



THE "PEACE STUDIES AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION"
PROGRAM AT BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

INDOCTRINATION or EDUCATION?

www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

Copyright ©2004
Parents and Students
for Academic Freedom

1015 15th Street NW
Suite 900
Washington, DC 20005
202-969-2467

www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

ISBN 1-886442-41-X
Printed in the United States of America

Students for Academic Freedom is a non-profit organization to ensure that universities are providing an education to college students and not an indoctrination in political agendas. Our goal is promote educational values and intellectual diversity on America's college campuses. We currently have chapters at over 135 schools nationwide, including several campuses in the state of Indiana.

We want to bring to your attention an extremely troubling situation at Ball State University which illustrates the need for an Academic Bill of Rights that will protect educational standards and ensure that all students are respected in the classroom, regardless of their political and religious views.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Letter to Legislators:.....	5
Academic Freedom and the Peace Studies Program s at Ball State	
2. The Academic Bill of Rights.....	8
3. Recruiting Students to the Anti-American,	12
Terrorist Support Network	
4. Indoctrination in the Classroom	16
– statement by student Brett Mock	
5. Exchange of Letters with the Ball State Administration	
a) Sara Dogan to President Gora.....	20
b) Provost Pitts to Sara Dogan.....	23
c) Sara Dogan to Provost Pitts.....	25
d) Brett Mock to Whom It May Concern.....	29
6. “One Man’s Terrorist Is Another Man’s Freedom Fighter”	33
(a review of the textbook used in the Peace Studies program at Ball State) – David Horowitz	
7. Excerpt from <i>Peace and Conflict Studies</i>	40
by Barash and Webel	
8. The Ideological University: An E-mail Exchange Between.....	45
Two Ball State Students Concerning the Peace Studies Program	

1. Letter to Legislators: Academic Freedom and the Peace Studies Program at Ball State

Dear _____.

My name is Sara Dogan and I am the National Director of Students for Academic Freedom, which has 135 chapters on as many university campuses. I am writing to call your attention to a troubling situation at Ball State University in regard to its “Peace Studies and Conflict” program. It is our belief that while funded by Ball State University and the taxpayers of Indiana this is not a proper academic program but an indoctrination effort by political radicals to recruit students to their radical agendas, which include sympathy for the terrorists who attacked the World Trade Center on 9/11 and for political organizations with radical agendas.

It is our view, moreover, that Professor George Wolfe who is in charge of the program is not academically qualified to teach the subject matter of the course, namely the social, economic and political causes of war and peace. Professor Wolfe was hired to the Ball State Faculty as a member of its Music Department where he is a professor of the saxophone. His degree is in education rather than, history, sociology, political science, anthropology, military science, economics or any other field that might be appropriate to the important and in this historical moment grave matters at issue in this course.

It is our view that the textbook used by Professor Wolfe for this course (Barash and Webel, *Peace and Conflict Studies*) is not an appropriate academic text, but a one-sided primer in radical ideology, whose treatment of history is unscholarly and tendentious. The authors of this text have academic degrees in psychology and philosophy which does not qualify them to write a text which covers most of human history, and includes commentaries on economics, anthropology, sociology and a broad range of geopolitical matters.

The problematic nature of the Peace Studies Program at Ball State was brought to our attention by Ball State senior Brett A. Mock, a

political science major who signed up for the course intending to pursue a minor in peace studies. Here is a portion of Brett Mock's report on his experience in Professor Wolfe's class:

My name is Brett Mock. I am a senior Political Science major at Ball State University in Muncie, IN. In the spring of 2004, I took a class taught by Professor George Wolfe. The class, titled "Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution," was the introductory class for a Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution minor that I took as a supplement to my major. I quickly learned that in this course, the phrase 'conflict resolution' as used in the description of the course was not to be taken in a literal sense. The only studying of conflict resolution that we did was to enforce the idea that non-violent means were the only legitimate sources of self-defense. In other words, the class was designed entirely to de-legitimize the use of the military in the defense of our country altogether. This seemed to me to be indoctrination rather than education.

Professor Wolfe would not allow any serious study of the reasons for the use of force in response to an attack.... Every book suggested by Professor Wolfe for class readings supported his extreme viewpoint. When the book reports were completed, each student was made to give an oral presentation. In other words, students like me had to read a book we disagreed with and then report on the book parroting back views we did not agree with or face a hostile professor with the power of grading us and do so in front the entire class, whose views were also shaped by the professor's intolerance of any dissenting view.

Professor Wolfe founded and heads the "Peace Workers group" at Ball State. ... Wolfe brings his extra-curricular involvement into the classroom and makes it part of a student's grade. In order to receive full credit in the class you must choose to be involved in one of the programs he actively promotes. You have to devote a semester to Peace Workers events; you must meditate at the Peace Studies center (which you must also pay for), or you must attend Interfaith Fellowship meetings during the semester. Failure to do so will result in a lowered

grade. This is simply another way in which Professor Wolfe attempts to indoctrinate his students, forcing them to be a part of his projects.

The organization to which Professor Wolfe appears to be recruiting students – PeaceWorkers – is a radical group which is part of a coalition of radical groups that includes the Muslim Students Association, a group that has promoted terrorist speakers, and the Young Communist League. We do not believe that it is appropriate for professors to recruit students to partisan political organizations or to use their authority as faculty at a state university to do so.

Our research has shown that there are at least a dozen Peace Studies programs at other Indiana colleges and universities, including at DePauw University, Notre Dame, Indiana University/Purdue University at Fort Wayne, Goshen College and Manchester College. Moreover, our organization has gathered information that indicates the widespread abuse of academic freedom in other departments and courses. One-sided teaching and political recruitment in classrooms violates the spirit and tenets of academic freedom that have been established over the last hundred years in American universities.

As a step towards remedying these abuses, we call upon the legislature and state education officials to adopt the Academic Bill of Rights, a document that has already become the education policy of the State of Colorado and that has been adopted as model legislation by the Association of Legislative Exchange Commissions (ALEC) a bi-partisan organization of 2400 state legislators. The Academic Bill of Rights has also passed the Georgia Senate by a vote of 41-5 and is currently being introduced in 19 state legislatures.

Sincerely,
Sara Dogan
National Director
Students for Academic Freedom
www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

2. The Academic Bill of Rights

I. The Mission of the University.

The central purposes of a University are the pursuit of truth, the discovery of new knowledge through scholarship and research, the study and reasoned criticism of intellectual and cultural traditions, the teaching and general development of students to help them become creative individuals and productive citizens of a pluralistic democracy, and the transmission of knowledge and learning to a society at large. Free inquiry and free speech within the academic community are indispensable to the achievement of these goals. The freedom to teach and to learn depend upon the creation of appropriate conditions and opportunities on the campus as a whole as well as in the classrooms and lecture halls. These purposes reflect the values -- pluralism, diversity, opportunity, critical intelligence, openness and fairness -- that are the cornerstones of American society.

II. Academic Freedom

1. The Concept. Academic freedom and intellectual diversity are values indispensable to the American university. From its first formulation in the *General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure* of the American Association of University Professors, the concept of academic freedom has been premised on the idea that human knowledge is a never-ending pursuit of the truth, that there is no humanly accessible truth that is not in principle open to challenge, and that no party or intellectual faction has a monopoly on wisdom. Therefore, academic freedom is most likely to thrive in an environment of intellectual diversity that protects and fosters independence of thought and speech. In the words of the *General Report*, it is vital to protect “as the first condition of progress, [a] complete and unlimited freedom to *pursue* inquiry and publish its results.”

Because free inquiry and its fruits are crucial to the democratic enterprise itself, academic freedom is a national value as well. In a historic 1967 decision (*Keyishian v. Board of Regents of the University of the State of*

New York) the Supreme Court of the United States overturned a New York State loyalty provision for teachers with these words: “Our Nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom, [a] transcendent value to all of us and not merely to the teachers concerned.” In *Sweezy v. New Hampshire*, (1957) the Court observed that the “essentiality of freedom in the community of American universities [was] almost self-evident.”

2. The Practice. Academic freedom consists in protecting the intellectual independence of professors, researchers and students in the pursuit of knowledge and the expression of ideas from interference by legislators or authorities within the institution itself. This means that no political, ideological or religious orthodoxy will be imposed on professors and researchers through the hiring or tenure or termination process, or through any other administrative means by the academic institution. Nor shall legislatures impose any such orthodoxy through their control of the university budget.

This protection includes students. From the first statement on academic freedom, it has been recognized that intellectual independence means the protection of students – as well as faculty – from the imposition of any orthodoxy of a political, religious or ideological nature. The 1915 *General Report* admonished faculty to avoid “taking unfair advantage of the student’s immaturity by indoctrinating him with the teacher’s own opinions before the student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters in question, and before he has sufficient knowledge and ripeness of judgment to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his own.” In 1967, the AAUP’s *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students* reinforced and amplified this injunction by affirming the inseparability of “the freedom to teach and freedom to learn.” In the words of the report, “Students should be free to take reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study and to reserve judgment about matters of opinion.”

Therefore, to secure the intellectual independence of faculty and students and to protect the principle of intellectual diversity, the following principles and procedures shall be observed.

These principles fully apply only to public universities and to private universities that present themselves as bound by the canons of academic freedom. Private institutions choosing to restrict academic freedom on the basis of creed have an obligation to be as explicit as is possible about the scope and nature of these restrictions.

1. All faculty shall be hired, fired, promoted and granted tenure on the basis of their competence and appropriate knowledge in the field of their expertise and, in the humanities, the social sciences, and the arts, with a view toward fostering a plurality of methodologies and perspectives. No faculty shall be hired or fired or denied promotion or tenure on the basis of his or her political or religious beliefs.

2. No faculty member will be excluded from tenure, search and hiring committees on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.

3. Students will be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, not on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.

4. Curricula and reading lists in the humanities and social sciences should reflect the uncertainty and unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas by providing students with dissenting sources and viewpoints where appropriate. While teachers are and should be free to pursue their own findings and perspectives in presenting their views, they should consider and make their students aware of other viewpoints. Academic disciplines should welcome a diversity of approaches to unsettled questions.

5. Exposing students to the spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a major responsibility of faculty. Faculty will not use their courses for the purpose of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination.

6. Selection of speakers, allocation of funds for speakers programs and other student activities will observe the principles of academic freedom and promote intellectual pluralism.

