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The purge of heretical scholars and ideas in academia is intensifying.¹ Many job applications now require loyalty oaths to woke orthodoxy in the form of “diversity statements.”² In the humanities and social sciences, large numbers of faculty are being hired to engage in what is effectively leftist activism.³ Simply ranting about how much you hate conservatives, Christians, or straight white men can be considered “scholarship” and the basis for a distinguished career. Entire departments devoted to ideology-driven fields like gender studies have been established to promote “social justice” and provide sinecures to activists.⁴ Academic papers that undermine the woke narrative are being retracted,⁵ and journals are adopting implicit or explicit polices to ensure that crimethink is never published again.⁶ Many undergraduate and graduate programs have stopped asking for standardized test scores and are increasingly making admissions decisions based on race, gender, sexual orientation, and ideological conformity.

Seven years ago, Heterodox Academy (HxA) came on the scene to promote “ideological diversity” in academia. Cofounder Jonathan Cofnas is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow in the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Cambridge; nrc48@cam.ac.uk.
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Haidt—a prominent social psychologist who is now chair of the board of directors and the person most associated with the organization—spoke forcefully about the scholarship-corrupting effects of liberal groupthink. The leaders of HxA led people to believe that they were going to organize a meaningful resistance.

Seven years later, you can count HxA’s accomplishments in promoting heterodoxy on the fingers of zero hands. It has focused mainly on aggrandizing celebrity academics who hold conventional leftist views, and giving a platform to liberals to engage in empty virtue signaling about their alleged commitment to free inquiry. Scholars whose work is genuinely heterodox have been systematically marginalized. In at least one instance, a psychologist known for his work on race differences (Helmuth Nyborg) was denied membership.

The situation at universities is part of a larger cultural phenomenon: namely, the triumph of wokeism as the religion of the ruling class, and the purge of dissenters from every mainstream institution. HxA provides an illustrative example of how attempts at resistance to leftist illiberalism continually fail.

**Wokeism as Religion**

One of the reasons we got into this situation in the first place is because of the shortsightedness of previous generations of self-styled heterodox thinkers. For decades if not centuries, “skeptics” and “freethinkers” trained their guns on religion, and especially on belief in an anthropomorphic God. The words “skeptic” and “freethinker” can both literally be used as synonyms for “atheist.” The prominent New Atheist philosopher Daniel Dennett says that atheists should be known as “brights,” apparently regardless of any beliefs they hold outside the domain of religion. It rarely occurred to such self-congratulatory brights that there were other issues of comparable importance, or that much of what they didn’t like about religion was an expression of general human tendencies that, in the absence of belief in God, would re-emerge in new forms. “Wokeism,” or “social justice,” is what has replaced Christianity among the ruling class in the West.

---

Although wokeism technically has no gods, it is no less devoid of magical thinking than traditional religions. It posits an armada of invisible forces of wickedness and impurity—“white privilege,” “systemic racism,” “patriarchy,” and so on—which control every aspect of our lives, operating in ways that no one can clearly explain or verify empirically. One expiates the sins of whiteness and privilege by performing rituals, paying tithes, and repeating incantations in the service of “diversity, equity, and inclusion.” Wokeism teaches that there is a natural caste system based on race, gender, and sexual orientation. A group’s position in the hierarchy is inversely related to its “privilege.” Whites have the most privilege and are at the bottom of the hierarchy although, paradoxically, the high priests of wokeism are often rich white people.

Like traditional religions, wokeism teaches a sacred narrative to make sense of the world. The woke narrative is primarily concerned with explaining inequality—the great evil against which wokesters are enjoined to wage an all-consuming crusade. It is an empirical fact that different groups of people—races, genders, sexual orientations—have different outcomes with respect to virtually everything that can be measured: educational attainment, income, incarceration rate, IQ, blood pressure, life expectancy, and so on. According to the woke narrative, all differences favoring whites or men are a consequence of forces such as white privilege and the patriarchy. In most cases it is not possible to explain in naturalistic terms how these forces produce the disparate outcomes in question, but to consider alternative explanations is an act of unspeakable wickedness. The penalty for asking critical questions about the narrative is what used to be called “excommunication” and is now called “cancelation.”

In their book, *The Coddling of the American Mind*, Greg Lukianoff and Jonathan Haidt blame the political situation at universities on a host of factors including iPhones, social media, and the fact that Zoomers didn’t have enough unsupervised playtime when they were children. While these things may be part of the story, Lukianoff and Haidt, among others, overlook the fact that what is happening at
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universities—and in the culture at large—is not a new phenomenon. Most of the older universities were founded by religious fanatics who wouldn’t let you on campus if you didn’t pledge allegiance to their favored brand of Christianity. The rise of political correctness, hysteria about sex, and cancel culture is a return to our natural state, not the consequence of iPhones.

Today, however, we ought to know better. We ought to be able to learn from the past and transcend our natural state. The regression that we are undergoing could potentially be stopped if we fought back effectively. We can look to the current heterodox movement in academia led by HxA for lessons about what not to do. I highlight four reasons why HxA failed.

Reason 1: It Became Another Club for Leftists

The so-called Great Awokening is dated to circa 2012, when there was a spike in social justice talk in leading American newspapers. But the core principle of wokeism—all groups have the same distribution of potential, and any disparities are the result of discrimination by whites or men—has been widely accepted among mainstream Western liberals for two or three generations. What is new is that this idea is being taken to its logical conclusion. Because we can’t find many people engaging in racist acts that could explain the persistent disparities, we must conclude that racism works in some subtle and mysterious way. It must be that culturally appropriated Halloween costumes, unconscious “implicit associations,” or statues of white men with pre-2012 ideas about race have tremendous destructive power. Zoomers are so fanatical simply because, as Nietzsche observes, “in the son that becomes conviction which in the father was still a lie.”

The leaders of HxA make a point of identifying themselves as liberals, and in practice they seem to advocate for a return to a more moderate version of wokeism (essentially pre-2012 liberalism). They do not actively support genuine heterodoxy with respect

to core issues or challenge the alliance between academia and the Democratic Party. Haidt has repeatedly gone out of his way to let people know that he’s never voted for a Republican. The first HxA conference in 2018 featured the same sort of conservative/Republican bashing that happens at regular academic conferences. No one said anything actually controversial. The second conference in 2019 was more of the same.

Out of the eighteen people on HxA’s Advisory Council, only three—Robert George, Diane Halpern, and Glenn Loury—are known for holding any views that are remotely controversial in academia. One member of the Advisory Council is the Vice President and Associate Provost for Inclusion and Diversity at Auburn University. At the second HxA conference she explained that she seeks to create an “environment that says ‘it is absolutely okay to disagree, but let’s do that in ways that don’t challenge one’s humanity, or existence, or even their own lived experiences, their ideologies, etc.’”

Reason 2: It Refuses to Leverage Political Power

Wokeism is the religion of the ruling triumvirate—the Democratic Party, big tech, and academia. Even more than most traditional religions, wokeism is based on blatant, empirically refuted falsehoods: there is an epidemic of police killing unarmed blacks because of racism, women are underrepresented in STEM because of discrimination, and many more. Therefore, the woke narrative must be protected by coercion and censorship. In America, it is sustained by the aforementioned coalition of the Democratic Party, big tech, and academia with the aid of their servants in Hollywood and the media. These institutions use the law, technology, and the prestige and

---
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resources of universities to advance the woke agenda and criminalize, censor, and marginalize dissenters.

Many aspects of woke academic (and corporate) culture arose in response to a legal environment created by the government—more specifically, by the Democratic Party. For example, during the Obama administration, then-Vice President Joe Biden and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan issued new guidelines to universities about how to interpret Title IX, which prohibits sex discrimination in programs that receive federal funding. They expanded the definition of “sexual harassment,” demanded that universities adopt a “preponderance of the evidence standard to evaluate complaints,” and recommended restrictions on cross-examining accusers. This led to the creation of notorious kangaroo courts for investigating sexual misconduct. In recent years, Title IX has been used to justify censorship and harass academics who deviate even slightly from the party line on matters related to sex. Biden and Duncan’s guidelines were rescinded by the Trump administration, but will likely be re instituted now that Biden is president. Government funding agencies use their influence to make universities adopt policies that advance the “diversity, equity, and inclusion” agenda. Universities engage in mass-scale, systematic racial discrimination against whites and Asians with the blessing and support of the Democratic Party.

