

I'm Offended! The Coddling Comfort of Political Correctness Smothering the Free Exchange of Ideas on College Campuses

Lisa A. Stefani

Professional Development Report

Spring 2015

Political Correctness, or the action of modifying ones speech to be particularly careful in word choice so as not to offend anyone, is widely acknowledged, accepted and endorsed on college campuses – Grossmont College included. Such ideals are thought to bring understanding and unity on a campus with a multicultural student and faculty populous. The goal of academic institutions is to educate their students and expand their fund of knowledge. Inherent in that goal is freedom of speech. Can we accomplish that goal with the speech codes dictated by political correctness?

GOALS: The goal of this Professional Development project is to examine political correctness in the context of the academic environment and explore the implications of its use on dialogue, learning, and the future of education.

Summary

Political Correctness is a pervasive ideology on college campuses throughout the United States of America. Far beyond common sense, good manners, and tact, today's Political Correctness surpasses any logical modicum of politeness and encompasses a rapidly growing list of words that are forbidden to be used because they are deemed, "offensive." All over this country teachers have to watch every word they say because the Political Correctness Police (PCP) have set up strict speech guidelines with an ever growing list of what *cannot* be said due to its "offensiveness." Students have been empowered to add their own words, phrases, and uses to this list at random reporting any "violation" of the extensive and nebulous code to people in administrative positions who are quick to take swift and decisive action against the teacher based solely on the student's word. This delights and encourages student PCP's and their administrative supporters to add even more words to the list and be on the lookout for their next PC target. Punishment takes a range of forms from privately and publicly humiliating the professor, ordering them to apologize and disciplining them by sending them to "Sensitivity Workshops," where they are ordered to reform their thought process. In many cases a violation of the political correctness code results in the suspension, termination or forced resignation of the "offending" professor. (Here's the Joke, 2011; Ray, 2015; Political Correctness Goes too Far on College Campuses, 2013; Peck, 2010; Maloney, 2014; Kainz, 2015; Irvine, 2015; Furedi, 2015; Feeny, 2014; Daubney, 2014; Baliker, 2011)

All over the United States, debate and discussion of important issues are being not only stifled but completely shut down because they are not politically correct and someone might be offended. Can we call that learning? Institutions of higher education were formerly known as the great market place of ideas

where freedom of expression, open discussion, open debate, stimulating intellectual discourse, genuine dialogue and freedom of speech were the order of the day. These institutions have been transformed into one-sided, mind molding, victim oriented, coddling campuses where Political Correctness supporting professors and administrators have “legalized as a right” that students should NOT to be offended, created lengthy speech codes and shut down the free speech of professors and students who do not conform to the dominant liberal left ideology of the institution. [Approximately 72% of college professors are self described as liberals and at the most elite schools 87% are self identified as liberal. (Kurtz, 2005; Smith 2012; Alexander, 2013)] The state of Political Correctness today is so extreme that something as simple as a single student complaint of a real or imagined offense by a professor can lead to the firing of that professor. In an actual case, the student went on record happily noting that she thought the outcome was fair and she did not regret her complaint. She said, “If that is what it took to give him a reality check, and to make sure that no other student has to go through that, maybe it’s for the best,” she said. (Here’s the Joke, 2011, p. 1). (Follow bibliography link to read the joke that got this professor fired.) (Ray, 2015; Political Correctness Goes too Far on College Campuses, 2013; Peck, 2010; Maloney, 2014; Kainz, 2015; Irvine, 2015; Furedi, 2015; Feeney, 2014; Daubney, 2014; Baliker, 2011)

You would really have to have your head buried in the sand not to realize that Political Correctness has gone stark raving crazy in all areas of society, but ironically nowhere is it more pronounced than on college campuses. The absurdity of that is almost incomprehensible. As tuition fees rise nationwide and administrators receive bigger and bigger pay raises, many members of society at large are questioning paying for such a one-sided, polarized, indoctrination into the Political Correctness world for youth. A closer look that the issues though reveal that this transformation has been coming since before WWI as a slow and “long march through the cultural institutions” of society (Gramsci).

This project sought to explore Political Correctness and its impact on learning on college campuses. Grossmont College is no exception and there are countless examples of extreme Political Correctness on a daily basis. For instance, the Muslim student association can host with tax payer dollars an imam as a guest lecturer to give a speech on how the Holocaust never happened, completely discounting the plethora of evidence, facts and data that it did happen but Muslim students can join up to complain to administrators about a Jewish professor who, in a content appropriate class, presents factual, documented information about Islamic extremists and shows a short video clip by a moderate Muslim asking why are the moderate Muslims of the world NOT speaking out against terror and terrorist groups. The Jewish professor gets called in by an administrator and admonished for having more complaints than anyone in the department and all but one are from Muslim students, and the one exception is a Muslim sympathizer. A Middle Eastern debate team student can win an award for a speech entitled, “America the Greatest Terrorist,” but a professor is not permitted to do a professional development project on the terrorist group ISIS and the threat they pose to America. That PC is crazy, rampant is a foregone conclusion – the content of this research itself is politically incorrect -- and most people know it is going on even if they are afraid to speak out about it. But how did it come to this -- particularly on college campuses? How has it morphed into fake hypersensitivity and what are the mechanisms driving it? What can be done about it? It is hard to imagine how learning can possibly occur when, “People have been lead to become so sensitive that fault can be found in almost anything anyone says because somewhere, somehow, someone will be offended by it.” (Carson, 2014, p. 13)

The Short on the Long History of Political Correctness

Political Correctness has its origins in Marxism beginning prior to 1914 and reaching momentum in Germany in the 1930's with the Frankfurt school and its prominent Marxist Theorists, Antonio Gramsci, Georg Lukacs, Felix Weil, Max Horkheimer, Theodore Adorno, Erich Fromm and Herbert Marcuse. Their combined efforts transformed the ill received and failed Marxist philosophy into a revamped version under the name of the Institute for Social Research which later became known as the Frankfurt school. They were instrumental in changing the theory's focus from an economic base to a culture base in order to find a source for energetic revolt since the originally theorized worker revolt was a complete flop -- workers took no interest in rebelling – capitalism had created more prosperity for more people than any other system ever had. The workers were quite happy and did not want to give up the life style and things they had for a classless society where assets were redistributed so that everyone could have a “fair share.” This revamped movement combined Marxism, Freudian philosophy of repression, and sexuality into the theory. The basic premise was that if they infiltrated all of the cultural and social institutions and harshly criticized these western and capitalistic venues from a cultural perspective, they could convince the workers that Western Civilization was the root of all things evil and then they would revolt. The group settled down and began to criticize all things German. In 1933 the Nazi's took over Germany, shut the school down and the members fled to the United States to New York City where they were helped by Columbia University to re-establish themselves as the Frankfurt school where they settled down and began to actively criticize all things American. This became known as critical theory which spread into specialized departments such as Women's Studies, African American Studies, Native American Studies, and many other such departments. Classes in these departments taught and still do actively teach victimization of the specific group by the oppressive Western Civilization and its Capitalism. A cloud of cultural pessimism was settling over colleges and universities. Because of free speech the members were able to do this. (Lind, 2000; Cultural Marxism: The Corruption of America; the History of Political Correctness)

In the 1960's Marcuse, a prominent Marxist Theorist from the school, capitalized on American student discontent with the Vietnam war and wrote a book called, “Eros and Civilization,” which became the bible for the disgruntled students and fueled the revolt and has since been the rally call for revolution through students and faculty on college campuses – again enabled by free speech. (Lind, 2000; Cultural Marxism: The Corruption of America; the History of Political Correctness)

In the 1970's, Middle Eastern Countries watching the US transformation from a nation filled with patriotic pride to a nation of America Bashers from within itself saw it in their best interest to contribute to the destruction of Western Civilization. Many Middle Eastern countries, particularly Saudi Arabia, began pouring money into major college campuses to create Middle Eastern Studies Departments. These funds also came from the (at the time) jointly held American and Saudi oil company, Aramco. In a very systematic fashion, Middle Eastern Studies Departments were established in the majority of college campuses in the United States. Key Middle Eastern people, some of them radical extremists, were given teaching positions, professorships and tenure to carry on the departments, thus one more element of America bashing was set in place. Funds to support these departments kept flowing because by 1988, Saudi Arabia had positioned itself to hold dominate shares of Aramco. They nationalized the oil industry for Saudi Arabia, essentially kicking the United States out of the industry (and the profits) that it had founded, funded, explored, created, and built with its own technology. Now Saudi had its share of the oil

profits and America's share of the oil profits. They were not only able to fund the Departments but also to ensure that key figures were hired in those departments, many of which teach radical Islam and hatred of America. It is quite common to hear radical Islamist professors at institutions such as Berkley, Harvard, Columbia and Yale openly and publically bash America and endorse terrorist groups such as Hamas. Directly after 9/11, a Muslim extremist and Taliban Spokesman was welcomed into Yale University defying all academic standard requirements since he only had a 4th grade education (Maloney). As was discovered by investigations surrounding the 9/11 Muslim terrorist attacks on this country, huge amounts of money funding the terrorists were funneled from Saudi Arabia through organizations described as "charities" such as the Holy Land Foundation and supposedly innocuous organizations such as the Muslim Student Associations on campuses. (Lind, 2000; Cultural Marxism: The Corruption of America: the History of Political Correctness) All of the 9/11 Muslim terrorists were on expired student visas and some of them attended Grossmont College.

For many years now, American students have been inculcated and indoctrinated in schools that teach them that all things American are evil, America is the great oppressor, all sub groups are victims of America's barbaric oppression, and they should hate and condemn the country in which they were born or have chosen to live. This slow, long walk through the cultural institutions of America as Gramsci described it, have brought us to the point where Political Correctness is completely out of control.

Today's Political Correctness Turned Fake Hypersensitivity and the Mechanisms Driving It

Far beyond common sense, good manners and tact, today's Political Correctness surpasses any logical modicum of politeness, seeks complete tolerance for its own views and absolute intolerance for any other viewpoint. Where did this "fake" hypersensitivity come from and what forces are driving it? In 1971, Saul Alinsky wrote a book, or rather revised a book he had written earlier, "Reveille for Radicals" – a book on principles and tactics for community organizing, a euphemism for agitating for revolution -- to his updated version, "Rules for Radicals," – which expands the original work, including 12 fundamental steps to instigate revolt. This Chicago born Marxist and his tactics of infiltration paired with confrontation have been the base of all political revolutionary movements in the US for decades. Alinsky believed, as Marxist Theory suggests, life in America is "intolerably miserable for most people . . . nothing more than an exercise in drudgery . . . the dreariest, drabbest, grayest outlook that one can have. Simply a future of utter despair (Perazzo, 2008, p. 4-5). Alinsky's life work centered around organizing communities, developing community leaders and instilling within them the goal of forcing "enough public discontent, moral confusion, and outright chaos to spark the social upheaval that Marx, Engles, and Lenin had predicted" (p. 2).

Alinsky viewed revolution as a slow, patient process. The trick was to penetrate existing institutions such as churches, unions, and political parties. He advised his organizers and their decipels to quietly, subtly gain influence within the decision-making ranks of these institutions

and to introduce changes from that platform. This was precisely the tactic of 'infiltration' advocated by Lenin and Stalin. (p. 3)

All of Alinsky's tactics are based on manipulation and training organizers to become master manipulators – to move the masses in the direction that the organizer prefers. He advocated exploiting what he held as a sound belief, that, "millions of people feel deep down in their hearts that there is no place for them, that they do not count," (Alinsky, 1946, p. 44). His tactics are to train organizers to get the group to ACT FIRST and then later they will rationalize to themselves why they acted that way. Of course, by human nature, the later rationalization will favor the group member's and organizers actions. Subtlety played a key role in Alinsky's tactics. His revolutionaries were supposed to have a clean cut, well dressed presentation to facilitate infiltration of the system. Followers were not supposed to flaunt their radicalism but instead to have the look to fit in (Poe as cited in Perazzo, 2008).

As an example of how this works, I will share a story about a student in a recent semester in one of my Public Speaking classes. In every public speaking class one of the first casual speeches is to introduce yourself to your class mates who will be your "audience" for all of your speeches in the class. Among the students there was an attractive, very well dressed, African American female student. When it was her turn to speak, she informed me that she had created a power point to accompany her presentation and needed the use of the computer. I was impressed and excited since as the first speech most students never create a power point for their 3 minute introduction and instead try to get it over with as fast as possible, some never even make the 3 minute mark. I was really looking forward to her presentation. She began her speech with a pleasant but commanding tone of voice, using perfect English, no slang, and very little verbal clutter such as "um," "like" etc. She shared with the class that as an African American, her entire life had been nothing but one racist event after another and that she had suffered terribly at the hands of racists. I was waiting to hear an example or a specific event of the racism she said had impacted her life so, but she did not offer one. Instead, she turned to her Power Point and showed a series of photos of herself in various places around the country holding protest signs, yelling through a bull horn, and protesting alongside an angry mob of mostly African Americans but a good amount of Whites and people of other races. All the protest were about race – Ferguson, Trevon Martin, jobs, affirmative action, and the like. She told the class that she was taking the speech class so that she could become a powerful protester since her goal was to become a professional protester and then after that to become a lawyer to learn the legal rules and ultimately to become a Judge to preside over and make decisions that stamped out all forms of racism against African Americans. Her conclusion was rewarded with a thunderous round of applause from many students in

the class, but other students, even some African American students were a bit stunned. She had spoken for 7 minutes, over twice the mandatory time.

