



Shut-up, White Boy! Professors: White Men Should Speak Last

We look to a day when people will not be judged by the content of their character, but by the color of their skin.

And the configuration of their chromosomes.

This seems the hope of a panel of professors and activists at Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, assembled to improve campus race relations and tackle matriculator misogyny. And relating to this they put forth an idea:



Women and blacks should be called on first in classroom discussions.

{modulepos inner_text_ad}

Campus Reform's Gabriella Morrongiello reports on the story, [writing](#), "On the heels of a scandal involving male Dalhousie University dentistry students making sexually charged comments on Facebook about their female peers, the Canadian university's Student Union and Gender and Women's Studies Program co-hosted a forum on misogyny titled "Transforming our campus and strengthening our community." Morrongiello then writes of the panel's proposed solutions:

... "I do think, in general, there are a lot of studies that indicate women, girls are socialized not to speak first.... And so to make a conscious rule, a deliberate rule that is explicit, that 'no, men are not allowed to speak first,' is certainly a strong way of addressing that issue..." said [Jacqueline Warwick](#), a professor of musicology and former coordinator of the Gender and Women's Studies Programs at Dalhousie.

Jude Ashburn, who identifies as a "non-binary trans person" and serves as an outreach coordinator at a local gender and sexual resource center, told [UNews](#) after the panel that she thinks black students should also be given priority when contributing to classroom discussions.

"When I do activist circles or workshops, I often say, 'OK, if you're white and you look like me and you raise your hand, I'm not going to pick on you before someone of color,'" said Ashburn.

One might wonder about applying this standard in college classes. If whites and men — and in particular white men — will be pushed to the back of the participation bus, will they also be charged less for this lower degree of educational service? Given that white men are practically the only group excluded from affirmative action (Asians may now be another), it actually will be just the opposite.

Of course, it's true that sex differences exist and that men are more likely to speak up, owing to their mover-and-shaker nature and to being less fearful of making mistakes. But it's also true, as Dr. Louann Brizendine writes in her 2007 book *The Female Brain*, that women are more talkative in general; she writes that women have approximately 20,000 "communication events" a day versus about 7,000 for men.

Yet these phenomena are interpreted very differently. When at issue is men's strong-and-silent nature,



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 21, 2015

it's bemoaned as a failure to communicate that warrants remedy. And when men and boys speak up more in class?

The onus is also put on them.

Then we're told "girls are socialized not to speak first," presumably by our (invisible) patriarchy, and that an explicit rule that "men are not allowed to speak first" is needed. Well, critics might note that this does prepare young men for modern marriages.

Or is it that they then aren't allowed to speak last?

One thing underlying this social engineering is an unjust rebellion against nature — against the different natures of the sexes. Dr. Brizendine addressed this in so many words when [asked](#) in a *New York Times* interview if she was concerned that she was rehabilitating outdated sex "stereotypes that portray women as chatterboxes ruled by female hormones?" She replied, "A stereotype always has an aspect of truth to it, or it wouldn't be a stereotype. I am talking about the biological basis behind behaviors that we all know about."

But there are more double standards, and a big one in education relates to the federal legislation known as Title IX. While it states, "No person in the U.S. shall, on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid," it is applied quite tendentiously. As I [wrote](#) in *The New American* in 2012:

The legislation has been interpreted to mean that the percentages of male and female athletes at a college must reflect the student-body male-female ratio (this is known as "proportionality"). Thus, at a school that is 60 percent women — common today — 60 percent of the athletes must also be. The problem? Many more men than women are interested in sports, so it's often difficult attracting enough female athletes to meet the quota. This, along with tight budgets, has led to the elimination of male sports teams — solely in deference to social engineering.

Moreover, while Title IX says nothing about sports, that area — where men have markedly greater interest — is the only one targeted by it. It's never applied to debate teams or other extra-curricular activities where women are numerically dominant and would be the ones to lose opportunities.

And then there's the 800-pound gorilla in the arena. Given that academics are more important than athletics, I ask you: If "proportionality" is such an imperative, why do we tolerate 60-40 female/male student bodies to begin with? Why don't we apply Title IX and insist that they reflect the sex ratio of the wider population?

Of course, though, leftist social engineers might say we need two standards because at issue are two distinctly different groups: the "privileged" and the "underprivileged." As to this, activist Jude Ashburn also said that white people had to "abandon" and unlearn their "white privilege." And, presumably, this is only magnified when coupled with "male privilege." But some may note that the real privilege academics and their acolytes perceive is leftist privilege, which ensures they get and keep professorships and explains why their ranks are approximately 90 percent liberal.

As for a lack of diversity, the Dalhousie University panel was wanting in the ideological department — and beyond.

It was all female and almost exclusively white.

Then again, it did have a "non-binary trans person" and who knows what else.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe