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Why are social and personality psychologists overwhelmingly liberal in their ideological sympathies and what consequences does that skew have for our science? This skewness of the ideological distribution appears to be driven primarily by self-selection, hostile-workplace processes, and direct discrimination (Duarte, Crawford, Stern, Haidt, Jussim, and Tetlock, under review; Inbar & Lammers, 2012). These processes are important for two reasons: 1. They unfairly harm individual scientists; and 2. They lead the "science" of social psychology to entirely unjustified and distorted "conclusions" about potentially politicized topics via a slew of questionable interpretive practices (QIPs; Jussim, 2012). QIPs include: selective preference (publication, funding, citations) given to politically congenial studies; blind spots (selectively ignoring politically uncomfortable results), and mythmaking (extolling weak or irreplicable findings as powerful and pervasive IF they bolster liberal narratives; systematically derogating and dismissing politically distasteful results).  Several specific examples of each type of QIP will be presented, involving questionable publication, IRB, and funding decisions; selectively ignoring research on rational and accurate stereotyping; and selectively extolling weak or irreplicable expectancy-confirmation studies. I conclude both with recommendations on how to limit QIPs and reasons to be optimistic about social psychology's future.