After the introduction speech there is always a question and answer session to give the audience a chance to get to know the class member better. One student (Mexican) asked, "What can I do to get on board with joining such protests?" Several other students cheered, raised their fists, stomped their feet and chimed in, "me too!" "Hell yeah!" She told them that she had a list of upcoming protest rallies that they could participate in and she would give the information to anyone who wanted it after class. Another student, (African American), asked the speaker what kind of racist things had happened to her. She responded that they were all just too traumatic to talk about and she didn't want to relive the old memories. Another student, (White), asked her to at least tell us where she was living when she suffered these atrocities. She said that she had live all over the US and experienced racism everywhere she had been. At this point, it was obvious that the speech was full of emotion but devoid of any concrete specific facts – an effective public speech will have elements of both. The professor can ask questions too, so I prefaced my question by quoting some mixed race marriage statistics, and the huge increase in mix race/culture babies being born in the US along with the six most diverse states in the US, California being one of them. (I did not share my mixed family so as not to influence the response in any way.) Respecting her request not to hash through old memories, I asked her if she had experienced equal levels of racism in all of the states she had been in, because according to the government statistics, it would appear that in many states, such as ours, a lot of people don't seem to care too much what race or color people are – enough to have very high marriage and mixed child birth rates. Before she could answer, 3 or 4 students volunteered that they were mixed race/culture themselves. She conceded to the class that it had been less severe in California. Another student, a female Chaldean refugee student, told the speaker that she was sorry that she had had such horrible experiences. She said she loved this country and was so happy to be here where she was free and safe from the barbarism of Militant Islamist in her own country. She asked the speaker if she had any good memories since the bad ones seem overwhelming to her. The speaker paused before responding, and then said that she didn't mean to imply that ALL her life experiences were bad, she had actually had some good times in California. Another student asked her what her favorite protest was. The speaker gave an answer (I don't recall which one was her favorite protest.) I was interested in why she had a "favorite," and if it had anything to do with the evidence behind the case because in public speaking, one of the things students learn is how to effectively research a situation, to look at all angles and then come to a conclusion. In argumentation and debate students learn to argue both for and against an issue. I prefaced my question with those facts and asked her how much preparatory research she does before a protest. She was stunned into silence for a minute, and then, with all eyes on her, finally said,

“Honestly, none. I just go make my voice heard at the protests. But I am going to start doing that.”

Another student asked her what if she was protesting for something that was totally wrong? She stood in silence. I rescued her and said that after this class she would know how to conduct effective research so she could know both sides of the issues, then her voice would be far more powerful at the protests she chose to go to. She smiled, relieved to be out of the spot light and sat down. I was looking forward to working with this student through the semester to hone her research and speaking abilities, especially since her ultimate goal was to become a Judge who would be making decisions that would impact a great many people. Unfortunately, the student wound up dropping the class due to a poor grade on an assignment requiring the effective use of factual data, and reliable sources in a timed, organized presentation format. This student dressed the part, acted before thinking/researching, was proud to have her voice count and enjoyed fitting in with the other protesters even though she did not know the facts or why she was protesting. Exactly what Alinsky advocated in a group member.

Another main goal of Alinsky’s tactics was to focus on singling out individual people who are linked to the organizations rather than targeting organizations themselves that perpetuate his evil view of capitalism. These individual people would become the face of the enemy. The organizer and group would portray them as the root of evil. The organizers job then was to instill in the hearts of the masses a deep- seeded, emotion backed hatred for this individual, personal, enemy (the target). By searching out differences, controversy, and conflict -- making it up if necessary -- the organizers next function was to “catch” the enemy breaking any teeny tiny rule, particularly a rule of his or her own or his or her institutions, and then beating them to death (figuratively) with their own rule book. The organizer rallies the masses into a public protest(s) to repeatedly attack the target through derision, dismissing him/her as someone unworthy of being taken seriously, labeling them intellectually deficient or morally bankrupt, laughing at them privately and publically, and ridiculing them ruthlessly. Alinsky preached that ridicule “is man’s most potent weapon. It is almost impossible to counterattack ridicule. Also, it infuriates the opposition, who then react to your advantage,” (Alinsky, 1971, p. 128). In other words, you goad, insult and provoke the “enemy” (target) into responding with irrational anger which makes them look bad in the public eye, particularly if they try to counter attack. The organizer then becomes a martyr for a “just cause” that the masses feel sorry for and rally behind even more than before the attack (Alinsky, 1971, p. 135 – 155).

