# Article information:

At last – a university that stands up to spoiled students
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/columnists/2023/04/29/reading-university-woke-students/>

# Article summary:

1. A university vice-chancellor has stood up to students who disinvited a Conservative MP from speaking at their Politics Association, reminding them of their responsibility to uphold free speech.

2. The author is wary of the progressive notion that people should apologize for the crimes of their distant ancestors, as every person with European ancestry is descended from Charlemagne, who committed atrocities.

3. Sir Keir Starmer's plan to teach boys to respect women under Labour is laudable, but the author suggests that many adults in his own party could benefit from these classes, given the abuse and accusations faced by Labour MP Rosie Duffield for defending single-sex spaces for women.

# Article rating:

Appears strongly imbalanced: The article is written in a biased or one-sided way, and the information it provides is not trustworthy enough to be considered a reliable source. You should consult other sources to find reliable information on the presented issues.

# Article analysis:

The article "At last – a university that stands up to spoiled students" by Tom Welsh discusses the recent incident at the University of Reading where Conservative MP James Sunderland was disinvited and then re-invited to speak at an event due to his views on immigration. The author praises the university's vice-chancellor, Robert van de Noort, for standing up for free speech and suggests that other universities should follow suit. The article also touches on topics such as vocational education, apologizing for historical crimes, and misogyny.

One potential bias in the article is its conservative perspective. The author seems to be critical of left-wing student activists who he portrays as "spoiled" and "self-important." He also suggests that vocational education is a solution to political grandstanding, which could be seen as dismissive of academic pursuits. Additionally, the article makes unsupported claims about genetic ancestry and reparations without providing evidence or exploring counterarguments.

The article also presents a one-sided view of the incident at the University of Reading. While it criticizes the students for disinviting James Sunderland, it does not provide any context or explanation for why they did so. It also does not mention any potential risks associated with allowing controversial speakers on campus or how universities can balance free speech with ensuring a safe and inclusive environment for all students.

Overall, while the article raises some valid points about free speech and academic freedom, its conservative bias and one-sided reporting limit its credibility and objectivity.

# Topics for further research:

* Why did students at the University of Reading disinvite James Sunderland?
* How can universities balance free speech with ensuring a safe and inclusive environment for all students?
* What are the potential risks associated with allowing controversial speakers on campus?
* What are the arguments for and against reparations for historical crimes?
* What is the evidence for genetic ancestry testing and how accurate is it?
* What are the different perspectives on the value of vocational education compared to academic pursuits?

# Report location:

<https://www.fullpicture.app/item/cc97127daa9d2725cf534f31ea646bfd>