diego’s electrical and computer engineering department has made leading contributions to circuit design, digital coding, and information theory.

Maria Sobek, UC Santa Barbara’s associate vice chancellor for diversity, equity, and academic policy and a professor of Chicana and Chicano studies, provides a window into how UC Two thinks about its mission. If a faculty hiring committee selects only white male finalists for an opening, the dean will suggest “bringing in some women to look them over,” Sobek says. These female candidates, she says, “may be borderline, but they are all qualified.” And *voilà!* “It turns out [the hiring committees] really like

the candidates and hire them, even if they may not have looked so good on paper.” This process has “energized” the faculty to hire a woman, says Sobek. She adds that diversity interventions get “more positive responses” from humanities and social-sciences professors than from scientists.

Leave aside Sobek’s amusing suggestion that the faculty just happen to discover that they “really like” the diversity candidate whom the administration has forced on them. More disturbing is the subversion of the usual hiring standard from “most qualified” to “qualified enough.” UC Two sets the hiring bar low enough to scoop in some female or minority candidates, and then declares that anyone above that bar is “qualified enough” to trump the most qualified candidate, if that candidate is a white or an Asian male. This is a formula for mediocrity.

Sometimes, UC Two can’t manage to lower hiring standards enough to scoop in a “diverse” candidate. In that case, it simply creates a special hiring category outside the normal channels. In September 2012, after the meritocratic revolt in UC San Diego’s electrical and computer engineering department, the engineering school announced that it would hire an “excellence” candidate, the school’s Orwellian term for faculty who, it claims, will contribute to diversity and who, by some odd coincidence, always happen to be female or an underrepresented minority. UC San Diego’s Division of Physical Sciences followed suit the next month, listing two tenure-track positions for professors who could “shape and expand the University’s diversity initiatives.” If the division had any specific scientific expertise in mind, the job listing made no mention of it.

Every campus has throngs of diversity enforcers like Sobek. In 2010, as a \$637 million cut in state funding closed some facilities temporarily and forced UC faculty and staff to take up to three and a half weeks of unpaid leave, Mark Yudof, the president of the entire university system, announced the formation of a presidential Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion. It would be supported by five working groups of faculty and administrators: the Faculty Diversity Working Group, the Diversity Structure Group, the Safety and Engagement Group, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Group, and the Metrics and Assessment Group. Needless to say, this new burst of committee activity replicated a long line of presidential diversity initiatives, such as the 2006 President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity and the president’s annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity. These earlier efforts must have failed to eradicate the threats that large subsets of students and faculty face. Yudof promised that his new council and its satellite working groups would address, yet again, the “challenges in enhancing and sustaining a tolerant, inclusive environment on each of the university’s 10 campuses . . . so that every single member of the UC community feels welcome, comfortable and safe.” Of course, under traditional measures of safety, UC’s campuses rate extremely high, but more subtle dangers apparently lurk for women and certain minorities.

In April 2012, one of Yudof’s five working groups disgorged its first set of recommendations for creating a “safe” and “healthy” climate for UC’s beleaguered minorities, even as the university’s regents, who theoretically govern the school, debated whether to raise tuition yet again to cover the latest budget shortfall. The Faculty Diversity Working Group called for hiring quotas, which it calls “cluster hiring,” and more diversity bureaucrats, among nine other measures. (California’s pesky constitutional ban on taking

race and gender into account in public hiring, which took effect after voters approved Proposition 209 in 1996, has long since lost any power over UC behavior and rhetoric.)

You would think that an institution ostensibly dedicated to reason would have documented the widespread bias against women and minorities before creating such a costly apparatus for fighting that alleged epidemic. I ask Dianne Klein, the spokesman for UC's Office of the President, whether Yudof or other members of his office were aware of any faculty candidates rejected by hiring committees because of their race or sex. Or perhaps Yudof's office knew of highly qualified minority or female faculty candidates simply *overlooked* in a search process because the hiring committee was insufficiently committed to diversity outreach? Klein ducks both questions: "Such personnel matters are confidential and so we can't comment on your question about job candidates."

Does UC Santa Barbara's associate vice chancellor for diversity, equity, and academic policy know of such victims of faculty bias? "It's hard to prove that qualified women haven't been hired," says Sobek. But "people don't feel comfortable working with people who don't look like them and tend to hire people that look like them." Doesn't the high proportion of Asian professors in UC's science departments and medical schools suggest that UC's white faculty *are* comfortable working with people who don't look like them? "Oh, Asians are discriminated against, too," replies Sobek. "They face a glass ceiling. People think that maybe Asians are not good enough to run a university." Sobek's own university, UC Santa Barbara, has an Asian chancellor, but never mind.

Bureaucratic overseers are not enough to purge the faculty of its alleged narrow-mindedness; the faculty must be retrained from within. Every three years, representatives from departmental hiring committees at UCLA must attend a seminar on "unconscious bias" in order to be deemed fit for making hiring decisions. In 2012, a Berkeley department in the social sciences was informed that a female professor from outside the department would be sitting on its hiring committee, since its record of hiring women was unsatisfactory. Only after protest did UC Two's administrators back down.

In September 2012, even as he warned of financial ruin if voters didn't approve Governor Jerry Brown's \$6 billion tax hike in November, Yudof announced another diversity boondoggle. The university was embarking on the nation's largest-ever survey of "campus climate," at a cost of \$662,000 (enough to cover four years of tuition for more than a dozen undergraduates). The system-wide climate survey was, of course, drearily repetitive. Individual campus "climate councils" had been conducting "climate checks" for years, and an existing UC survey already asked each undergrad if he felt that his racial and ethnic group was "respected on campus." Nevertheless, with the university facing a possible quarter-billion-dollar cut in state funding, Yudof and his legions of diversity councils and work groups felt that now was the moment to act on the 2007 recommendations of the little-remembered "Regents' Study Group on University Diversity (Work Team on Campus Climate)" and of the "Staff Diversity Council." Yudof's many campus-climate pronouncements are rife with the scary epidemiological language typical of this diversity subspecialty. "Now is a time when many of our most marginalized and vulnerable populations are most at risk," he wrote in July 2011, informing the campus chancellors that despite the budget crisis, planning for the "comprehensive and systematic campus climate assessment" was under

way. Yudof didn't specify what these "marginalized and vulnerable populations" were "at risk" for, or why they would be at even *greater* risk now that the financial challenges facing the university had worsened.

If UC One were launching a half-million-dollar survey of the incidence of bubonic plague, say, among its students, faculty, and staff, it would have assembled enough instances of infection to justify the survey. It might even have formulated a testable hypothesis regarding the main vectors of infection. But UC Two's campus-climate rhetoric promiscuously invokes the need for "safe spaces" and havens from "risk" without ever identifying either the actual victims of its unsafe climates or their tormentors. These unsavory individuals must be out there, of course; otherwise, UC's "marginalized and vulnerable populations" wouldn't require such costly interventions. It would be useful if UC Two provided some examples. Who are these people, and where do they hide? Further, the presence of such bigots means that UC's hiring and admissions policies must be seriously flawed. Where are the flaws, and what does UC intend to do about them?

Time for a reality check. UC's campuses are among the most welcoming and inclusive social environments known to man. They are filled with civilized, pacific professors who want to do their research and maybe a little teaching and who have nothing but goodwill for history's oppressed groups. The campuses are filled, too, with docile administrators whose only purpose is swaddling students in services and fending off imaginary threats to those students' fragile identities. For their part, said students want to make friends and connections, maybe do a little learning, and get a degree. Race, ethnicity, and other official varieties of "identity" would be a nonissue for almost all of them if the adults on campus would stop harping on the subject. If Yudof and the regents, who enthusiastically back every diversity initiative that UC's administrators can dream up, don't know that, they are profoundly out of touch with the institution that they pretend to manage.