Here are Alinsky’s 12 Rules for Radicals:

1. Power is not only what you have, but what the enemy thinks you have.
2. Never go outside the expertise of your people.

3. Whenever possible, go outside the expertise of the enemy.
4. Make the enemy live up to his own book of rules.
5. Ridicule is man's most potent weapon.
6. A good tactic is one your people enjoy.
7. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.
8. Keep the pressure on.
9. The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.
10. If you push a negative hard and deep enough, it will break through into the counter side.
11. The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.
12. Pick the target, freeze it, personalize it and polarize it.

The translation:

1. Psych your enemy out and make him or her think you have way more supporters and damaging information than you really do. This will make them really afraid. "Stage loud, defiant, massive protest rallies expressing deep rage and discontent over one particular injustice or another" (Perazzo, 2008, p. 10). Intensify and embellish your rage and exaggerate your numbers.
2. Avoid anything that your group has little or no knowledge about – the real issues, how they came about, short term and long term outcomes and the like. Remember, you want your group to act first and then rationalize their actions later. A logical examination of the real issues will interfere or halt the action.
3. Blindside your enemy with irrelevant arguments that they are forced to deal with and address rather than any of the substantive issues. Waste their time. Waste their energy. Frustrate them with your irrelevant and/or irrational arguments. No matter how ridiculous they are, your enemy will have to deal with them.
4. Exploit the enemy's own rule book. For instance, if their "rule book" says every letter will get a personal reply, send 20,000 letters. Find ways to make it impossible for them to follow their own rules and every time they don't live up to their commitment, chip away at the enemy's credibility and reputation (Perazzo, 2008).
5. Make your enemy fearful and angry with irrational ridicule. It infuriates the enemy because there is no defense to ridicule. Webster's Dictionary defines ridicule as: to make fun of, to make an object of laughter of; deliberate, malicious belittling; deride with bitter contempt; mock, scorn, mimic or shame; taunt jeeringly provoking insult or challenge.
6. If attacking the enemy is fun, your group will keep doing it. They feel empowered as a group ridiculing the enemy, derailing them with tangential, irrelevant arguments and issues. Group

members may come up with even better, more fun ideas to attack your enemy than the organizer did him or herself. If you successfully get what you want, it is even more fun, so move onto the next issue with the same target or onto another target.

7. Keep your group excited, involved, angry, and fueled with deep seeded hate for the enemy. Constantly come up with new strategies and tactics to beat down your enemy. Be totally unpredictable and absolutely willing to plunge society into chaos and anarchy with your group's actions (Alinsky, 1946, pp. 150 – 151).
8. Never let up. Attack from all sides and all angles constantly so the enemy never has a chance to rest, regroup, strategize or recover. Each enemy is an individual, but your group has a number of people to constantly keep the attack going. Keep “more than one fight in the bank,” so that you always have a stockpile of issues and controversies which you are ready to pounce on and some bigger ones you can move quickly too if you gain a victory from another attack (Alinsky, 1946, pp. 151-152).
9. Your angry, screaming, chanting, threatening mob will cause the enemy to conjure up many horrible, worst case scenarios to possibly have to deal with. Enormous time and energy will be wasted by your enemy doing this. All of this derision will demoralize your enemy.
10. Every positive has a negative. Push and push your enemy to the point of anger or violence and you will gain sympathizers as the underdog. Especially when you goad your enemy to give an angry or irrational response back to your irrational arguments and accusations.
11. You know your attack has been successful when the enemy offers a constructive solution. Your enemy may well continue to be rational in the face of your group's irrational attacks. He may convince him or herself that the people in the group are logical, rational citizens such as him or herself and that the angry mob will be willing to seek resolutions that are beneficial to both sides – win/win. Alinsky warned that if the enemy attempts to end the conflict by extending a hand of friendship, surrendering to your demands or making a compromise, “. . . you cannot be trapped by the enemy in his sudden agreement . . .” (Alinsky 1971, p. 130). The same holds true for apologies and guilt. Alinsky directed organizers and members to exploit each and every one of these concessions to extort more concessions and greater moral leverage. War is eternal and must never end until your enemy is absolutely crushed and permanently ruined. The organizer and the group should take every concession they get as an admission that the enemy is the guilty devil but no concession or compromise is ever to be considered good enough. With every concession amplify the attack until the devil enemy is decimated and the organizer's agenda completely rules.
12. Pick your enemy(s), follow all of the rules against him/her/them. Cut off any support that they might have and this might mean adding another enemy to your list for attack. It is vital to cut off