7. An environment conducive to the civil exchange of ideas being an essential component of a free university, the obstruction of invited campus speakers, destruction of campus literature or other effort to obstruct this exchange will not be tolerated.

8. Knowledge advances when individual scholars are left free to reach their own conclusions about which methods, facts, and theories have been validated by research. Academic institutions and professional societies formed to advance knowledge within an area of research, maintain the integrity of the research process, and organize the professional lives of related researchers serve as indispensable venues within which scholars circulate research findings and debate their interpretation. To perform these functions adequately, academic institutions and professional societies should maintain a posture of organizational neutrality with respect to the substantive disagreements that divide researchers on questions within, or outside, their fields of inquiry.

Op. cit., p. 50

3. Recruiting Students to the Anti-American, Terrorist Support Network At Ball State

By Thomas Ryan

(FrontpageMagazine.com November 5, 2004)

The Center for Peace and Conflict Studies at Ball State University was founded in 1988. It is the evolution of the previous anti-U.S. military program, the Center for Global Security Studies, which was created by left-wing academics in the early 1980's "as a response to the issues concerning the nuclear arms race." Conducting "teach-ins" against nuclear arms, the Center for Global Security Studies was a component of the larger Nuclear Disarmament movement. Advocates of the Cold War-era nuclear freeze movement served as surrogates for the Soviet Union, seeking to "freeze" the U.S. deployment of nuclear missiles in Europe, to protect the Soviet Union's missile superiority in Eastern Europe. President Reagan rejected the "freeze" movement, one of whose senatorial sponsors was Ted Kennedy in favor of deploying cruise missiles in Western Europe, while disregarding massive anti-American protests against their emplacement. The result was that the Kremlin, unable to compete in the arms race, sued for peace and then disintegrated.

The Peace and Conflict Studies Center describes its evolution from a surrogate for Soviet military diplomacy thus: "As threat of a nuclear war diminished, the Center refocused. Renamed the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies, it reflected twin perspectives – peace studies and conflict resolution." But little changed in its anti-American agendas. Whereas the earlier program sought to undermine U.S. nuclear defense capabilities during the Cold War, the new program seeks to weaken U.S. resolve in the War on Terror.

In an article for FrontPage magazine, "Indoctrination in the Classroom," Brett Mock, a student in the program, wrote, "[My] class, essentially, was designed to discredit any reasons that a military response would be appropriate after 9/11." Mock's professor, George Wolfe, who is also the

head the Peace Studies program, has made ample remarks to support Mock's claim. At a 2002 September 11th Memorial Concert, Wolfe said to the audience in attendance, "The Sept. 11th tragedy a year ago today has stirred within everyone conflicting emotions as we deal with this event and understand what was and still remains unexplainable... Now, a year later, we take time to reflect, reflect on what we as Americans may have done or not done, to invoke such extreme hatred as to have motivated human beings to commit such a horrendous act." Blaming the U.S. for the attacks against it, is a reoccurring theme of anti-war activists. At an anti-war demonstration prior to the start of the war in Iraq in 2003, Wolfe – whose academic expertise is that he is a professor of the saxophone, stated, "The war has already started, and we are losing. We are being defeated without shooting a gun... (U.S.) foreign policy is a fiasco. It's leading us down the wrong path."

Other Ball State Peace Studies professors have been equally pointed in their condemnation America as responsible for the attacks of September 11th, 2001. Citing U.S. involvement in the Middle East as a probable reason for 9/11, Director Emeritus and Associate Professor of History, Phyllis Zimmerman, said, "Mediation assumes you are neutral, and I think many, not just Muslims, but a lot of people, perceive America is not neutral in the Middle East peace process at all...there is a great deal of resentment against stirring the pot up for our own gain, for our own interest." Zimmerman furthermore describes the War on Terror as a "tool" used by the Bush administration to obtain national conformity after the 2000 election dispute. Zimmerman states, "[The word] war was used immediately, right after it happened (9/11). We are at war. That unifies people. Don't forget the divisiveness in this country as a result of the last election. War makes presidents. The result is, you could argue in part the reason we are using war rhetoric, we are using it as a manipulative tool to get people behind you...People are scared about wars, but then there is 'we have to be unified.' That means you can't question. You can't do that in a war. Those people are unpatriotic. That rhetoric makes it very difficult to get dialogue going in war. That's why they use that."

Demonstrations, protests, and "social activism" are a large part of the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies' curriculum. In Wolfe's

“Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution” class, participation in such anti-war demonstrations counts as one of three options by which students are graded. Mock states that students were recruited from his class to attend anti-war rallies, and that students “received extra academic credit as an incentive to go.” These academically-credited protests were specifically organized by Wolfe’s activist group, PeaceWorkers, whose agendas are leftwing and anti-American military.

PeaceWorkers was formed as the Iraq war got under way to promote “peaceful and just interactions between individuals, organizations, and nations.” The first event that the PeaceWorkers activists took part in was staged on March 4 2003, on the eve of the war. “Student Strike for Books Not Bombs,” called on students across the country to strike in protest of the War in Iraq. “Books Not Bombs” includes such member organizations and endorsers as: Medea Benjamin’s anti-Israel and pro-Castro organization Global Exchange; Historians Against the War, an anti-American coterie of leftwing history professors which has organized anti-war teach-ins at over forty colleges and universities across the country; the radical Student Peace Action network, whose anti-Semitic Palestinian Solidarity March in 2002 was attended by activists adorned with swastikas; and the Young Communist League. Another member of Books not Bombs is the Muslim Students’ Association of the United States and Canada (MSA). The MSA is a Saudi-originated, pro-Hamas organization which is steering committee member of the Marxist-Leninist-front group International A.N.S.W.E.R. The MSA which makes no secret of its sympathies for terrorists has also sought out financial aid for the Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development, a charity organization that funded the Palestinian terrorist group Hamas. On September 9, 2003, two days before the anniversary of 9/11, Wolfe served on an MSA Ball State panel in a discussion entitled “Islam in their Eyes.”

One indoctrination method employed Wolfe is requiring students to use textbooks that follow the leftwing party line and insist on students’ agreeing with the doctrine. “I was forced to read a book that I strongly disagreed with,” comments student Brett Mock, “write about that book, and then present the book to the class as though I agreed with it, which I

did not.” Wolfe is not alone among “Peace Studies” professors in forcing students to read radical books as their principal course texts. In the “Environment and Society,” class students are required to read the eco-propaganda book *Ishmael, An Adventure of the Mind and Spirit*, by Daniel Quinn. The book has been championed by the left as a classic of radical environmentalism. It recounts the dialogue between a telepathic Gorilla and his human student. The thrust of the story is that humans are to blame for the world’s ills -- and not humans in general, but specifically Christians and Jews. Other books on the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies reading lists include: *The Coming United Religions*, by William E. Swing, which advances the United Religions Initiative, a religious equivalent of the United Nations, which seeks the dissolution of disparate religions in favor of a religious governing body that promotes the worshiping of an “all-inclusive” god. Also prominent is Noam Chomsky’s *Hegemony or Survival: America’s Quest for Global Dominance*, an anti-American screed, which describes the United States as the greatest terrorist state and a threat to human survival.

The ideological agendas of Center for Peace and Conflict Studies and its favored organizations like PeaceWorkers are hardly concealed. The website for PeaceWorkers, which is hosted by the Center’s own website, contains links to radical organizations and connects the student to a coalition which includes the pro-terrorist Muslim Students Association and the Young Communist League. Links also include Moveon.org, which spear-headed the efforts of Kerry-supporters George Soros and former organizing director Zack Exley, to unseat George Bush in the 2004 elections. In other words, in addition to conducting an indoctrination program under university auspices, the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies also promotes organizations supporting political candidates.

The Peace Studies program at Ball State is not an academic course but an indoctrination and recruitment program operating at taxpayers expense and under the false cover of an educational program. Worse, it is indoctrinating students and recruiting them to agendas that are anti-American, anti-military and friendly to the terrorist enemy intent on destroying us.

4. Indoctrination in the Classroom

By Brett Mock

(FrontPageMagazine.com September 13, 2004)

My name is Brett Mock. I am a senior Political Science major at Ball State University in Muncie, IN. In the spring of 2004 I took a class taught by Professor George Wolfe. The class, titled "Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution," was the introductory class for a Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution minor that I took as a supplement to my major.

I quickly learned that the phrase "conflict resolution" as used in the description of the course was not to be taken in a literal sense. The only studying of conflict resolution that we did was to enforce the idea that non-violent means were the only legitimate sources of self-defense. In other words, the class was designed entirely to delegitimize the use of the military in the defense of our country altogether. This seemed to me to be indoctrination rather than education.

Professor Wolfe had no tolerance for those who disagreed with his points of view and philosophies. For example, Professor Wolfe explained that violent responses to violent aggression are never acceptable. A student spoke up to confront him, asking, "What if a group of armed gang members were to come to Ball State. What if they started shooting up the school, killing students who were peacefully walking by and traveling around campus?" If I or another student had a gun available and could defend myself and others, should I?" Professor Wolfe's response was shocking to even the most peaceful in the group. "No" he replied. The student asked, "why not," and asked for him to explain. He said, "Well, the gang would eventually run out of bullets, and you can always hide."

"What if no shelter was available to hide or it was clear that some students couldn't make it to shelter."

"Well regardless of how many students would be lost in the shooting there is no good reason to fire back."

Professor Wolfe's attitude was so adamant that it put the students in the room who did not agree with him in an awkward position. For the rest of the semester we worried as to whether our views would hurt our grades. It was clear that Professor Wolfe would have no tolerance whatsoever for any disagreement and that he would never support the use of force as an instrument of peace. This alienated every student in the room who disagreed and made us feel silenced altogether. How could I speak up with my own opinions, I thought, if I knew in advance they would invariably be shot down by the professor himself?

Professor Wolfe would not allow any serious study of the reasons for the use of force in response to an attack. A book report was assigned to the class, and different books were suggested for reading. Every book suggested by Wolfe supported his extreme viewpoint. When the book reports were completed, each student was made to give an oral presentation. In other words, students like me had to read a book we disagreed with and then report on the book parroting back views we did not agree with or face a hostile professor with the power of grading us and do so in front the entire class, whose views were also shaped by the professor's intolerance of any dissenting view.