Your average UC student is unimpressed by UC Two's campus-climate initiatives. "That's ridiculous!" guffaws Tuanh, a UCLA senior majoring in psychobiology, when asked about UCLA's new campus-climate dean. But then, Tuanh is a first-generation Vietnamese-American from the San Gabriel Valley; perhaps, as a member of a successful minority group, she doesn't count as "marginalized and vulnerable," however poor her parents. Vanessa, a black UCLA junior from Long Beach, is closer to the kind of student whom Yudof and UCLA's administrators have in mind. But Vanessa is perplexed when told about the campus-climate dean. "I don't understand what that person would do," she says. "The school definitely takes racism seriously." Are your professors open to you? "I've never felt that a professor here didn't care about me succeeding." Perhaps things are worse on other campuses? Not at UC Irvine. Ade, a 24-year-old Nigerian finishing up his economics B.A. there, says that he's found no hostility on campus: "Everyone was welcoming and willing to try to get to know me."

UC One's faculty, too, are unenthusiastic about the campus-climate initiatives. Yudof's office tried to boost participation rates in the latest "inclusion survey" by raffling off two \$5,000 faculty-research grants, two \$5,000 graduate-student stipends, and a \$10,000 student scholarship to respondents answering merely half of the survey questions. (Whether such a raffle is the most rational way to

allocate scarce research and scholarship dollars is debatable.) Yudof also offered a shot at five \$2,000 professional-development grants and 24 iPads. Campuses threw in their own incentives: UC San Francisco provided ten lucky raffle winners the opportunity to have lunch with the local vice chancellor for diversity and outreach and handed out 50 gift certificates worth \$50 apiece; UC San Diego offered iPads, iPod Touch music players, cash, and restaurant gift certificates, among other goodies. Despite these sweeteners, most people ignored the survey. After extending its deadline by nearly two months, UC San Francisco had reached only a 40 percent response rate. Most professors and grad students apparently have better things to do than answer grammatically challenged questions about whether they have “personally experienced any exclusionary (e.g., shunned, ignored), intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct (harassing behavior) at UC.”

True, every so often, an oafish student at UC, as at campuses across the country, stages a tasteless incident to rile the enforcers of political correctness. In 2010, a group of UC San Diego frat students sent out an invitation for an off-campus party with a crude ghetto theme; a black comedian later claimed responsibility for the event, which came to be known as the Compton Cookout. The inevitable student protests triggered the usual ballooning of UC Two’s diversity bureaucracy, along with hand-wringing, from the UC president’s office on down, about how hostile the university is to nonwhite students.

In a more rational world, the adults on campus might respond to such provocations by putting them in perspective—condemning the juvenile pranks but pointing out their insignificance compared with the resources and opportunities available to *all* students. If the adults were particularly courageous, they might even add that a minority student’s best response to such pygmies is to crush them with his own success. Acing a chemistry exam does magnitudes more for minority empowerment, the straight-talking administrator might say, than sitting in at the dean’s office demanding more “resources” for the Black Student Union. Such a message, however, would put UC Two out of business.

UC Two’s pressures on the curriculum are almost as constant as the growth of the diversity bureaucracy. Consider Berkeley’s sole curricular requirement. The campus’s administration and faculty can think of only one thing that all its undergraduates need to know in order to have received a world-class education: how racial and ethnic groups interact in America. Every undergraduate must take a course that addresses “theoretical or analytical issues relevant to understanding race, culture, and ethnicity in American society” and that takes “substantial account of groups drawn from at least three of the following: African Americans, indigenous peoples of the United States, Asian Americans, Chicano/Latino Americans, and European Americans.” In decades past, “progressives” would have grouped Americans in quite different categories, such as labor, capital, and landowners, or bankers, farmers, and railroad owners. Historians might have suggested Northerners, Southerners, and Westerners, or city dwellers, suburbanites, and rural residents. Might the interplay of inventors, entrepreneurs, and industrialists, say, or of scientists, architects, and patrons, be as fruitful a way of looking at American life as the distribution of skin color? Not in UC Two.