any possibility of sympathy toward the enemy by anyone. Alinsky warned against any organizer or any member of the group to hold or purport any view of your target except that he/she is “100 percent the devil.” Regardless of how many good qualities the enemy has, do not concede to even a single small, good quality in the enemy as it will “dilute the impact of the attack,” and amounts to nothing more than “political idiocy” (Alinsky, 1971, p. 134).

From these rules and the detailed directions in Alinsky’s books, it is clear how today’s political correctness defies any sort of logic, has nothing to do with politeness, dramatizes a “fake” hypersensitivity, and demands nothing less than absolute submission to its intolerant dictums.

Dealing With the Political Correctness Police

Given the absolute intolerance for any views other than their own, the cruel, immoral strategies used to destroy the enemy, and the cluelessness of the protesting group at large being lead along by the organizer for the “greater” good, how does one possibly deal with the PCP? This is an important but difficult question to answer. The difficulty is evidenced repeatedly when angry, protesting students march on the administration shouting their long list of demands and the administration succumbs and meets the demands only to be marched on again for more concessions creating a never ending cycle. Here are some things to consider: (These considerations are based on the rationale that logical, knowledgeable people will typically be polite, well mannered and not purposely offend someone.)

How do you know if it is a real offence or a “fake” hypersensitivity?

1. If it is a real offence, where someone has actually felt slighted, a logical person may consider the source of the slight, brush it off and get on with life. If they are not willing to brush it off, most logical people would typically address the issue with the person who made the statement. This can be done in a polite and inquisitive way even if the “offender” is superior to you. Effective communicators will usually make the inquiry in a private forum giving the person the benefit of the doubt but also allowing the person to “save face” if it was an unintentional slight. The “fake” hypersensitivity person will rarely address the issue with the person themselves and dramatize the feigned offense by reporting it to a higher person in the institution and avoiding the person who made the statement altogether. Sadly, many people in the administrative chain, instead of referring the complainer back the person who made the statement, jump on board the PCP train and without even hearing the other side of the issue, console the complainer and promise to take action against the person who made the statement. In the case of academic institutions, many have already made campus wide rules that the swift action must be taken to stop the “offender” before any kind of questioning or discussion has occurred. The professor is guilty, no questions asked. Ironically, if professors have an issue with each other or an administrator, it is typically district policy, whether written or unwritten, to deal with the issue at the lowest level possible beginning with the actual person. If a professor jumps the chain of command and heads to the Vice President of Academic Affairs office to complain about the chair or the dean, the professor is usually admonished by the VP and told to first begin with the person they have an issue with. But as we have seen thus far in this paper, one student saying they are offended can get a professor

terminated. If the complainer has jumped the chain of command and completely avoided the “offender,” you can be fairly certain that it is “fake” hypersensitivity rather than a real offence.

2. Second, if the offence is real, the person who felt slighted will actually listen to what you have to say. Logical people expect that other people will be logical back. If the accuser will not listen to anything you say and interrupts you repeatedly, you know they are behaving illogically and may well be faking offence. If you combine one and two, that is, the accuser has jumped the chain and you are being address by someone higher in the chain who has already made a decision in favor of the accuser prior to talking to you and the purpose of them speaking to you is to admonish you, then you are most likely dealing with a fake hypersensitivity accuser and a PCP higher up endorsing the fake accuser.
3. Third, if the accuser has completely cut you off and refuses any sort of dialogue or discourse with you at all despite your efforts to communicate, you are most likely dealing with a fake hypersensitivity accuser.
4. Fourth, if the accuser will not verbally have a dialogue with you and you reach out to that person in writing with your explanation of what you said and the intent behind it, and the accuser acts as if you do not exist or avoids you and goes back to the higher up, you are likely dealing with a fake hypersensitivity accuser.
5. Fifth, if you reach out to the accuser with an explanation of what you said and why you said it and offer them a concession or constructive solution to resolve the issue and the accuser ignores you but continues attacking in other ways then you are probably dealing with a fake hypersensitivity accuser. If your accuser accepts the concession or constructive solution and still continues to attack in other ways then you are probably dealing with a fake hypersensitivity accuser.