When I actually asked Professor Wolfe if the book we read had to be about peaceful responses to conflict or against violent ones, he told me that we could not read, write, or present about a book that disagreed with those positions. As such, I was forced to read a book that I strongly disagreed with, write about that book, and then present the book to the class as though I agreed with it, which I did not. I was ever conscious of the fact that I had to deliver a report that Professor Wolfe would like or suffer a lower grade.

This fear was reinforced by the way Professor Wolfe questioned all the arguments I made in papers I wrote for the class. He would lower my grade citing in justification his view that I clearly "didn't understand how peaceful resistance worked." In other words, if I wrote, however cogently, that I thought peaceful forms of resistance might not always work, he would lower my grade.

Naturally, Professor Wolfe actively promoted his own political stances in class concerning the current policies in the United States. The class, essentially, was designed to discredit any reasons that a military response would be appropriate after 9/11. Every article that was assigned in class gave reasons why U.S. foreign policies were wrong and were root causes of what happened on 9/11. According to these texts we should be helping help other countries instead of oppressing them, and that our money and focus was being wasted on an unjustified war against terror in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Articles highlighted only how many people were dying in the war and that civilians may have died. Not a single article was presented defending the decision to fight in Afghanistan or in Iraq. In fact, it appeared as though Professor Wolfe would attempt to quell any such arguments before students could formulate them. He tried to draw an analogy between the Iraq war and Vietnam. He required students to examine both wars and to note their similarities. All of this had to be done to complete the course and to receive a grade. No alternatives were provided. A student could only assume that choosing to not be involved with the materials, or to fight against the points of view brought up in class, would adversely affect his or her grade and relationship with the professor.

Professor Wolfe founded and heads the Peace Workers group at Ball State. He is also the head of the Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Center for the university. He is the on-campus instructor for meditation – to encourage peaceful attitudes. Finally, he runs the Interfaith Fellowship meetings. Wolfe brings his extra-curricular involvement into the classroom and make it part of a students grade. In order to receive full credit in the class you must choose to be involved in one of the programs he actively promotes. You have to devote a semester to Peace Workers events; you must meditate at the Peace Studies center (which you must also pay for), or you must attend Interfaith Fellowship meetings during the semester. Failure to do so will result in a lowered grade. This is simply another way in which Professor Wolfe attempts to indoctrinate his students, forcing them to be a part of his projects.

Professor Wolfe took a group recruited from our class to travel to Washington, D.C., to protest the war in Iraq. The Peace Studies center – a university program – provided the funds. No funding was offered to those students who would have liked to go to Washington to support the war to end terror and bring about peace. The students who went to Washington to protest the war, on the other hand, received extra academic credit as an incentive to go. In other words, students who allowed themselves to be recruited for anti-war protests thereby were in line for better grades than those who did not.

In circumstances like these, it is difficult to find students who are willing to stand up for themselves and their education and for academic freedom. Professor Wolfe has used his classroom as a political indoctrination center for years with no one willing to speak up and call him on it. The only way that students can hope to find themselves in classrooms that are fair and respectful of their views is to change this situation. They should get involved in the campaign for academic freedom and take their grievances to their school administrations. That's what I'm going to do.

5. Exchange of Letters with the Ball State Administration

a) Letter to the President of Ball State University:

By Sara Dogan,

National Director, Students for Academic Freedom

September 13, 2004

President Jo Ann M. Gora
Office of the President
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306

Dear President Gora,

I am the national campus director of Students for Academic Freedom, a student organization dedicated to promoting academic freedom, intellectual diversity, and civility on American university campuses. We currently have chapters at 135 institutions of higher learning nationwide, including at Ball State University.

I write out of concern about the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies at Ball State University, and its director, Professor George Wolfe.

BSU student Brett Mock recently contacted our organization with an account of his experience in Professor Wolfe's "Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution" class last spring. He describes an intellectual atmosphere that was entirely closed to all political or philosophical viewpoints that differed from Professor Wolfe's personal belief in extreme pacifism. Students who attempted to argue that violence is sometimes the only means to achieving peaceful resolution were intimidated from presenting their views to the class.

Among the specific violations of academic freedom alleged in this class:

-Professor Wolfe asserted to the class that violent responses to violent aggression are never acceptable, even in extreme circumstances, thus alienating and silencing those members of the class who believe that force can be an instrument of peace.

-When a book report and presentation were assigned to the class, Professor Wolfe refused a student request to review a book presenting a theory of non-peaceful resolution to conflict.

-Professor Wolfe created the impression that he would lower students' grades on papers when he disagreed with their views, claiming that they "didn't understand how peaceful resistance works."

-Many articles were distributed in class criticizing U.S. military action in Afghanistan and Iraq and highlighting casualties, but not a single article was presented defending the decision to go to war.

-In order to receive full credit in his course, Professor Wolfe requires students to be involved in one of the ideological programs he promotes: devoting a semester to Peace Workers, mediating at the Peace Studies Center, or attending Interfaith Fellowship meetings. Failure to comply would result in a lowered grade.

-Professor Wolfe offered extra credit to students who attended a university-sponsored trip to Washington, DC for the purpose of protesting the war in Iraq. No funding or extra credit was granted to students who would have preferred to show their support for the war on terror.

In short, Professor Wolfe's conduct in the classroom smacks of indoctrination, not education, and constitutes a blatant violation of his students' academic freedoms. It is deeply troubling that at a prominent university like Ball State, a professor would find it acceptable to coerce students into accepting his own personal political creed with no regard for the importance of encouraging

open debate and discussion on complicated issues.

We believe that an apology is in order from Professor Wolfe to the students in the Peace Studies program and request that your office launch an immediate inquiry to ascertain whether the Peace Studies program is appropriately fulfilling its educational mission.

We would further like to see a policy statement from the Ball State administration reminding faculty and students alike that intellectual diversity is a primary educational value and the university is not to be used as a partisan political platform. To restore and/or strengthen the educational standard at the University, we would encourage you to incorporate the following statement in your existing diversity program:

Statement on Diversity:

This office was established with the premise that expanding diversity within the university enhances the educational experience and furthers the understanding of the entire scholarly community. An atmosphere of civility and mutual respect towards difference is indispensable to the educational process and enables the free interchange of ideas that is the basis of scholarship. These differences may be immutable or changeable, cultural, ethnic, religious, intellectual, ideological or political. Each of these qualities is integral to the identity we form as individuals, and all are essential to creating a vibrant university community composed of individuals with unique perspectives and backgrounds. The university must commit itself to a policy of inclusion, respect for difference, and fairness, and guarantee the same rights and freedoms to all its members to ensure the fullest degree of intellectual freedom.

I look forward to hearing from you in respect to these matters.

Sincerely,
Sara Dogan
National Campus Director
Students for Academic Freedom

Cc: U.S. Senator Evan Bayh, U.S. Senator Richard Lugar, State Senate Education Committee Chair Luke Kenley, State House Education Committee Chair Gregory Porter, Governor Kernan's Education Advisor Floyd Worley, BSU Trustee Tom DeWeese, BSU Trustee Frank Bracken, BSU Trustee Greg Schenkel, BSU Trustee Hollis Hughes, BSU Trustee Ceola Digby-Berry, BSU Trustee Greg Fehribach, BSU Trustee Kim Hood Jacobs, BSU Trustee Richard Moake, BSU Trustee Kyle Mitchell, BSU Student Brett Mock

b) Reply from Ball State Provost Beverley Pitts

September 23, 2004
Ms. Sara Dogan
Students for Academic Freedom
Washington, D.C. 20005

Dear Ms. Dogan:

We appreciate your concerns about allegations made by Ball State student Brett Mock regarding his experiences in an Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution course taught by Professor George Wolfe last spring. Upon becoming aware of Mr. Mock's concerns, we did look into the matter as we do with any concern of this nature. Specifically, I have reviewed the syllabus for the course, spoken with Dr. Wolfe and his supervisor for this course, Dean Thomas Lowe, and have reviewed statements forwarded to me by other students in the class who wished to dispute the claims made by Mr. Mock in an article posted on Frontpagemag.com.

As a matter of background, the course in question is an interdisciplinary elective course open to any student. The course is described in the Undergraduate Catalog as focusing on "the study of methods of achieving peace within communities and among nations; history of peace movement and the causes of conflict; and analysis of principles to resolve conflict using case studies." Further, the emphasis on study of peace initiatives and mediation is clearly stated in the course goals on the syllabus. Dr. Wolfe has a doctorate in higher education from Indiana University; has

received mediator training; is on the advisory board of the Toda Institute for Peace, Policy, and Global Research at the University of Hawaii; and has taught and published in the area of peace studies.

As is the case in any university course, we encourage open dialog and respect students' opinions. Grading is based on performance, not upon student or faculty opinion on specific issues or general ideology. I can assure you that we uphold this standard in all of our courses, and we have in place an appeal procedure for any student who believes his or her grade was unfairly determined. You can review this policy at <http://www.bsu.edu/sa/article/0,1375,13330-2935-12310,00.html>

Dr. Wolfe's class emphasizes critical thinking with respect to peace issues. The primary text for the class is Barash and Webel, *Peace and Conflict Studies* (Sage Publications, 2002), which presented various sides of peace- and war-related issues. In addition, questions on the midterm and final examinations, course discussion questions, and descriptions of class discussions by other students clearly indicate that consideration of a wide range of viewpoints was accepted and encouraged.

The course does require a field assignment outside of class, but there are a variety of ways to fulfill this requirement, not simply the three identified by Mr. Mock. For example, some students choose to volunteer time to a cause related to social responsibility, such as a local food pantry, while others elect to attend a lecture of event dealing with political activism. As part of fulfilling his field assignment, Mr. Mock received credit for attending a meeting in Indianapolis at which Vice President Dick Cheney spoke.

Mr. Mock's assertion that students received extra credit for a university-sponsored trip to Washington, D.C., for the purpose of protesting the war in Iraq is incorrect. Rather, three students in the course last spring chose to attend a lobbying workshop in Washington to learn the protocol for lobbying Congress. This opportunity, which was made available to all students, developed skill pertaining to lobbying that apply to all issues, independent of position. This experience fulfilled the field assignment, and travel support was provided to encourage attendance.

I hope that this response provides you with some facts that will be helpful to you in evaluating Mr. Mock's statements. We are confident that we clearly communicate to faculty our expectations and standards about academic freedom and respect for a diversity of opinions in the classroom.

