



# **THE CAMPAIGN FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

by  
**DAVID  
HOROWITZ**

PRICE: \$5

Bulk orders of \$25 or more \$2 each.

Copyright ©2005  
Center for the Study of Popular Culture

P.O. Box 361269  
Los Angeles, CA 90036-9828  
800-752-6562

WWW.STUDENTSFORACADEMICFREEDOM.ORG

ISBN 1-886442-47-9  
Printed in the United States of America

# **THE CAMPAIGN FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

by DAVID HOROWITZ



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### INTRODUCTION:

College Professors Should Teach, Not Preach.....	5
1. Why An Academic Bill of Rights Is Necessary.....	9
2. Victory in Colorado.....	16
3. Ward Churchill Is Just the Beginning.....	24
4. The Strange Dishonest Campaign Against Academic Freedom.....	24
5. The Colorado Exam: A Case of Indoctrination.....	41
6. The Academic Bill of Rights.....	56



## **COLLEGE PROFESSORS SHOULD TEACH, NOT PREACH\***

By now, we've all heard how Harvard President Lawrence Summers, a former member of President Clinton's Cabinet and a distinguished scholar in his own right, made a politically incorrect point at a faculty seminar. One feminist professor stormed out of the room, and before you knew it, activists were clamoring for Summers' resignation. Soon after, he embarked on an apology tour for even raising the point that aroused them.

If the president of Harvard cannot raise intellectual questions in a university setting without jeopardizing his job, what does that tell you about the state of higher education in America? It tells you that American universities are in trouble. They are less free than they were in the McCarthy era (when I was in school), and something must be done to rectify the situation.

Two years ago, I drafted an Academic Bill of Rights that would defend "intellectual diversity" on college campuses and remove politics from the classroom. The idea has steadily gained traction as the public and, indeed, legislators hear what's happening at universities across the country.

Last month, I met with Minnesota legislators who have agreed to sponsor an Academic Bill of Rights based on my model. Similar legislation is before legislatures in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida, Tennessee, Missouri, Georgia and a dozen other states this spring.

Why do we need legislation? There are too many people like Ward Churchill — the University of Colorado professor

This introduction appeared originally as an article in *USA Today*. | March 23, 2005

who compared 9/11 victims with Nazi war criminal Adolf Eichmann — on faculties across the nation. They confuse their classrooms with a political soap box.

The issue is not one of their free speech as citizens, but what is appropriate to an education.

We don't go to our doctor's offices expecting to get political lectures. That is because doctors are professionals who have taken an oath to treat all, regardless of political belief. To introduce divisive matters into a medical consultation would injure the trust between doctor and patient that is crucial to healing. Why is the profession of education any different? It isn't.

Examples dot the U.S. higher education landscape:

- It is not an education when a final examination contains a required essay on the topic, "Make the argument that the military action of the U.S. attacking Iraq was criminal." Yet a criminology final exam at the University of Northern Colorado did just that.

- It is not an education when a professor of property law tells his class that the "R" in Republican stands for "racist," and devotes an entire class hour to explaining why Americans deserved to die on 9/11. But that happened at the Colorado University Law School.

- It is not an education when professors try to get their students to vote against President Bush or to demonstrate against the war in Iraq, but that has happened in classrooms across the country.

The Academic Bill of Rights says that a university "shall provide its students with a learning environment in which the students have access to a broad range of serious scholarly opinion pertaining to the subjects they study."



The leading opponent of my Bill is the American Association of University Professors, the oldest and largest organization of faculty members. The AAUP contends that the Bill would restrict professors' free speech rights. It wouldn't. Professors can still express their political opinions, but outside the classroom. In the classroom, they must distinguish between their official responsibilities as teachers and their private rights as citizens.

Ironically, the AAUP once recognized this distinction. In 1940, a year when the nation was also divided over a war, the AAUP warned: "Teachers ... should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject."

Too many professors indoctrinate students, while university administrators are intimidated from enforcing their own guidelines. It is because of this that legislatures are the last resort for providing a remedy and setting universities back on their intended course: educating our students, not brainwashing them.