Now that you know what to look for to determine if it was a real offense or a “fake” hypersensitivity accuser who just wants to twist your words, your meanings, and your intentions then cling to the lies that they have created to substitute for your real words in order to destroy you as the enemy. What should you do when you are dealing with each accuser?

1. If you find you have actually but unintentionally offended someone, apologize with sincerity and explain what you meant. In most cases, logical people will accept your apology and usually your explanation and you may even find that the discussion and dialogue created move your future interactions to a higher, more fruitful level.

As a specific example of what to say, Mr. Carson, Dr. Ben Carson, pediatric surgeon and former director of the John Hopkins Pediatric Neurosurgery Department, author of several books, and possible Presidential candidate for the 2016 election, says:

When the offended party proclaims the injury you have wrought upon them with your words, say something to the effect of, “I can see that you were deeply hurt by my choice of words. It was not my intention to hurt you and for that I am sorry. Now I would like for you to know what I intended to communicate to you and I will use different words that will hopefully convey the spirit of my thoughts and allow our discussion to continue.” If the offended party was truly offended, that will be a sufficient statement, but if they were only pretending to be offended, they will continue to harp on their perceived mistreatment. (p. 22)

2. If you discover that you are dealing with a fake hypersensitive accuser, Mr. Carson offers a concise and direct approach to dealing with the PCP who have targeted you as an enemy and wishes only to destroy you. All the following suggestions were summarized from his 2014 book, "One Nation."

Remember that Alinsky's tactics call for ridicule and harsh, cruel attacks designed to goad the "enemy" into an angry, reactionary, irrational response there by destroying their credibility.

Remain calm but not silent as silence also feeds into the hands of the PCP because they have successfully shut you up and eliminated your voice and your opinions.

Respond but refrain from reacting in fear or anger.

Say everything you say calmly and reasonably.

Remain physically calm and reasonable.

"Frequently remind your attackers that our greater purpose is to engage in intelligent conversation and solve problems" (p. 20).

Know what points you want to make and stay focused. "This makes constant interruptions, attacks, and attempts to change the subject more difficult" (p. 21) for your attackers.

Recognize that your attackers will make every attempt to dredge up or expose any mistakes, misstatements or misdeeds you have ever made in order to destroy you. Often times these may be made up lies, but if they exploit a factual misdeed from your past, "it is best to admit to it, condemn it, and ask 'What more do you want?'" (p. 21)

If you follow these suggestions, it won't take long for your attacker(s), to realize that he or she (or they) "are the ones who look like fools if they refuse to engage in problem solving," (p. 20)

It is hard to stay calm when you are being attacked by a cruel person who is ridiculing you and making ridiculous accusations and irrational statements. Mr. Carson says, "When someone is being particularly mean and nasty, I simply think to myself, *He or she used to be a cute little baby, I wonder what happened?*" (p. 21).

Conclusion

Political Correctness has its roots in Marxism which seeks to systematically destroy Western Civilization from within by destroying the family unit, individual property rights, Judeo-Christian religion, and ultimately the nation. On colleges it is destroying freedom of expression, open discussion, open debate, stimulating intellectual discourse and eliminating the possibility of resolving any problems with its strict intolerance of any view except its own. Genuine dialogue is completely shut down. Political Correctness is stifling pedagogical devices that jar students into experimenting with all kinds of ideas

and notions. Good professors DO make you feel uncomfortable. You go to college to learn new things not have things dictated to you. Feeling “comfortable” is not the goal of college. Unfortunately, Political Correctness is so out of control that now on most campuses it really is against campus rules to “offend” someone. Political Correctness, rather than creating unity among a multicultural student and faculty populace, is creating greater polarization and racial and cultural separation on college campuses throughout the US – all in the name of diversity. With all of the negative problems created by Political Correctness it seems like it would be a safer bet to risk “offending” students rather than not educating them. Fortunately, there is a significant movement in society in general and in academia particularly to battle the extreme political correctness on today’s campuses. Organizations are cropping up all over the US to defend professors and students from the PCP. In the wake of such politically correct firings, organizations have sprung up to defend freedom of speech in academia such as FIRE Foundation for Individual Rights in Education and the American Center for Law and Justice. These organization web sites list current and closed cases defending professors who were fired or students who were expelled for words or statements that would not remotely be considered offensive by any logical, rational person. Colleges and universities may think that they are their own universes, but they operate under the foundations of this country and its constitution. Freedom of speech is a two way street.