Sincerely,
Beverley Pitts
Provost and Vice President
For Academic Affairs

c) Reply to Provost Pitts

October 5, 2004

Dr. Beverly Pitts
Provost and Vice President
for Academic Affairs
Ball State University

Dear Dr. Pitts,

Thank you for your response to my previous letter concerning the Peace Studies Center at Ball State University and our concerns regarding BSU student Brett Mock's experiences in Professor George Wolfe's Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution class.

I am pleased to hear that Ball State University thought it important to look into the questions raised by the *Frontpage Magazine* article and my letter to you on this subject. I am concerned, however, by the fact that this investigation was apparently conducted without the knowledge or the input of Brett Mock, the student whose concerns sparked the need for an inquiry in the first place. You note that you took the time to interview Dr. Wolfe, Dean Lowe, and other students from the course who disputed Mr. Mock's claims. Surely you could have made time to speak with Mr. Mock directly, to alert him that Ball State was investigating his concerns and to allow him the opportunity to present any additional evidence pertaining to

his allegations, before dismissing the matter entirely.

Our concern as an organization is the protection of students' academic freedom. The fact that the Ball State Administration would draw conclusions in this case without even consulting the student who is making the complaint is very troubling.

I have spoken with Mr. Mock and he has possession of many additional pieces of evidence to support his claims, including a class syllabus and copies of several papers he wrote for the class containing comments by Professor Wolfe which illustrate Professor Wolfe's failure to consider the idea that force can ever be a means to resolving conflicts or keeping the peace. This is an extreme view to begin with and the fact that Professor Wolfe seems unable to tolerate a contrary view seems inappropriate to a scholarly institution. I urge you to reopen your investigation into this matter, and to take the time to interview Brett Mock and examine the relevant documents pertaining to this course.

Although you claim that Professor Wolfe's class emphasized critical thinking and was not politically one-sided, the links included on the course website suggest otherwise. In particular, PeaceWorkers website, which is listed very prominently on the Center's main page, contains links to radical anti-war organizations like MoveOn.org, the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition, and the Friends Committee on National Legislation, while no links to organizations supporting the American government's efforts to broker peace in the Middle East or the American military's efforts combat terror can be found. The description of the Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Minor that is posted on the site also differs significantly with the description in the student course guide, which states that the minor "examines proposals and attempts to introduce more equitable, harmonious and nonviolent methods and identifies individual action to transform unjust, violent or oppressive situations." This is the description of an ideological course committed to pacifism, again not an academic or scholarly examination of the questions of war and peace.

Regarding the University-sponsored trip to Washington, the PeaceWorkers

website, refers to this as an "annual" event that they attend. According to Mr. Mock, the students who attended are all members of PeaceWorkers a leftwing activist group who not only received the required field credit, but actually received extra course credit for attending this event. Given the radically anti-war nature of the Peace Studies website, it is reasonable to assume the other students would be extremely uncomfortable attending an official function with the group if they did not share their views, and might not realize it to be an option.

I find incomprehensible your claim that Dr. Wolfe who was hired by Ball State as a saxophone teacher is sufficiently qualified to teach Peace Studies and serve as the director of the Peace Studies Center, which purport to examine issues of war and peace, race conflict, and "oppression." You mention, his doctorate in higher education and his experience as a mediator. Clearly the former has no bearing on the causes of war, while the latter is not an academic credential or degree for teaching any subject, including mediation. If universities hired people because merely they had "experience" in certain areas without formal academic credentials, their own credentialing would be jeopardized. Professor Wolfe's biography on his official BSU homepage makes no mention of any degrees related to Peace Studies, and identifies him as a saxophonist and an associate professor of music. Placing him in charge of a course that purports to deal with the history and nature of war and its social sources is an abuse of the students who pay tuition to attend Ball State and misuse of the funds provided by Indiana taxpayers.

Finally, as would have been clear if you had spoken with Mr. Mock directly, the issue at stake is not a grading dispute. Mr. Mock openly acknowledges that he received a B+ in the class, and believes that grade to be fair. His concern in regards to grades is that he was forced to parrot the opinions of his professor which were not his own in order to get a good grade. Other relevant issues in this case are 1.) The failure of Professor Wolfe's class to examine non-peaceful resolutions to conflict, 2.) Professor Wolfe's questionable qualifications to teach this course, and 3.) Course requirements which mandated students to accept controversial political positions as fact.

Unfortunately this practice seems to be widespread at Ball State. Today FrontPage has published an exchange between Brett Mock and another student at Ball State, who is also columnist for the school paper, David Swindle. In the exchange Mr. Swindle says of Mock's enrollment in the Peace Studies Program: "In going into those kinds of courses wouldn't you expect the ideology to be somewhat leftist? Isn't that like a communist student taking a course in capitalism? Of course capitalism is going to be promoted as the only option. The course wouldn't be about other economic systems." Mr. Swindle goes on to ask: "Isn't all education indoctrination?"

This is a very sad commentary on the educational atmosphere at your school. Students like David Swindle apparently have no idea that the American educational system is different from that in totalitarian states where education is indeed indoctrination.

These are very serious matters. We urge you to reopen the investigation into Professor Wolfe's class and the Peace Studies Center at Ball State. We request that you appoint an Academic Committee to examine the curriculum of the Peace Studies Program in order to assess its appropriateness as an academic course of study given its present one-sided nature and to make necessary recommendations for bringing up to academic standards. We would hope that such a committee would be composed at least half by professors in the hard sciences and professional schools and not in liberal arts programs which are subject to ideological bias. We would like Ball State to adopt the Academic Bill of Rights, which I have attached, and to immediately issue a policy statement asserting that intellectual diversity is a primary educational value and the university is not to be used as a partisan political platform.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Sara Dogan
National Campus Director
Students for Academic Freedom

d) Letter to Whom It May Concern by Brett Mock

November 9, 2004

To Whom It May Concern:

Ball State University's Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs sent a letter of response to Sara Dogan, national campus director of Students for Academic Freedom concerning my complaints about my "Peace Studies" course. In her letter, Provost Pitts responded to claims I made in a FrontPage magazine article concerning the "Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution" class, taught by Ball State Music Professor George Wolfe. Her letter contains a number of misrepresentations that I feel display a lack of interest in the substance of my complaints and in addressing the concerns raised by Professor Wolfe's behavior in the classroom.

When Provost Pitts claims that the course is simply an interdisciplinary elective, she misrepresents the significance of Professor Wolfe's course to the student for whom Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution is a Minor, as was the case with me (my Major is Political Science). When Professor Wolfe's course is taken as part of a Minor it is required. Any student who takes the course for the completion of the Minor receives three credit hours and must do extra course work. I received three credit hours for the completion of the course, which Provost Pitts should have a record of, and did so because the course was required for the minor.

When discussing the course description as "the study of methods of achieving peace within communities and among nations; history of peace movement and the causes of conflict; and analysis of principles to resolve conflict using case studies," Provost Pitts suggests that any student would know what to expect in the classroom. However, she does not address the question of why this course did not examine the role of a strong military in preserving the peace. The discussion of how to "achieve peace among nations" and of the "principles to resolve conflict" is clearly incomplete without discussing the military methods of doing so. When Provost Pitts argues that there was an "emphasis on study of peace initiatives and

mediation” she clearly overstates the case. The course description does not emphasize these categories although the course itself certainly did.

In defense of Dr. Wolfe’s credentials and ability to teach the course, Provost Pitts mentions that he “has a doctorate in higher education from Indiana University; has received mediator training; is on the advisory board of the Toda Institute for Peace, Policy, and Global Research at the University of Hawaii; and has taught and published in the area of peace studies. None of these credentials has significant bearing on his academic credentials for assuming the chair of the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies.

Provost Pitts claims that Dr. Wolfe’s class “emphasizes critical thinking with respect to peace issues.” This was not my experience in the class. Nor did Provost Pitts interview me during her investigation of these matters. Provost Pitts states that, “questions on the midterm and final examinations, course discussion questions, and descriptions of class discussions by other students clearly indicate that consideration of a wide range of viewpoints was accepted and encouraged.” Unfortunately, the way Professor Wolfe graded my “opinion” papers suggests otherwise. During one class session that we were required to attend, a video showing was sponsored by the Peace Workers group. The video, titled “Uncovered: The Whole Truth about the War in Iraq,” portrayed the U.S. government and Bush administration as lying about the reasons for the war in Iraq and the response to 9/11. It had no value in educating student about conflict resolution nor the study of peace.

Many students who sign up for this course agree with its political agendas and thus do not encounter the problems in grading that I did as someone who disagrees with Professor Wolfe’s political biases. Provost Pitts’ conclusion would be more convincing had she taken the time to contact me when conducting her inquiries.

Provost Pitts writes that, “the course does require a field assignment outside of class, but there are a variety of ways to fulfill this requirement, not simply the three identified by Mr. Mock.” The syllabus Mrs. Pitts

claims to have reviewed directly states that there are three options -- and only three options -- for completing this “field assignment.” Those options are the ones that I have indicated in my complaint. Provost Pitts has simply misrepresented the course requirement.

Provost Pitts states that, “Mr. Mock received credit for attending a meeting in Indianapolis at which Vice President Dick Cheney spoke.” Pitts is correct, I did receive credit for this event. But the credit I received had nothing to do with peace or conflict studies. Cheney was in Indianapolis to endorse gubernatorial candidate Mitch Daniels, for whom I worked during the summer of ‘04. I did not receive any extra-credit for this event, nor any university funding for my travel, as my colleagues did who went to Washington to lobby against the Iraq war.

In regard to this trip, Provost Pitts claims that the “three students in the course last spring chose to attend a lobbying workshop in Washington to learn the protocol for lobbying Congress.” In fact, this lobbying workshop was a gathering of extreme pacifists, which included a religious ceremony with a religiously motivated extreme pacifist group. Before leaving on this trip, the students declared that it was their intention to go to Washington to protest the war in Iraq, a declaration that was encouraged by Professor Wolfe. All of the students were also a part of the Peace Workers group, which is leftwing anti-war group, for whom Professor Wolfe acts as faculty advisor.