Naturally, this “American Cultures” requirement is run by Berkeley’s ever-expanding Division of Equity and Inclusion. Berkeley students can fulfill the requirement with such blatantly politicized courses as

“Gender, Race, Nation, and Health,” offered by the gender and women’s studies department, which provides students with “feminist perspectives on health care disparities” while considering gender “in dynamic interaction with race, ethnicity, sexuality, immigration status, religion, nation, age, and disability.” Another possibility is “Lives of Struggle: Minorities in a Majority Culture,” from the African-American studies department, which examines “the many forms that the struggle of minorities can assume.” It is a given that to be a member of one of the course’s favored “three minority aggregates”—“African-Americans, Asian-Americans (so called), and Chicano/Latino-Americans”—means having to struggle against the oppressive American majority.

In 2010, the UCLA administration and a group of faculty restarted a campaign to require all undergraduates to take a set of courses explicitly dedicated to group identity. UCLA’s existing “general-education” smorgasbord, from which students must select a number of courses in order to graduate, already contained plenty of the narcissistic identity and resentment offerings so dear to UC Two, such as “Critical Perspectives on Trauma, Gender, and Power” and “Anthropology of Gender Variance Across Cultures from Third Gender to Transgender.” Yet that menu did not sufficiently guarantee exposure to race-based thinking to satisfy the UC Two power structure.

So even though UCLA’s faculty had previously rejected a “diversity” general-education requirement in 2005, the administration and its faculty allies simply repackaged it under a new title, with an updated rationale. The new requirement would give meaning, they said, to that ponderous Eighth Principle of Community that the Chancellor’s Advisory Group on Diversity had just approved. After the usual profligate expenditure of committee time, the faculty voted down the repackaged diversity requirement in May 2012, recognizing the burdens that any new general-education mandate puts on both students and faculty. UCLA chancellor Gene Block issued a lachrymose rebuke: “I’m deeply disappointed that the proposed new general education requirement was not approved and I’m especially disappointed for the many students who worked with such passion to make the case for a change in curriculum.” As a consolation prize to UC Two, Block ordered his administrators to “bring about the intentions of the failed GE requirement proposal” anyway, in the words of UCLA’s student-affairs vice chancellor. And sure enough, in February 2013, the community-programs office rolled out a series of initiatives to provide “spaces for dialogue and education about diversity.”

UC Two captured the admissions process long ago. Ever since the passage of Proposition 209 banned racial discrimination at public institutions, UC’s faculty and administrators have worked overtime to find supposedly race-neutral alternatives to outright quotas. Admissions officials now use “holistic” review to pick students, an opaque procedure designed to import proxies for race into the selection process, among other stratagems.

Vanessa, the UCLA junior, shows how drastically UC administrators violate the intention of Prop. 209. If she were white or Asian, her chances of being accepted into UCLA would have been close to zero. The average three-part SAT score of UCLA’s 2012 freshman admits was 2042, out of a possible total of 2400. Vanessa’s score was 1300, well below even the mediocre national average of 1500. Her academic performance has been exactly what her SATs would predict. She wants to double-major in psychology

and gender studies, but she received a D-minus in psychological statistics, a prerequisite for enrolling in the psychology major. “I tried so hard; I don’t understand why my grades didn’t reflect how hard I was working,” she says. “But I was always hard on myself and never gave myself enough credit.” Apparently, Vanessa thinks that she suffers from a self-esteem, rather than a skills, deficit. On her second attempt at psychological statistics, she got a C, enough (for now) to continue in the major. “It’s all I can ask for,” she says. If UCLA’s psychology major requires strong quantitative ability, however, Vanessa stands a good chance of ending up a gender studies major and nothing else.