Most academics are emotionally invested in their relationship with the Democratic Party and in their hatred of Republicans. However, by any measure, the Republican Party is currently far friendlier to free speech and heterodoxy. Many academics will say that Republicans are beyond the pale or too extreme to engage with.

In fact, it is the Democratic Party that has taken an extreme turn. Yet the idea of making an alliance with Republicans is psychologically unpalatable for most academics involved in the “heterodox” movement. The fight against loyalty oaths, forced woke indoctrination, and discrimination against conservatives and other groups that are low in the woke racial/sexual hierarchy can’t be successful without political support.

**Reason 3: HxA Leaders Are Trying to Make a Big-Tent Movement**

As I mentioned earlier, there are entire academic departments that do nothing but employ activists to promote woke ideology. Even departments devoted to legitimate fields such as philosophy and psychology have hired large numbers of activists who have nothing to offer besides their burning hatred of conservatives and straight white males. Their academic work consists in dressing up their hatred with the trappings of scholarship and submitting it for peer review by fellow activists.

Once the professoriate reaches a critical mass of activist non-scholars like this, that is the end of heterodoxy. It only takes one or two wokester’s in a department to prevent dissenters from ever being hired. When SJWs (Social Justice Warriors) take over the journals and become a large percentage of the pool of peer reviewers it becomes nearly impossible to publish anything that challenges their ideology.

Amna Khalid—the inaugural John Stuart Mill Faculty Fellow at HxA—said in a panel discussion on the “Future of Heterodoxy” in December 2020 that HxA works for “slow sustained change. . . . [It’s] not about naming and shaming but to actually have a cultural shift in the way that people are engaging with intellectual questions to reposition and recenter curiosity once again.” This approach is guaranteed to fail. SJW academics who lack the ability or temperament to do real scholarship are not going to metamorphosize in response to slogans about the importance of open inquiry. Culture is instantiated

in people, and there is a problem with many of the people on university campuses.

**Reason 4: HxA Won’t Support Heterodoxy on the Most Important Topic**

Wokeism is built upon an ideological certitude about the origins of inequality: all groups have the same distribution of innate potential, and all differences favoring whites or men are due to past or present white racism or sexism. The whole ideology stands or falls on this empirical claim. Therefore, the greatest taboo in our society is to consider alternative explanations for inequality, particularly those that implicate natural differences in the distribution of traits among racial groups.²⁷

The ideological precept underlying wokeism has to be protected from scrutiny by a taboo for one simple reason: it is not scientifically supported.²⁸ No matter how much people are punished for telling the truth—denied jobs, kicked off social media, or called names—and no matter how much honor is bestowed on those who defend woke lies, the facts will not change. Different ancestral populations—call them “races,” “ethnicities,” or whatever you want—are genetically distinguishable.²⁹ They have different distributions of traits, including measured IQ³⁰ and athletic abilities,³¹ likely in part because they were subject to different selection pressures in recent history. It is possible these differences play a nontrivial role in social outcomes. Almost every remotely plausible environmental explanation for these differences has been repeatedly tested in both natural and controlled experiments, and the same patterns of differences appear every time. As of yet, there is nothing that seriously casts doubt on the
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hereditarian explanation, and if it weren’t for the political implications this wouldn’t be controversial.

Like all informed people, Jonathan Haidt is aware of this. In 2009, he noted that “[r]ecent ‘sweeps’ of the genome across human populations show that hundreds of genes have been changing during the last five to ten millennia in response to local selection pressures.” He predicted that “dozens or hundreds of ethnic differences will be found” in “traits such as collectivism, clannishness, aggressiveness, docility, or the ability to delay gratification.”32 But since the founding of HxA he has changed his tune. In 2018 he said only that we should be “willing to entertain the possibility that . . . people from different cultures may have different preferences.”33

More recently—and despite his highly publicized resignation from the Society for Personality and Social Psychology over required DEI statements—Haidt said he “open[ed] [his] heart” to the woke narrative on race. His “transformation” occurred when he went on a “civil rights pilgrimage” with the late Congressman John Lewis. Someone “helped [him] understand [that] it’s not that slavery ended, it changed form. It’s not that Jim Crow ended, it changes form.” While the ideal of a “colorblind” society in which we “treat everybody the same” may be appealing to “twentieth-century white guys” like himself, he’s “now much more open to the idea that . . . for now, we do have to pay attention to race. We do have to change things about our society that lead to different outcomes.”34