Pitts states that “this opportunity... was made available to all students... independent of position.” Hypothetically, of course, anyone could have gone for any reason. But the in-class environment made that impossible. The opportunity to go to Washington was presented as an opportunity to lobby against the war, not as an opportunity to learn about the lobbying process whatever your point of view might be. There would could be no reasonable expectation for any student in the classroom to see this as an opportunity to attend this “lobbying workshop” as anything other than a chance to “lobby” for an anti-war position. That is why only Peace Workers members were interested in attending the event who all made clear that their intent was to protest the war in Iraq. Ignoring these facts,

Pitts says that, “this experience fulfilled the field assignment, and travel support was provided to encourage attendance.” The facts are that these students were sent to Washington D.C. with the intended purpose of “lobbying” against the war in Iraq. Attendance was never encouraged for any other reason, nor was the informational handout that was given to students neutral. One of the marquee events was to attend an extreme pacifist church ceremony in Washington. A majority of the attendees were members of this religious group.

It is apparent from her letter that Provost Pitts has not involved herself in this dispute as a mediator or disinterested observer. She has displayed no interest in contacting or speaking with me about my concerns with the Peace and Conflict Studies minor, introductory course, or center. She has misrepresented the program, the class taught by its chairman and my particular experiences in the classroom. How can Provost Pitts or the administration at Ball State University hope to address issues of in-class indoctrination unless they interview everyone involved?

Sincerely,
Brett Mock

6. “One Man’s Terrorist Is Another Man’s Freedom Fighter”

By David Horowitz
(FrontPagemagazine.com November 5, 2004)

On September 13, 2004 -- as it happens just two days after the third anniversary of 9/11 -- *FrontPage* magazine published student Brett Mock’s account of a class he took in “Peace Studies” at Ball State University in Indiana. The class was billed as a course in the causes of war and peace (“the study of methods of achieving peace within communities and among nations; history of peace movement and the causes of conflict; and analysis of principles to resolve conflict using case studies”).

Enrolling in the course, Mock discovered, to his dismay, that far from being an academic examination of these issues, the class was a recruitment and training course in leftwing politics and anti-American attitudes. Its lectures and texts without exception guided him and his classmates to views of America as an enemy of global peace, and to a sympathetic understanding of the terrorists who have attacked us. Among the “methods of achieving peace” recommended by the course was a menu of radical organizations that students were encouraged to join, including PeaceWorkers, which is part of a coalition that includes the pro-terrorist Muslim Students Association and the Young Communist League. Students who joined the lobby to oppose America’s war to topple the Iraq dictatorship were given academic credit; those who supported their country were not.

To add insult to these injuries, moreover, the head of the Peace Studies program at Ball State and Brett Mock’s teacher, Professor George Wolfe was academically incompetent to teach the subject, with its broad-ranging forays into all of human history, geopolitics and global economics. George Wolfe is a professor in the Music Department at Ball State whose expertise is the saxophone.

Mock’s *FrontPage* article was followed by a letter from the National

Director of Students for Academic Freedom to the president of Ball State, expressing concern about the nature of the course and its failure to observe basic educational standards. Ten days later the Ball State administration replied through its Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Beverley Pitts. In her letter, Pitts announced that she had investigated Brett Mock's claims (without interviewing Mock himself) and concluded that they were mistaken -- that the course met academic standards and was not one-sided. Addressing the issue of how a professor of the saxophone was academically qualified to discuss the social, economic and cultural causes of war and peace, the Provost wrote: "Dr. Wolfe has a doctorate in higher education from Indiana University; has received mediator training; is on the advisory board of the Toda Institute for Peace, Policy, and Global Research at the University of Hawaii; and has taught and published in the area of peace studies."

A doctorate in higher education, however, covers none of the subjects that would form the basis of a course in the causes of war and peace, while a training session in mediation would only do marginally better. The Toda Institute, on whose board Professor Wolfe serves as an advisor, is run by the Soka Gokkai, a zen Buddhist cult, which believes that world peace can be achieved by persuading the world's inhabitants to chant "Nam Myoho Renge Kyo."

As to Mock's complaint that the course involved indoctrination rather than a disinterested examination of the subject matter, Provost Pitts asserted: "Dr. Wolfe's class emphasizes critical thinking with respect to peace issues. The primary text for the class is Barash and Webel, *Peace and Conflict Studies* (Sage Publications, 2002), which presented various sides of peace- and war-related issues."

This view of *Peace and Conflict Studies* would come as a surprise to the authors of this widely used text in the field of peace studies. In the preface to their book, Barash and Webel write: "The field [of Peace Studies] differs from most other human sciences in that it is value-oriented, and unabashedly so. Accordingly we wish to be up front about our own values, which are frankly anti-war, anti-violence, anti-nuclear, anti-authoritarian,

anti-establishment, pro-environment, pro-human rights, pro-social justice, pro-peace and politically progressive." (p. x)

In other words, *Peace and Conflict Studies* makes no pretension to being an academic exploration of the complex issues of war in peace. It does not explore the many possible views of world problems that might lead to conflict, or the various assessments that might be made of the history of peace movements. It is, in fact, a leftwing screed whose clear purpose is to indoctrinate students in the radical view of the world shared by "progressives" like Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn and Michael Moore. On the other hand, no indication is provided to the uninformed student that these might be extreme views, or that there might be other reasonable ways to look at these issues and events.

Peace and Conflict Studies discusses the problems of poverty and hunger as causes of human conflict, but it approaches these issues exclusively through the eyes of Marxists (and obscure ones at that) such as Andre Gunder Frank and Frances Moore Lappe. The only academic credentials the authors themselves possess are in the fields of psychology and philosophy. Nonetheless, their text is bold -- not to say reckless -- in its pronouncements on these complex issues.

On the problem of global hunger, for example, the text's theme is socialist: "To a very large extent, the problem of world hunger is not so much a production problem, so much as it is a *distribution* problem." (p. 498) This would be news to North Koreans, where recent famine caused by their government's socialist policies has killed more than a million people. It would be equally surprising to citizens of the former Soviet Union, whose Marxist leaders attempted to make equitable distribution the center of their economic policy and wound up turning a country that had been the breadbasket of Europe into a nation of chronic food shortages until the collapse of the system.

The *Peace and Conflict Studies* text relentlessly condemns the economic inequalities that characterize market systems, even though these systems are responsible for prodigious agricultural surpluses and for raising

billions of people out of poverty, facts the authors systematically ignore. The authors identify the culprits responsible for world poverty (and thus for the conflicts this suffering causes) in terms that would have pleased Lenin: “The greed of agribusiness shippers and brokers, plus control of land by a small elite leaves hundreds of millions of people hungry every day.”(p. 499) No wonder terrorists hate rich countries like the United States.

Since the authors believe that the greed of the ruling class is responsible for world hunger, *Peace and Conflict Studies* does actually endorse one kind of violence, and one kind alone. Not surprisingly this is the revolutionary kind. Here is Barash and Webel’s example of revolutionary violence that has led to good results:

Consider the case of Cuba. In the aftermath of the Cuban Revolution of 1959, despite more than 40 years of an American embargo of Cuban imports and exports, infant mortality in Cuba has declined to the lowest in Latin America; life expectancy increased from 55 years in 1959 to 73 years in 1984; health care was nationalized and made available to all Cuban citizens at no or little cost; literacy exceeded 95%; and although prostitution, begging, and homelessness returned to Cuba in the 1990s (almost entirely for economic reasons due to the embargo and to the loss of support from the former Soviet Union), Cuba still has far fewer of these problems than virtually all other countries in Latin America. *While Cuba is far from an earthly paradise, and certain individual rights and civil liberties are not yet widely practiced, the case of Cuba indicates that violent revolutions can sometimes result in generally improved living conditions for many people.*” (pp. 14-15, emphasis added)

This is the entire portrait provided by the authors of Cuba’s Communist dictatorship. No mention is made that Cuba is in fact a totalitarian dictatorship in which every citizen is a prisoner in his own country, spied on by the ruler’s secret police. No indication is given that Castro is the longest surviving dictator in the world with a legendary record of sadism against his own supporters. Cuba’s wretched medical system is not evaluated; nor is the fact that while literacy is impressive Cubans can now read only materials approved by government censors. In 1959 when Castro seized

power, Cuba was the second richest nation per capita in Latin America. After nearly fifty years of socialism it ranks near the bottom of Latin America’s 22 nations, above Haiti, but below Honduras and Belize. When the authors feel compelled to mention a deficiency in Cuba’s achievement -- whether political or economic -- it is invariably blamed on the United States and its embargo, even though Cuba trades with every other nation in the world and its economic woes are attributable to the crackpot economic policies of its dictator. This one-sided promotion of a Communist dictatorship is typical of the text and an accurate sampling of the authors’ ideological point of view.

Throughout *Peace and Conflict Studies*, the authors’ justify Communist policies and actions and put those of America and western democracies in a negative light. This one-sided tilting to America’s totalitarian enemies is evident in its treatment of the Cuban Missile Crisis, for example. In 1962, the Soviet dictator Nikita Khrushchev precipitated an international crisis and brought the world to the brink of nuclear war by secretly placing nuclear missiles in Cuba and lying to President Kennedy when confronted over them. In the *Peace and Conflict Studies* textbook, however (which Ball State Provost Beverley Pitts assures us presents “various sides of peace- and war-related issues”), the Cuban Missile Crisis is discussed without the authors ever mentioning the cause of the crisis -- the Soviet missiles. Instead, the crisis is described as having been caused by the American president’s alleged psychological insecurity and his consequent desire to act tough. This created a dilemma from which the world was rescued by the Soviet dictator. Here is the entire account of the Missile Crisis in this college text:

The Cuban Missile Crisis – the closest humanity has apparently come to general nuclear war – was brought about in part because John F. Kennedy had felt browbeaten by Soviet Premier Khrushchev at their 1961 summit meeting in Vienna and felt humiliated by the debacle of the failed American-supported invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs. The following year, Kennedy was determined that he wouldn’t be pushed around again by the Soviet leader; fortunately for the world, Khrushchev was able (perhaps due largely to insufficient military strength) to be willing to back

down.” (p. 211)

Nor is this positioning of the Soviet Union on the side of peace when it is the aggressor unique. In its account of the Cold War generally, *Peace and Conflict Studies* treats the Soviet Union as a sponsor of peace movements and the United States as the militaristic and imperialist power that peace movements -- and thus the students of peace in the Peace Studies program -- are supposed to keep in check.