Vanessa is a case study in a powerful critique of racial preferences known as “mismatch theory,” pioneered by Richard Sander, a UCLA law professor. Sander and other economists have shown, through unrebutted empirical analysis, that college students admitted with academic qualifications drastically lower than those of their peers will learn less and face a much higher chance of dropping out of science and other rigorous majors. Had Vanessa gone to a school where her fellow students shared her skill level, she would be likelier to finish her psychology degree in good standing because classroom instruction would be pitched to her academic needs. The leaders of UC Two, however, don’t just ignore Sander’s work; they press on relentlessly in their crusade to reinstate explicit racial quotas at UC. In 2012, Yudof and UC’s ten chancellors found the time to submit an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Fisher v. Texas*, bellyaching about the crippling effect of Prop. 209 on the university’s “diversity” and urging the court to reaffirm college-admissions preferences.

The admission of underprepared students generates another huge hunk of UC Two’s ever-expanding bureaucracy, which devotes extensive resources to supporting “diverse” students as they try to complete their degrees. Take UC’s vice president for student affairs, Judy Sakaki, who has traveled a career path typical of the “support-services” administrator, untouched by any traditional academic expertise or teaching experience. Sakaki started as an outreach and retention counselor in the Educational Opportunity Program at California State University, Hayward, and then became special assistant to the president for educational equity. She moved to UC Davis as vice chancellor of the division of student affairs and eventually landed in the UC president’s office, where, according to her official biography, she continues to pursue her decades-long involvement in “issues of access and equity.” She earns more than \$255,000 a year.

Sakaki has dozens of counterparts on individual campuses. UCLA’s \$300 million Division of Undergraduate Affairs, with nary a professor in sight, is a typical support-services accretion, stuffed with “retention” specialists and initiatives for “advancing student engagement in diversity.” (The division, which labels itself UCLA’s “campus-wide advocate for undergraduate education,” hosts non-diversity-related programs as well, intended to demonstrate that the university really *does* care about undergraduate education, despite complaints that its main interest lies in nabbing faculty research grants.) It is now assumed that being the first member of your family to go to college requires a bureaucracy to see you through, even though thousands of beneficiaries of the first GI Bill managed to graduate without any contact from a specially dedicated associate vice provost. So did the children of Eastern European Jews who flooded into the City College of New York in the 1930s and 1940s. So do the

children of Chinese laborers today who get science degrees both in China and abroad. Yet UC Two and other colleges have molded a construct, the “first-generation college student,” and declared it in need of services—though it is simply a surrogate for “student admitted with uncompetitive scores from a family culture with low social capital.”

It’s unclear how much these retention bureaucracies actually accomplish. What *has* improved minority graduation rates, though UC Two refuses to admit it, is Prop. 209. Graduation rates for underrepresented minorities in the pre-Prop. 209 era, when the university openly used racial preferences, languished far behind those of whites and Asians; it was only when Prop. 209 reduced the number of students admitted with large achievement gaps that minority graduation rates improved.

The costs of all these bureaucratic functions add up. From the 1997–98 school year to 2008–09, as the UC student population grew 33 percent and tenure-track faculty grew 25 percent, the number of senior administrators grew 125 percent, according to the Committee on Planning and Budget of UC’s Academic Senate. The ratio of senior managers to professors climbed from 1 to 2.1 to near-parity of 1 to 1.1.

University officials argue that hospitals and research functions drive such administrative expansion. But the rate of growth of non-medical center administrators was also 125 percent, and more senior professionals were added outside the research and grants-management area than inside it.

It’s true that UC isn’t wholly responsible for its own engorgement, since government officials continue to impose frivolous mandates that produce more red tape. In October 2011, for example, Governor Brown signed a bill requiring the university to provide the opportunity for students, staff, and faculty to announce their sexual orientation and “gender identity” on all UC forms. A hurricane of committee meetings ensued to develop the proper compliance procedures.

But most of UC’s bureaucratic bulk is self-generated, and the recent budget turmoil hasn’t dented that growth. In 2011, Berkeley’s \$200,000-a-year vice chancellor for equity and inclusion presided over an already princely staff of 17; by 2012, his realm had ballooned to 24. In September 2012, UC San Francisco’s vice chancellor of diversity and outreach opened a new Multicultural Resource Center, complete with its own staff, timed to coincide with Celebrate Diversity Month.