References

- Alexander, R. (2013 June 10). Suspicious Confirmed: Academia Shutting Out Conservative Professors. Town Hall.com. Available at:
<http://townhall.com/columnists/rachelalexander/2013/06/10/suspicious-confirmed-academia-shutting-out-conservative-professors-n1616406/print>
- Alinsky, S. (1946). Reveille for Radicals. New York, New York: Vintage Books.
- Alinsky, S. (1971). Rules for Radicals. New York, New York: Vintage Books.
- Baliker, T. (3 April 2011). UCLA Professor Fired for Politically Incorrect Findings on Pollution. The Green Regulation Machine: Saving the Planet or Killing Jobs? Available at: <http://mu-warrior.blogspot.com/2011/04/ucla-professor-fired-for-politically.html>
- Carson, B. (2014). One Nation: What We Can All Do to Save America’s Future. New York, New York: Penguin Group.
- Cultural Marxism: The Corruption of America. Available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gldBuK7_g3M

Daubney, M. (2014 December 16). Was 2014 the Year Political Correctness Went Stark Raving Mad?

The Telegraph. Available at: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/thinking-man/11294974/Was-2014-the-year-political-correctness-went-stark-raving-mad.html>

Education Watch International. (2015). Available at: <http://edwatch.blogspot.com/>

Feeney, M (2014 April 30). Are Political Correctness Police Really Outraged or Are They Signaling Their

Social Standing? Reason.com: Free Minds and Free Markets. Available at:

<http://reason.com/blog/2014/04/30/are-political-correctness-police-really>

Furedi, F. (2015 April 15). UK: Islam vs liberalism: The classroom's silent culture war. Available at:

<http://www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/islam-vs-liberalism-the-classrooms-silent-culture-war/16844>

Furedi, F. (2015 April 15). Teachers are afraid of tackling difficult questions in front of pupils. Available at:

<http://www.spiked-online.com/newsite/article/islam-vs-liberalism-the-classrooms-silent-culture-war/16844>

The History of Political Correctness

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EjaBpVzOohs>

Here's the Joke that Got College Professor Fired: Complaining Student Says Outcome Fair as Legal

Fight Launches. (13 Jan 2011). World Net daily. Available at:

<http://www.wnd.com/2011/01/250705/#!>

Irvine, S. (2015). Another School Postpones Screening of American Sniper after Muslim Students

Complain. Accuracy in Academia. Available at: <http://www.academia.org/another-school->

[postpones-screening-of-american-sniper-after-muslim-students-complain/](http://www.academia.org/another-school-postpones-screening-of-american-sniper-after-muslim-students-complain/)

Kainz, H. (18 Feb 2015). Firing Professor McAdams: When a Catholic University Collides With Political

Correctness. The John William Pope Center for Higher Education Policy. Available at:

<http://www.popecenter.org/commentaries/article.html?id=3147>

Lind, B. (2000). The Origins of Political Correctness. Accuracy in Academia. Available at:

<http://www.academia.org/the-origins-of-political-correctness/>

Maloney, E. C. (2014). Indoctrinate U: Marxism on Campus. On the Fence Films. Available at:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GdbSP_Ramvs

Peck, M. (2010). "Campus Culture Wars, Five Stories About PC." PBS Documentary available at:

<http://www.c-span.org/video/?53366-1/political-correctness-college-campus>

Perazzo, J. (2008). Saul Alinsky. Discover the Network. Available at: www.discoverthenetwork.org

Political Correctness Goes too Far on College Campuses. (2013 May 26). The Bend Bulletin Central

Oregon. Available at: <http://www.bendbulletin.com/news/1361765-153/political-correctness-goes-too-far-on-college-campuses.htm>

Ray, J. (2015 April). Political Correctness Watch. Available at: <http://pcwatch.blogspot.com/>

Schwartz, S. (2015 March 9). Student Blasts Her Colleagues Thought Police and Political Correctness

That Has Reached the Level of Crazy. The Blaze. Available at:

<http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2015/03/09/student-blasts-her-colleges-thought-police-and-political-correctness-thats-reached-the-level-of-crazy/>

Smith, E. (2012 August 1). Survey shocker: Liberal profs admit they'd discriminate against conservatives in hiring, advancement 'Impossible lack of diversity' reflects ideological intimidation on campus.

Washington Times. Available at: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/aug/1/liberal-majority-on-campus-yes-were-biased/#ixzz3XoaiPMTn>