A brief section of *Peace and Conflict Studies*, which was written in 2001, is devoted to the terrorist attack on the United States on September 11 of that year. It provides troubling insight into the impact courses like this may be having on American college students as their country faces the terrorist threat. The authors begin by telling students that, “Terrorism is a vexing term.” This is because, from the “peace studies” perspective, the moral aspects of the term are purely relative: “Any actual or threatened attack against civilian noncombatants may be considered an act of ‘terrorism.’ In this sense, terrorism is as old as human history.”(p. 80) Far from being criminal or evil, terror (according to Barash and Webel) is a last resort of the weak as a means of self-defense: “‘Terrorists’ are people who may feel militarily unable to confront their perceived enemies directly and who accordingly use violence, or the threat of violence, against noncombatants to achieve their political aims.” If you’re weak, then apparently it’s all right to murder women and children if it advances your cause. Terrorism, according to the authors, is also “a contemporary variant of what has been described as guerrilla warfare, dating back at least to the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist struggles for national liberation conducted in North America and Western Europe during the late 18th and early 19th centuries against the British and French Empires.”(pp. 80-81) In other words, the American Founders were terrorists, and the terrorists in Iraq can be viewed as patriots (as Michael Moore has actually described them).

So that no one will miss the point, the progressive authors of *Peace and Conflict Studies* explain: “Placing ‘terrorist’ in quotation marks may be jarring for some readers, who consider the designation self-evident. We do so, however, not to minimize the horror of such acts but to emphasize the

value of qualifying righteous indignation by the recognition that often one person’s ‘terrorist’ is another’s ‘freedom fighter.’”(p. 81) The terrorists who killed 3,000 innocent civilians from eighty countries in the heinous attacks of 9/11 can thus be viewed as “freedom fighters” striking the oppressor.

Peace and Conflict Studies continues: “After the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. many Americans evidently agreed with pronouncements by many senior politicians that the United States was “at war” with ‘terrorism.’ Yet, to many disemboweled [sic] people in other regions, “Americans are the worst terrorists in the world” (according to Osama bin Laden in a 1998 TV interview with the American Broadcasting Company). Following the attacks, President George W. Bush announced that the United States ‘would make no distinction between terrorists and the countries that harbor them.’ For many frustrated, impoverished, infuriated people-who view the United States as a terrorist country-attacks on American civilians were justified in precisely this way: making no distinction between a ‘terrorist state’ and the citizens who aid and abet the state.”(Ibid.) In other words, America is a terrorist state and the terrorists are liberators of the worlds oppressed.

There are two-hundred-and-fifty “Peace Studies” programs in America like the one at Ball State. They teach students to identify with America’s terrorist enemies and to identify America as a “Great Satan” oppressing the world’s poor and causing them to go hungry. There are equally many Provost Pittses, defending the fraudulent academic credentials of the political activists who conduct these indoctrinations and who are academically illiterate in the subject matter itself. The question is: how long can a nation at war with ruthless enemies like bin Laden and Zarqawi survive if its educational institutions continue to be suborned in this way?

7. Excerpt from the textbook *Peace and Conflict Studies* by Barash and Webel

Terrorism and Counter-terrorism

In September 2001, during the first year of the new millennium, the cities of New York and Washington, D.C., were attacked by what most political and military leaders in the West have described as “terrorist” groups. The loss of life in a single day due to these attacks (about 3,000 civilians) was exceeded in American history only by battles during the Civil War. However, many bombing attacks on urban centers during World War II resulted in far greater casualties to noncombatants in other countries. Raids on Hamburg, Dresden, and Tokyo caused tens of thousands of deaths, not to mention the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, each of which resulted in at least 100,000 dead and wounded noncombatants. What may be unprecedented is that the attacks on September 2001 were perpetrated by foreign “terrorists” on American Soil, that U.S. civilian airplanes were transformed into weapons of mass destruction, that the United State was not in a declared state of war at that time, that the identity of the perpetrators was unknown, and that although the leadership of certain countries (notably Afghanistan) was perceived in many Western circles to be sympathetic to the attacks, the actual perpetrators were probably non-state actors.

Thus, who is or is not a terrorist and what may or may not be acts of terrorism depend largely on the perspective of the person or group using these terms.

Prior to the U.S. Civil War, militant abolitionists such as John Brown were considered terrorists. During the 1940s, Menachem Begin -- who subsequently became prime minister of Israel and a close ally of the United States -- headed a militant Zionist group known as the Irgun: this organization conducted numerous acts of violence, primarily against British-occupied Palestine, which included the notorious bombing of the King David Hotel, a civilian target. Yasser Arafat, head of the Palestine

Liberation Organization, has similarly been denounced (in the West and in Israel) as a terrorist; among Palestinians, he is widely regarded as a heroic leader. The government of Pakistan, which criticized “terror attacks” on United States as “un-Islamic” has long sponsored violent agitators in Kashmir, who are considered terrorists by the government of India. The Irish Republican Army is widely regarded in Great Britain as a terrorist organization, yet many Irish Catholics consider this group to be laudably patriotic, and much of its funding has come from donations raised in the United States.

After the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. many Americans evidently agreed with pronouncements by many senior politicians that the United States was “at war” with “terrorism”. Yet, to many disemboweled people in other regions, “Americans are the worst terrorists in the world” (according to Osama bin Laden in a 1998 TV interview with the American Broadcasting Company). Following the attacks, President George W. Bush announced that the United States “would make no distinction between terrorists and the countries that harbor them.” For many frustrated, impoverished, infuriated people-who view the United States as a terrorist country-attacks on American civilians were justified in precisely this way: making no distinction between a “terrorist state” and the citizens who aid and abet the state.

There are also levels of terrorism. These range from threats to individual security experienced by civilians whose airplanes have been hijacked to the global existential threat posed by the very existence of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. Accordingly, at present there exist state and state-sponsored terrorism in addition to terrorist group, as well as government-created counter-and antiterrorist agencies and operations. What seems particularly novel, and terrorizing, about this state of affairs in the early 21st century are the global scope of terrorist and counter terrorist operations, and the suddenness and lethality of such actions. In addition, whereas people often demand swift and decisive response from their government in the face of violent events of this sort, the perpetrators are typically elusive and often difficult to identify, much less to punish or apprehend.

Any war against terrorism will likely be part of an increasingly recognized 21st-century pattern: so-called asymmetric warfare. In this circumstance, large, wealthy, heavily armed, and technologically sophisticated countries and their military forces find themselves aligned against small, poor, lightly armed, low-tech opponents, who are often willing to die for their cause. Although the latter can typically be defeated in straightforward “set-piece battles,” the former in part because of the openness of their civil societies as well as the fact that they offer a “target rich” environment – are likely to remain vulnerable.

In this regard, another major concern is the “law of unintended consequence,” whereby actions (especially violent ones) often bring about results that are unpredictable as well as undesirable. This can apply to those responding to terrorism no less than to the perpetrators. Thus, violent retribution by the leaders of a victimized country runs the risk of not only killing additional innocent civilians but also of generating yet more attacks, in a potentially endless cycle of violence. (This problem is exacerbated when, as already noted, terrorists’ perpetrators are difficult to identify and target.) In the specific case of the events unleashed following the attacks of September 2001, there is great danger that a U.S.-led “crusade” against terrorism will be seen as a war directed against Islam, which could in turn destabilize certain moderate regimes, resulting in government that are yet more extremist and violence prone. Given that Pakistan, for example, is a nuclear weapon state, such concerns seem especially cogent.

Historically, terrorists have sought not only to cause death, injury, and terror itself but often to induce their victims to strike back; the more bloody and indiscriminate the retaliation, the more perceived benefit derived by the terrorist themselves. Thus, a violent response tends not only to delegitimize the respondent morally, it also plays into the hands of the original perpetrators, by recruiting others, newly victimized, to their cause.

A peace-oriented perspective condemns not only terrorist attacks but also any violent response to them. It is tempting to conclude that under such circumstances, violence is always counterproductive. Nonetheless, an

alternative view also deserves respect. Consider a country that refuses to respond forcefully after a large number of its citizens’ area attacked: It must be acknowledged that well-meaning, well-informed people honestly disagree as to whether such a policy might actually encourage more attacks, resulting in reduced overall security. Although vengeance is not highly regarded by most civilized persons, justice is.

Accordingly, the best response to such terrible events is often maddeningly unclear, and should not be made precipitously, in the heat of the moment. One course of action might be for international organizations such as the United Nations and the International Court of Justice to be empowered to bring to justice the perpetrators of such crimes against humanity as acts of terrorism involving mass murder of civilians. In any event, any policy—military, diplomatic, and/or economic—must be chosen with the greatest care and with the utmost respect for human life. No one has a monopoly on wisdom...

Social and Political Justifications of Wars

Some influential Western philosophers, including Hobbes and Hegel, have at times expressed views that seem to deem war as not merely natural but as beneficial to humanity because, in Hegel’s words (which are also a critique of Immanuel Kant’s path-breaking essay “Perpetual Peace”), “war prevents a corruption of nations which a perpetual, let alone an eternal peace would produce.”

Although this view may be in disrepute today, throughout most of the “civilized” world the fact is that wars have often shaken up the existing (and often unjust) sociopolitical order and have resulted in many changes, not all of them for the worse. Through revolutionary wars and wars of national liberation, many peoples have won their independence from colonial powers, both by overthrowing despotic governments and by repulsing the efforts of other powers to force them back into subjugation. In some cases, however, revolutionary struggles have resulted in newer forms of autocracy, as in the Iranian revolution of 1979, in which the despotic pro-Western shah was overthrown, only to be replaced by the

despotic Islamic Fundamentalists Ayatollah Khomeini. Still, revolts against oppression should not automatically be condemned because they sometimes go astray after the insurrectionary groups have seized state power.

Consider the case of Cuba. In the aftermath of the Cuban Revolution of 1959, despite more than 40 years of an American embargo of Cuban imports and exports, infant mortality in Cuba has declined to the lowest in Latin America; life expectancy increased from 55 years in 1959 to 73 years in 1984; health care was nationalized and made available to all Cuban citizens at no or little cost; literacy exceeded 95% and although prostitution, begging, and homelessness returned to Cuba in 1990s (almost entirely for economic reason due to the embargo and to the loss of support from the former Soviet Union), Cuba still has far fewer of these problems than virtually all other countries in Latin America. While Cuba is far from an earthly paradise, and certain individual rights and civil liberties are not yet widely practiced, the case of Cuba indicates that violent revolutions can sometimes result in generally improved living conditions for many people. Moreover, although “Western governments (especially the United States) criticize and impose sanctions on governments they detest (such as those in Cuba and Iraq), and may even overtly or covertly try to overthrow governments, such efforts may result in worsened conditions for the great majority of the populace in the targeted “rogue nations” (as in Iraq since 1991)....