And expanding its own bureaucracy isn’t the only way that UC Two likes to spend money. In September 2012, UC San Diego chancellor Pradeep Khosla announced that every employee would get two hours of paid leave to celebrate California Native American Day, a gesture that, under the most conservative salary assumptions, could cost well over \$1 million. In the same month, the vice provost of UCLA’s four ethnic studies departments announced that five professors would get paid leave to pursue “transformative interdisciplinary research” regarding “intersectional exchanges and cultural fusion”—at a time when the loss of faculty through attrition has led to more crowded classrooms and fewer course offerings. (Yes, UCLA’s ethnic studies departments boast their own vice provost; the position may be UC Two’s most stunning sinecure.) In August 2012, UCLA’s Center for Labor Research and Education announced that it would create the “National Dream University,” an online school exclusively for illegal aliens, where they would become involved in “social justice movements” and learn about labor

organizing. Only after negative publicity from conservative media outlets did UC cancel the program, while leaving open the possibility of reconstituting it at a future date.

UC Two's constant accretion of trivialities makes it difficult to take its leaders' protestations of penury seriously. Yudof likes to stress that the state's contribution to the University of California's 2012 budget (\$2.27 billion out of a total UC budget of \$22 billion) is only 10 percent higher, in non-inflation-adjusted dollars, than it was in 1990, even as enrollment has grown 51 percent and UC has added a tenth campus. To Yudof, that equation signals crisis. It would be just as easy to argue, though, that UC must be doing just fine with the money that the state is giving it. Otherwise, why would it have added that new campus, not to mention reams of new bureaucrats?

Indeed, for an institution not known for its celebrations of capitalism, the university shows a robber-baron-like appetite for growth. The system announced plans to add a fifth law school in 2006, notwithstanding abundant evidence that California's 25 existing law schools were generating more than enough lawyers to meet any conceivable future demand. Initial rationalizations for the new law school focused on its planned location—at UC Riverside, in the less affluent and allegedly law-school-deficient Inland Empire east of Los Angeles. But even that insufficient justification evaporated when movers and shakers in Orange County persuaded the regents to site the school at well-endowed UC Irvine, next door to wealthy Newport Beach. Following the opening of Irvine's law school in 2009, California's glut of lawyers and law schools has only worsened, leading another UC law school (at UC San Francisco) to cut enrollment by 20 percent in 2012.

UC's tenth campus, UC Merced, which opened in 2005, is just as emblematic of the system's reflexive expansion, which is driven by politics and what former regent Ward Connerly calls "crony academics." Hispanic advocates and legislators pushed the idea that a costly research university in California's agricultural Central Valley was an ethnic entitlement—notwithstanding the fact that UC's existing nine research institutions were already more than the state's GDP or population could justify, according to Steve Weiner, the former executive director of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities. And now that the Merced campus exists, UC's socialist ethos requires redistributing scarce resources to it from the flagship campuses, in pursuit of the chimerical goal of raising it to the caliber of Berkeley, UCLA, or UC San Diego.

Smaller-scale construction projects continue as well. UC Irvine's business school is getting an opulent new home, though its existing facility—an arcaded sandstone bungalow nestled among eucalypti—is perfectly serviceable. The new building will have white-noise cancellation technology, as well as Apple TV and iPads in every classroom. Like the new law school and the new UC campus, this doesn't paint a portrait of a university starved for funds.

Even UC's much-lamented rise in tuition masks a more complicated picture than is usually acknowledged. Tuition has trebled over the last decade, to about \$12,000, and now covers 49 percent of the cost of an undergraduate education, compared with 13 percent in 1990, according to the UC Faculty Senate. For the first time in UC's history, students are contributing more to their education than the state is. But contrary to received wisdom, tuition increases have not reduced "access." The number of

students attending UC whose family income is \$50,000 or less rose 61 percent from 1999 to 2009; such students now make up 34 percent of enrollment, according to the *Los Angeles Times*. Students whose families earn up to \$80,000 pay no tuition at all, a tuition break that extends even to illegal aliens. It is certainly true that state funding has not kept up with enrollment growth, leading UC to freeze much faculty hiring and eliminate courses. But UC's leaders continue to expect the state to bail them out. They shilled heavily for Governor Brown's successful November 2012 ballot measure to raise approximately \$6 billion a year in new taxes, calling it the only alternative to avoiding further tuition increases and cuts in core functions. Given the still-perilous condition of the state's finances, however, the chance that taxpayer funding will be restored to the level to which UC feels entitled is zero.