# 1. WHY AN ACADEMIC BILL OF RIGHTS IS NECESSARY

Ohio Senate Bill 24, which has been sponsored by Senator Larry Mumper and is now before this Committee, and which is based on my Academic Bill of Rights, is not about Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, left and right. It is about what is appropriate to an education, and in particular what is an appropriate discourse in the classrooms of an institution of higher learning.

All higher education institutions in this country embrace principles of academic freedom that were first laid down in 1915 in the famous *General Report* of the American Association of University Professors, titled “The Principles of Tenure and Academic Freedom.” The *Report* admonishes 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 to fairly 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 other words, an education -- as distinct from an indoctrination -- makes students aware of a spectrum of scholarly views on matters of controversy and opinion, and does not make particular answers to such controversial matters the goal of the instruction. This is sound doctrine and common sense, and in one form or another it is recognized in the academic freedom guidelines of all accredited institutions of higher learning in the United States.

Unfortunately, it is a principle increasingly honored in the

breach and not in the observance in American universities today. All too frequently, professors behave as political advocates in the classroom, express opinions in a partisan manner on controversial issues irrelevant to the academic subject, and even grade students in a manner designed to enforce their conformity to professorial prejudices. (Numerous instances of these abuses are available on the websites [www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org](http://www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org) and [www.noindoctrination.org](http://www.noindoctrination.org))

Why this abuse of the academic classroom has occurred in the last academic generation is a matter for historians. Why it has not been remedied by existing institutional supports for academic freedom is the business of Senate Bill 24 and the Academic Bill of Rights.

To anticipate, it is the view of the authors of this legislation that the academic freedom protections to prevent indoctrination in the classroom are generally buried in “faculty handbooks,” as faculty “responsibilities,” never codified as student rights. Therefore when they are neglected there is no remedy for students who are victims of professorial abuse. Nor does there exist any grievance machinery that specifically recognizes the academic freedom rights or that provides a policy for redress. The purpose of Senate Bill 24 and legislation in other states based on the Academic Bill of Rights is to rectify this omission.

It is not an education when a mid-term examination contains a required essay on the topic: “Make the argument that the military action of the U.S. attacking Iraq was criminal,” as did a criminology exam at the University of Northern Colorado in 2003. It is not an education when a professor of property law harangues his class on why all Republicans are racist as happened at the Colorado University Law School in 2004. It is not an education when a widely-used required “Peace Studies” textbook, described by the professor as a “masterpiece,” explains that the Soviet Union was a force for peace in the Cold War and the United States was not, that “revolutionary violence” is the only justifiable

violence, and that the United States is the greatest terrorist state – and does so without making students aware that there are other interpretations of this history and other views that should be considered on these matters. This extremist text, *Peace and Conflict Studies*, written by two university professors who explain in their preface that they are partisans of the political left is the required “academic” textbook for students in the Peace Studies course at Ohio State University (Marion).

At Foothill College in California, a pro-life professor compared women who have abortions to the deranged mother Andrea Yates who drowned her six children. The professor then gave D’s and F’s to students who expressed opinions in favor of abortion. Abortion is a matter that is both profoundly controversial and also emotional, and involves the deepest and most personal values. It is also a matter of opinion. It is not the task of a professor to provide his students with politically correct opinions.

It is the task of professors – whether they are politically left or politically conservative -- to teach students *how* to think and not *what* to think about matters that are controversial. An education should make students aware of the range of scholarly views on a subject, teach students how to marshal evidence in behalf of a point of view, and instruct them how to make a logical case for their conclusions. An education is not about providing students with the correct conclusions on controversial matters.

We live in democracy that is based on the proposition that there is no correct conclusion available to ordinary mortals, that no one – not even professors – are in possession of absolute truth. If there were only one correct conclusion to all controversial issues there be no need for a multi-party democracy, since the only party necessary would be the one with the truth. No such party exists. No such professor exists. Therefore, Ohio Senate Bill 24 states that “*students [shall] have access to a broad range of serious scholarly opinion*

*pertaining to the subjects they study;” and further that: “Students shall be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study and shall not be discriminated against on the basis of their political, ideological, or religious beliefs. Faculty and instructors shall not use their courses or their positions for the purpose of political, ideological, religious, or antireligious indoctrination.”*

Three principal objections have been made to Senate Bill 24, all of them groundless. The first is that the Bill would impose “political standards” on higher education. This is an invention of opponents of the Bill, whose text could not be clearer on this matter: “*students [shall] have access to a **broad range of serious scholarly opinion** pertaining to the subjects they study.*” In other words, the standards “imposed” by the Bill are scholarly not political.