8. The Ideological University

By Brett Mock

(FrontPageMagazine.com October 5, 2004)

(This is an e-mail correspondence between Ball State University Daily News columnists David Swindle and *Brett Mock*. We provide these exchanges to further illuminate the prevalence of leftist indoctrination on our college campuses and its acceptance by students like David Swindle. -- *The Editors*).

DS: First of all, I'm a little curious... Why would a right-winger such as yourself be minoring in "Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution"? If you believe passionately, 100% that the use of force is often necessary in foreign policy, why are you minoring in a philosophy that holds the opposite to be true? In other words, what is a hawk like you doing in the doves' nest?

BM: I chose to pursue the Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution minor for a variety of different reasons, however, the two that are most important are that I wanted to supplement my Political Science major with a unique minor (I plan to attend law school and pressure to impress is a part of getting there) and national defense policies, and how to ultimately result in a peaceful world, are things that interest me. What I don't understand from your analysis is why a class, introducing a Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution minor, would contain ONLY the study of peaceful means of resolving conflict. In the undergraduate student catalogue, the minor is described as:

The interdisciplinary Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution minor addresses the sources of war, social oppression, and violence and the challenges of promoting peace and justice. It also examines proposals, such as mediation, to promote redress of grievances. (Emphasis added)

In this description I find that it is entirely reasonable to believe that we would focus on the "causes of war and violence," as well as the "challenge

of promoting peace and justice." These are the two areas of the course and minor that intrigued me. Based on the description, and the name of the minor, it clearly is not necessary to cut out violent means of resolving conflict as a part of the challenge of promoting peace and justice. Also, as an introductory course to a minor it is absurd to not cover any of the ways to resolve conflict using force. How are students to understand why peaceful means are "better," if that is what Professor Wolfe chooses to argue, unless they can evaluate successful means using violence and successful means without it? I would imagine that that would be a part of the examination of peaceful means of resolving conflict. For educational purposes, here is the description of the course itself:

Interdisciplinary study of methods of achieving peace within communities and among nations; history of peace movements and the causes of conflict; and analysis of principles to resolve conflict using case studies. (Emphasis added)

Nothing in this course's description gives a potential student the idea that violent forms of resolving conflict won't be included in the "study of METHODS of achieving peace" or in the "analysis of principles to resolve conflict." It does mention a study of "peace movements," which also interested me... as I've said, I am open-minded... but this mention of peace movements is the only part of the course description that could support your argument. In context, the description tends to suggest that it will only be a part of, not the purpose for, the course.

More importantly, however, when studying conflict resolution, the intentional disregard of violent means smacks of indoctrination. During WWII I don't think anyone, including Professor Wolfe, would be able to logically argue that Hitler's actions could have been stopped through peaceful means and demonstration. After the attack on Pearl Harbor I don't think Professor Wolfe, or anyone else, can logically argue that a peaceful response to Japan would have been appropriate or successful in ending our conflict with them. Finally, after the attacks on 9/11 I don't think anyone can logically argue that peacefully apologizing to Osama Bin Laden, and trying to understand why he doesn't like us, after he and his group masterminded the murder of over 3,000 civilians, would be an

appropriate response or would end any conflict with him. After all, he labeled the United States a "paper tiger" and used that observation to gain confidence in his ability to take pot shots at us.

Clearly, peaceful means of resolving conflict are not ALWAYS appropriate and will not ALWAYS be successful. Nothing in this course's name or description would give a student entering the class the idea violent forms of resolving conflict will constantly be ignored and pushed aside.

If, however, he wanted to only pursue the study of peaceful means of resolving conflict, he could indicate that in the title and course description and/or he could set up a class or minor for Peace Studies; not one that claims to focus on the ways through which conflict can be resolved.

DS: In going into those kinds of courses wouldn't you expect the ideology to be somewhat leftist? Isn't that like a communist student taking a course in capitalism? Of course capitalism is going to be promoted as the only option. The course wouldn't be about other economic systems.

BM: I disagree with your analogy concerning a communist taking a capitalist class, partially for all the reasons I've already given, but also because I don't think any study of capitalism would or should be done unless it compares itself to other economic and social systems. I would imagine that students studying economics, and a class on capitalism, would examine its inherent differences from socialist or communist economies, and social structures, and attempt to show its strengths and weaknesses in comparison to those systems. From my experience in classes of this nature, the environment I just described was prevalent and, in my estimation, appropriate.

DS: Also, why didn't you drop the course when you found out what it would be like? During the first week of courses, you have the option to drop the class without penalty and switch to something else.

BM: I didn't drop this course because nothing in the first week of class (which is the time frame allowed for dropping courses without penalty)

suggested that we would never study violent means of resolving conflict, and more importantly, that such a view point would not be allowed in the class at all. Anyone who has taken a class can realize that in the first week you often can't tell where it is going to go... in some classes you can and others you can't, and in this one I couldn't. In fact, it appeared to me that the radical slant became more and more prevalent as the semester went on... once you have the fish hooked start reeling them in, right?

More importantly, there is no defensible reason why I should have been put in that position to begin with. The only reason I would need to drop the class is because the professor refused to consider more than one side or one way to resolve conflict. He took this so far as to lower my grade if I tried to bring in other points of view or ways of resolving conflict. He forced EVERYONE in the class to write about and present on books that only supported peaceful means of resolving conflict. I find that interesting, because he had a chance to encourage a meaningful discourse concerning the challenges in resolving conflict and the different methods of doing so... yet forced only one side to be represented. Students who would finally have a chance to speak in front of the class, and let their opinions be heard, were silenced... and forced to discuss only one method of resolving conflict... the one the professor agreed with. The fact that you are someone who sees the value in a healthy debate would make me think that you would find this remarkably one-sided as well, when it has no justifiable reason to be.

DS: "For example, Professor Wolfe explained that violent responses to violent aggression are never acceptable." The analogy that comes to mind is, "OK, we're in an upper level Spanish class. From now on out you're not allowed to speak English in class." Isn't the whole point of peace studies the simple idea that violence is never acceptable?

BM: The Spanish class analogy fails in this situation because the course was never presented as a class that would include only one side of this issue. In a foreign language course it is no secret that a student will be challenged to learn a new SKILL... that is speaking another language. In this case, the course was presented as an examination of the methods of

resolving conflict and the challenge of promoting peace. Professor Wolfe chose to do something other than that entirely. Imagine taking an introduction to economic systems course and studying ONLY socialism. Not only do you study only socialism but the professor does not let you examine ANY OTHER economic system even if you want to. More so, the professor lowers your grade if you argue, in any way, for the benefits of capitalism and how it has been shown in certain areas to be superior to socialism. That is a more accurate description of what was going on in the classroom. Obviously that is morally wrong and an abuse of a student's academic freedom. Why? Because the student took the course to study economic systems, studied only one, and was forced to support that system unconditionally in order to get a good grade in the class. More so, students that already supported the system personally were given extra credit for doing an outside of class project that defended socialism as the best economic policy in the world. While students that did not believe that and would not lie to themselves and to others about their beliefs, were not given an option to get extra credit through a project concerning a different economic system. That is just wrong, and it should be easy to see that.

Final issue on the Spanish class analogy. Again, in a foreign language class the professor's job is to develop in students a new skill. Spanish, as a language, is tangible in that either you know how to speak Spanish correctly or you don't. You can test this in multiple different ways. Studies concerning conflict resolution are not used to develop a skill but to educate students on the challenges of promoting peace and justice. There are multiple ways of promoting peace and justice, multiple ways through which conflict can be resolved, and differing ideologies that support those ways. In other words, the material in this course is ideological... it concerns ones opinions about conflict resolution. No one, including the professor, has the right to totally neglect one opinion for his own agenda. For you to argue that a Spanish professor has an agenda would be a joke... well yeah... he/she wants to teach students Spanish. To argue that a conflict resolution professor has an agenda is reasonable, if his or her actions illustrate the agenda and attempt to indoctrinate students. A study of conflict resolution did not take place. A study of the methods of resolving conflict, of the challenges of promoting peace and justice, were

absent. Instead, the professor used the classroom as his own political soapbox to push HARD his ideological opinions on the students in the classroom and would not permit any reasonable debate or discussion of the issue from the other side; at least without shooting such debate or discussion down himself and alienating those students that chose to share their ideas and opinions. Spanish obviously doesn't apply.

DS: "This seemed to me to be indoctrination rather than education."

Isn't all education indoctrination? In my Virginia Woolf class, isn't my teacher indoctrinating me with the idea that Virginia Woolf is one of the greatest writers of the 20th century?

BM: In your "Virginia Woolf class" you knew what the material of the class would be before you entered. It was made clear that the course would cover the works and writing styles, maybe even the historical significance, of Virginia Woolf's writing. In essence, the course is set up as a forum through which the professor will show you Virginia's Woolf's accomplishments and why they are significant. In this sense you are really only being given information, asked to study it and try to know Virginia Woolf's work at the end of the class, and learn from her and your professor in some way in the process. As Virginia Woolf is the subject it would only make sense that you would discuss only Virginia Woolf. I have explained to you how this does not parallel with the Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution class already. But also I want you to understand that when you are tested on Virginia Woolf you are likely tested either on your ability to write about her, or to identify things about her or her writing. In other words, you are not asked a question that forces you to weigh Virginia Woolf's writings against all other writers in history and then, ultimately, come to the conclusion that V. Woolf was the best... or your grade would be lowered. Ideology... versus knowing the facts about V. Woolf and her writing style.

DS: By signing up for these classes and continuing with it, am I not saying, "I want to be indoctrinated with this ideology"?

BM: Your "signing up for it" idea, and how it is "saying" that you want to be indoctrinated, fails in a couple of ways. First, I have shown you that no indoctrination is occurring in those classes, so you couldn't be signing up for it. Second, I highly doubt most students sign up for a course because they want to agree with everything the professor says when they leave. When I sign up for a class I hope to become more knowledgeable on the subject that interests me. I hope to take something positive from the classroom. I hope to be challenged by the material and to be able to enter into intellectual discourse on it. Unfortunately, there is no challenge when only one side is presented, nothing positive is gained when you are silenced and have your grade threatened for your beliefs and opinions, and little knowledge is gained because you can't apply the material you are exposed to anything but a very narrow set of thoughts and ideologies that the professor agrees with.