If the university doesn't engage in internal reform, the primary victim will be UC One, that still-powerful engine of learning and progress. The first necessary reform: axing the diversity infrastructure. UC Two has yet to produce a scintilla of proof that faculty or administrator bias is holding professors or students back. Accordingly, every vice chancellor, assistant dean, and associate provost for equity, inclusion, and multicultural awareness should be fired and his staff sent home. Faculty committees dedicated to ameliorating the effects of phantom racism, sexism, and homophobia should be disbanded and the time previously wasted on such senseless pursuits redirected to the classroom. Campus climate checks, sensitivity training, annual diversity sub-reports—all should go. Hiring committees should be liberated from the thrall of diversity mandates; UC's administrators should notify department chairs that they will henceforth be treated like adults and trusted to choose the very best candidates they can find. Federal and state regulators, unfortunately, will still require the compiling of "diversity" data, but staff time dedicated to such mandates should be kept to a minimum.

UC should also start honoring California's constitution and eliminate race and gender preferences in faculty appointments and student admissions. The evidence is clear: admitting students on the basis of skin color rather than skills hurts their chances for academic success. And by jettisoning double standards in student selection, UC can significantly shrink its support-services bureaucracy.

Some useful reforms at UC are only loosely related to its obsession with "diversity." For example, one of the university's reigning fictions is that it is a unified system of equal campuses, efficiently managed from the Office of the President. That conceit is false and results in enormous waste. The campuses should be cut free from central oversight to the greatest extent possible and allowed to govern themselves, including setting their own tuition. Local boards should oversee the campuses, as recommended in a 2012 paper by Berkeley's outgoing chancellor, Robert Birgeneau; its provost, George Breslauer; and researcher Judson King. The regents "want to do the right thing and they behave as if they know what's going on," says Larry Hershman, who oversaw UC's budget from 1978 to 2004, "but they can't possibly understand the details of a \$22 billion budget." (In fairness to the regents, UC's budget is opaque to all but the deepest insiders, and UC's administrators have a history of deliberately keeping the regents in the dark about such matters as cushy executive pay packages.) John Moores, an entrepreneur and owner of the San Diego Padres, served as chairman of the regents in the 2000s. "I cannot imagine less oversight over an organization that size," he says. "Our meeting agendas, which

were controlled by the administration, were set up to celebrate the university's various (and generally well-deserved) achievements. But there was never anything that looked like regental oversight." The behemoth Office of the President should be put on a starvation diet. With a budget of well over a quarter-billion dollars and a staff of more than 1,500 people, it is the equivalent of a small college—without faculty or students. It "absorbs a staggering amount of money," says UCLA astronomer Matt Malkan, "but no one can figure out what it actually does except consume the research overheads from our grants." Administrators at the stronger campuses chafe under its make-work demands. The Office of the President "messes in things that it has no knowledge of," says former UCLA chancellor Charles Young. The office is the main engine of UC's socialist redistribution mechanism, however, so while the flagship campuses are eager to jettison it, the weaker ones see it as protection against market forces. A 2007 effort to reorganize the office accomplished little, and postrecession personnel cuts, achieved in part by foisting its administrators on local campuses, have been window dressing. (Asked for the job titles that have been recently eliminated and those that remain, spokesman Dianne Klein responds: "Such information isn't readily available.") Ongoing decentralization efforts have stalled. UC San Francisco and UCLA's business school have sought to become more financially self-supporting but have been blocked by howls about "privatization."

So far, UC's students have borne the brunt of the system's budget problems. Whenever the state legislature sends UC less money than it thinks it deserves, its response is to boost tuition. By comparison, the faculty have been relatively unharmed, aside from the occasional salary freeze. Faculty positions have been eliminated through attrition, but the professors who remain haven't been asked to teach more to make up for the loss—so students face more crowded classrooms and greater difficulty enrolling in the courses needed for their major.

Despite the rapid growth in the bureaucracy, the faculty is still the largest single fixed cost at UC (as at other research universities); asking them to teach more is an obvious way to boost productivity in the face of reduced funding. The average teaching load at UC is four one-quarter courses a year; some professors work out deals that allow them to teach even less. By contrast, at California State University—also public but less prestigious than UC—the faculty may teach four lecture courses a semester and are paid about half as much as at UC.

Some professors readily acknowledge that they have "the best deal in the world," in the words of Berkeley political scientist Jack Citrin. Some, however, threaten to decamp at the mere mention of more time in the undergraduate classroom, and the regents and UC administration appear to back them in their opposition. Complicating the already thorny question of the proper balance between research and teaching is the widespread conflation of the sciences and the humanities. In the hard sciences, the line between teaching and research is less sharp. A graduate student who works in a professor's audiology lab is learning from him no less than if the professor were lecturing before him; the professor is teaching even as he does research. But the faculty member who churns out another paper on de-gendered constructions of postcolonial sexuality is probably doing it solo.

Even in the sciences, however, there may come a point of diminishing returns to investment. “No one has ever asked the fundamental question: ‘How much research should Californians be supporting at UC?’ ” Steve Weiner observes. The assumption, he says, has always been that there can never be enough research and that therefore, each of the ten campuses should become world-class research institutions, with faculties equally absolved from teaching duties. That assumption will have to change. The university could further save on faculty costs by encouraging students to take introductory courses at a community college or online. (Governor Brown began pushing UC in this direction, as well as toward higher faculty course loads, in early 2013.) If it’s true that undergraduates at a research university benefit from being taught by professors at the cutting edge of knowledge, they do so mostly in the final stages of their degree. Industrial-strength freshman courses don’t require instruction by the author of a field’s standard textbook. A 20-year-old Chinese engineering major at UC Irvine, paying \$30,000 a year in nonresident tuition, says ruefully: “It’s too late now, but had I known more, I would have started out at a junior college.”

As for tuition, all UC students should contribute something toward their education, no matter their income level. And students’ tuition money should fund their own education, not other students’. Currently, one-third of all tuition supports financial aid. This cross-subsidy drives up the price for those paying their own way. Instead, financial aid should be funded directly by the legislature (or by donors), so that decisions about how much aid to offer are transparent and taxpayers know the cost of their subsidy.

The UC undergraduates whom I met in 2012 were serious, self-directed, and mature. But they are ill-served by a system that devotes so many resources to political trivia. UC Two’s diversity obsessions have no place in an institution dedicated to the development of knowledge. No one today asks whether the Berkeley physics laboratory that developed the cyclotron had a sufficient quota of women and underrepresented minorities; the beneficiaries of nuclear medicine are simply happy to be treated. The retirement of President Yudof in summer 2013 provides an opportunity for an overdue course correction. Unfortunately, it is doubtful that anyone will seize it. Every potential countervailing force to UC Two has already been captured by UC Two’s own ideology. The California legislature is as strong an advocate for specious social-justice crusades as any vice chancellor for equity and inclusion. The regents have been unanimous cheerleaders for “diversity” and will run all presidential candidates through a predictable gauntlet of diversity interrogation. For more than a decade, the federal government has used its grant-making power to demand color- and gender-driven hiring in the sciences. UC One’s passion for discovery and learning will fuel it for a long time yet, but it will continue to be weakened severely by UC Two.

Heather Mac Donald is a contributing editor of City Journal and the John M. Olin Fellow at the Manhattan Institute. She is the author of The Burden of Bad Ideas and Are Cops Racist?: How the War Against the Police Harms Black Americans.