HxA has not welcomed or given a platform to scholars who talk about race differences. At the 2018 HxA conference, John McWhorter argued—without receiving any pushback—that race differences shouldn’t be discussed on campus,35 and another panelist said that someone known for talking about differences shouldn’t be invited to speak.36 McWhorter went on to win HxA’s 2020 Leadership Award for
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his “exceptional leadership in championing open inquiry.” But the reality of race differences is a stake in the heart of wokeism. Many social scientists refuse to consider possible genetic explanations for group (or even individual) differences in outcomes, so a large part of their work is likely to be substantially incomplete. While some people associated with HxA have suggested cultural explanations for race differences that do not invoke white racism, these explanations may not possess the empirical power necessary to undermine wokeism. A “heterodox” movement that does not support free inquiry into genetic differences among races and their potential effect on outcomes is guaranteed to fail.

The Future of Free Thought

Because wokeism is based on demonstrable lies, it can only survive if people are prevented from telling the truth. It is inherently incompatible with open inquiry. Wherever there is wokeism—and it is metastasizing to every major institution in our society—there is censorship, intimidation, and groupthink.

There is an epidemic of cowardice among opponents of wokeism, and not only in academia. While SJWs fight tooth and nail to defend their lies and delusions, very few people on the other side are willing to defend their position with the same intensity. This is why SJWs almost always win despite the fact that most people are unhappy about political correctness; even a majority of college students say they “often feel intimidated sharing their ideas, opinions or beliefs in class.”

When SJWs decided to get Noah Carl fired from his postdoc at St. Edmund’s College at the University of Cambridge, they picketed,
they rewrote the lyrics to popular songs to make them about how Carl is a racist, and they mobilized hundreds of academics to advance their cause. There were zero counterprotests. No prominent academics threatened to boycott St. Edmund’s College if Carl was mistreated. He was fired, and then not much happened.

In 2013, SJWs discovered that Jason Richwine’s doctoral dissertation at Harvard mentioned some facts they didn’t like about race differences. Twenty-three student groups at Harvard released a statement declaring that “[e]ven if [Richwine’s] claims had merit, the Kennedy School cannot ethically stand by this dissertation whose end result can only be furthering discrimination under the guise of academic discourse.” His employer, the Heritage Foundation, which is a supposedly conservative think tank, forced him to resign.

In 2020 Bo Winegard was fired from Marietta College for crimethink about race, and there was virtually no response other than a few complaints on Twitter.

For four years University of Pennsylvania law professor Amy Wax has been barred from teaching required courses because SJWs don’t like something she said about race differences, and no one is doing anything about it. In fact, one panelist at the 2018 HxA conference suggested that Wax’s treatment “may be appropriate” while the other panelists nodded in apparent agreement. Recently the dean of Penn’s law school asked the Faculty Senate to impose “major sanctions” against Wax as a step toward revoking her tenure. Silence from HxA.

Last year, two Georgetown University adjunct law professors—Sandra Sellers and David Batson—were caught having (what they thought was) a private Zoom conversation in which Sellers lamented that many of their lower-performing students are black. According to Slate, fifty-one student organizations at Georgetown, seventy-four black law student associations across the country, and almost 800
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current Georgetown law students and 700 alumni (including the Slate journalist himself) united to attack Sellers and Batson.\textsuperscript{50} On the heterodox side, only one organization—the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education—even offered to help.\textsuperscript{51} HxA didn’t say a word. Sellers was fired. Batson was placed on administrative leave and resigned under pressure.

When SJWs require illegal loyalty oaths for job applications, illegally rule out white men as job candidates,\textsuperscript{52} or commit any number of other acts of war, there just isn’t a meaningful response.

Attempts to resist wokeism outside academia have foundered for some combination of the same reasons as HxA. Dissident leaders and institutions (a) are themselves going woke, (b) are squeamish about allying with the Republican Party, (c) make futile attempts to find common ground with woke dogmatists, and (d) avoid confronting the Big Lie about the cause of group differences upon which wokeism is based. But most people don’t want to live in a woke dystopia. Now is not the time to surrender. We can still win if we change our strategy and put up a real fight.
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