DS: "For the rest of the semester we worried as to whether our views would hurt our grades."

Can't you study and argue for positions that you personally disagree with? Isn't that a great way to learn? Isn't debate one of your things? Surely you've debated on the side of issues with which you disagree. How is this any different?

In early western thought I'm going to have to present on Machiavelli. Do I agree with "the ends justify the means"? Hell no, but I'm sure I'll be able to put up one tough argument for it.

BM: I do think it is good to expand your thoughts by studying and even, at times, making arguments for things you don't necessarily agree with. For the last eight years I have done that at every debate tournament I have ever attended. It is certainly a positive experience to see the other side of an issue. But... this fails to recognize the most important issue. There was no debate in the class. No two sides were presented. A single ideology was imposed on every student in that classroom for the length of the semester. If you expressed an idea... ANYTHING... that the professor didn't personally agree with you would be docked points. For example,

throughout the class Professor Wolfe assigned papers on various different issues. These papers were more informal and were meant to stimulate thought about whatever prompt Professor Wolfe would assign. *This is a great method and way to learn... way to go Professor Wolfe.* However, when I wrote a paper concerning corporal punishment when raising children, I challenged the idea that "non-violent" means of disciplining a child can always work, after I demonstrated that I understood how peaceful means operate. I explained how I thought spanking while I was growing up actually benefited me in many ways, though I would have argued with it then. I also explained that as a child I was very manipulative, an only child, and if I knew nothing of any real significance would happen if I acted up/out... nothing would stop me from doing just that. Unfortunately, in some cases corporal punishment is the best method of disciplining a child, by my observations and opinions. Upon grading the paper Professor Wolfe had many written comments about my opinions and ideas, and lowered my grade because he thought I didn't really understand how peaceful means of disciplining a child or resolving conflict worked if I thought it could be manipulated. WHAT? Nothing I said in the paper said that "obviously peaceful means of conflict resolution don't work" and nothing in my paper said, "only corporal punishment is free from a child's manipulation." I said nothing that would have given any level headed person the idea that I was entirely shrugging off the concepts or that I didn't fully understand them. Professor Wolfe lowered my grade because he wanted me to believe that at NO TIME can peaceful ways of conflict resolution be manipulated. In other words, "It is fool proof Brett, and until you understand that I'll have to lower your grade."

I called him out on this, after class, explained that my opinions had nothing to do with a misunderstanding of peaceful means of resolving conflict and ended up getting the grade I deserved. However, upon taking the chance that I did, by "arguing" with the professor, I had to worry that I would be on the wrong side of him from the very start. I had to worry from paper number one that my opinions would be regarded as wrong and that if I stated them I would receive a lower grade. Not only that, but it left me, and anyone else that experienced his grading bias, feeling isolated from the professor and as though I had to stroke his ideological

biases to receive the grade I deserved.

DS: "Professor Wolfe would not allow any serious study of the reasons for the use of force in response to an attack." Isn't that because the course is not about reasons for the use of force?

"In other words, students like me had to read a book we disagreed with and then report on the book parroting back views we did not agree with or face a hostile professor with the power of grading us and do so in front the entire class, whose views were also shaped by the professor's intolerance of any dissenting view."

What if you had to give an oral presentation on Mein Kampf? Would you be willing to do that? What's wrong with doing a report on ideas that you disagree with? Would you be willing to give a report on, say, creationism? Arguing in favor of that?

BM: On Mein Kampf: I would do a report on Mein Kampf, explaining its historical significance, the movements it initiated, and the arguments and ideas that it articulated. But I wouldn't present Mein Kampf in a class that had a Nazi professor who forced me to do so and to act like I believed it to receive a good grade. No one should have to do that. Indoctrination and demonstrating knowledge of a book, speech, philosopher, or subject are entirely different. And also, I would not argue that Mein Kampf was good or that Hitler was right... under any circumstance... not even just pretending.

Further, you're misunderstanding of this whole issue is that you still think it was just "giving a report." You fail to understand the significance of the environment Professor Wolfe created through his assigned readings, grading biases, and absolute intolerance for any point of view in his class that would even hint of arguing with his beliefs. Anyone can go in front of a class and explain, "give a report," about creationism... what it stands for, where it is rooted, and explain what creationists argue. But if an atheist who fully believes in evolution had to get in front of the class and say... "creationists are brilliant and clearly show us why evolution is wrong" because if the student did not the professor would lower his/her

grade. That would be wrong. You can't force an IDEOLOGY on someone. If you force them to study materials and know about the arguments that are made in philosophies they disagree with that is fine. But to force them to agree with it, or at least convincingly act like it, or suffer the consequences is wrong.

DS: "I was ever conscious of the fact that I had to deliver a report that Professor Wolfe would like or suffer a lower grade."

In the workplace, aren't you often required to do things that you don't like? If your boss tells you to do something, then you have to do it. If you refuse, you get fired. That's how it works.

BM: On the workplace: Understand that the classroom and the workplace are very different places. In the workplace you are doing your job, performing tasks that have been assigned, and might have to put up with ideological differences in the way things are run or even philosophical differences concerning politics, religion, etc. However, you do have the right in the workplace to disagree with your boss or anyone else on a topic, you can read whatever newspapers or sources you want, and you can continue to have your own ideologies without fear of repercussion. If you were fired from a job solely because of differences in political ideologies, you have the right to sue your past employer for discrimination. Guess what, if the only reason you were fired was because of differences in political ideology... you would win, the company would have to more than make up for your losses... and it is possible your "boss" could get fired altogether.

In the classroom professors have a bit more to hold over a student's head. If you do not appease the professor or live up to his/her expectations, you will receive a lowered grade. You are absolutely being judged/graded on your comprehension of the course material and your ability to demonstrate your comprehension of it. That is all fine and dandy if it is not abused. However, when a professor like George Wolfe chooses to force his ideology on you things are different. If you fight against the professor you risk a lowered grade... and a hit to your GPA. For a student his/her GPA is his/her record, like a police record. If the student receives a lowered grade and his/her GPA is lowered, the student could fail to get into a

graduate school/law school or whatever educational institution he/she wants to attend next. Maybe the lower GPA won't stop him/her from getting into graduate school, maybe it will just make it so he/she is passed up at a higher quality school that he/she aspires to attend. The student now has to settle for just getting in somewhere and fails to reach his/her goal. Now, in most cases "that's how it works," it's just the way it is. But when your GPA and grade suffer because you refuse to conform to your professor's ideology, something is desperately wrong. More important than the lowered grade you might suffer is that you are being slighted. A student is intentionally receiving only a portion of the story on a topic that has many different sides... an abundance of ideologies. In the classroom, if an ideology is forced, the student has been stifled... put in his/her place and his/her desire to learn suffers... learning is no longer fun and rewarding.

By the way, don't ever argue that because things are like this "here" that it should be like that "here too." That line of thinking and reasoning gets you nowhere. If a person's boss forced an ideology on someone, not just required them to complete tasks, it would be just as wrong there as it would be in the classroom.

DS: "Every article that was assigned in class gave reasons why U.S. foreign policies were wrong and were root causes of what happened on 9/11."

Well... I don't know about whether our foreign policies are wrong or not -- that's debatable -- but what really isn't is that the root cause of Al Qaeda and Islam terrorism is our foreign policy. They may not agree with our values, but they won't go to war with us over Britney Spears. There's mountains of evidence that the reason they're at war with us is because they believe that through our foreign policies we've been waging a war on Islam. If you want to get into the debate on this point, I welcome it, there's mountains of hard factual evidence -- from Middle East opinion polls to statements from bin Laden himself -- backing this up. It's one of the central theses of the book I've been reading -- "Imperial Hubris." The "they hate our freedoms" and "they want to destroy Western civilization" arguments are bald-faced lies without substantial evidence to back them up.

BM: As far as your root of terrorism dialogue... I would be willing to debate that issue with you at a later time. But you aren't going to bait me with a small paragraph making undocumented claims and then get a large, intricately documented response. I disagree with you here David... and I would argue it has much more to do with a hatred of our comfortable way of life, capitalist systems, and the power we have in the world. So... that's what you think... this is what I think.

And I'm sorry but "Imperial Hubris" is not a reliable source, even in the outer depths of the imagination. If you think so, start citing thoughts from anonymous sources as the reason for your beliefs in the Daily News... see what kind of response you get on that one... from both sides.

DS: *"In order to receive full credit in the class you must choose to be involved in one of the programs he actively promotes."*

By enrolling in the course, aren't you saying that you're interested in these subjects and might want to be in one of these groups?

BM: Full-credit: Unfortunately your argument about being interested in one of these groups is no longer valid because I have shown you that the course, through its own description, does not say that this type of ideological bias is going to exist in the class. I have explained that this was not a "peace studies" class but also concerned "methods of resolving conflict." It did not say peaceful methods of resolving conflict but the study of them in general. I don't need to go back here. Obviously this was never suggested by anything in the course description. Also, once again you have the issue of indoctrination. If Professor Wolfe really wanted us to be involved with an extra-curricular activity that would involve focusing on resolving conflict he could have opened it up to ideas students would come up with or find. However, he was only interested in imposing his ideological biases through groups he oversees... he only wanted another avenue through which he could impose on you his belief that peaceful means of resolving conflict is the way to go. It would be one thing to promote those groups in his class... but entirely another to make your involvement in one of them a part of successfully completing the

course (this was a big chunk of the grade by the way).

DS: OK. Now, you're all about students having "academic freedom." My question for you is, "Well, don't you?" You're free not to take this course. You're free to drop the course when you realize what it is and what it demands.

BM: Academic Freedom: Unfortunately you fail to understand what academic freedom really is. You discuss freedom in general. I don't have to go to class, I don't have to enroll in class, I can drop a class... whenever I want to. I might have repercussions for those actions, which I discussed above, but sure... I can do whatever I want whenever I want.

Academic freedom concerns the right to be free of ideological indoctrination in the classroom. There is no justifiable reason or excuse for Professor Wolfe's actions. You try to take the responsibility off of him and place it on me but fail to recognize the issue in doing so. The issue is that actions like Professor Wolfe's shouldn't be a part of an educational institution. An atmosphere like the one in the Introduction to Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution has no place in higher education. Forcing ones ideologies on students from a position of power is immoral and shouldn't happen... there is no excuse for it. There is nothing any student can gain from it, and there is no reason the administration at a university should encourage it, or tolerate it.