The second objection is that the Bill “limits free speech” and in particular would impose limits on the ability of professors to express themselves freely in the classroom. A typical “news” headline in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, reporting Senator Mumper’s legislation, transforms a bill expressly designed to *promote* academic freedom into its opposite: “Legislator Wants Law To Restrict Professors.”

This false charge originates with the American Association of University Professors, which long ago abandoned its commitment to academic freedom where students are concerned. The AAUP was entirely absent from the battle against speech codes in the 1990s – the most dramatic infringement of free speech rights on college campuses since the McCarthy era. I am acutely conscious of this dereliction because my Individual Rights Foundation was actively engaged in those battles.

The AAUP has particularly singled out the following clause in the Senate Bill for disapproval: “Faculty and instructors shall not infringe the academic freedom and quality of education of their students by persistently introducing controversial

matter into the classroom or coursework that has no relation to their subject of study and that serves no legitimate pedagogical purpose.” According to the AAUP and opponents of the Bill generally, this stipulation is an infringement of the free speech rights of professors.

Presumably it would be perfectly appropriate as far as the AAUP and these opponents of the Bill are concerned if a professor of property law were to devote an entire class to explaining why Americans deserved to die on 9/11, or a professor of Women’s Studies devoted an entire class to discussing how the terrible results of the 2004 presidential election could be countered, or a Metallurgy professor confronted students in a class on “Organic Materials” with the question of whether it was right for the Governor of California to leave his state to campaign for George Bush in Ohio, or a Spanish language professor used her class time to tell her students “I wish George Bush were dead.” All these incidents happened at quality American universities (Colorado, Stanford, and Ripon) within the last school year.

In fact, the issue here is not the free speech rights of professors as private citizens, but what is appropriate to a classroom, and in particular what form of discourse constitutes indoctrination as distinct from education. We don’t go to our doctors’ offices expecting to get a lecture on politics. That is because doctors are professionals whose responsibility is to minister to all their patients regardless of their patients’ political beliefs. Introducing passionately divisive matters into a medical consultation can injure the trust between doctors and their patients, which is essential to the healing mission. Why is the profession of education any different? When students go to their professors’ offices, for example, they go for advice and help. When professors plaster their office doors with partisan cartoons that mock the deeply held beliefs of students on matters like abortion and party affiliation – which they regularly do – this creates a wall between faculty and students, which is

injurious to the counseling process. How can a professor teach a student whom he regards as a partisan adversary? The answer is he cannot.

Can professors, under this guideline, discuss controversial matters in class? Of course they can. But their purpose must be educational and not political. They can present students with the opposing views that define a controversy, show them how to marshal evidence for one view or the other and teach them how to construct a case in behalf of their own viewpoint. What they must not do is jump into the controversy on one side, wielding all the authority of their greater experience and superior knowledge, backed by their grading power. They are not in the classroom to recruit students to their political or religious agendas. They are there to teach them. It does not take a rocket scientist to understand the difference. A classroom is not – or should not be – a political soap box.

The truly insurmountable problem for opponents of this injunction is that the principle of restricting professorial speech in the classroom to what is professionally appropriate is not only a long-standing principle of academic freedom, it is a principle *already embraced* (if not practiced) by most universities. The Faculty Handbook of Ohio State University, for example, instructs professors as follows: “Academic freedom carries with it correlative academic responsibilities. The principal elements include the responsibility of teachers to “...(5) Refrain from persistently introducing matters that have no bearing on the subject matter of the course;...(7) Differentiate carefully between official activities as teachers and personal activities as citizens, and to act accordingly.”

The principle of professional restraint in the classroom could not be stated more clearly than in the Ohio State University handbook and it is expressed in the very wording of Senate Bill 24 to which apparently the same administrators who are responsible for the Faculty Handbook and the same professors who are supposed to be guided by it now



strenuously object. Apparently, the principle of academic freedom is acceptable when it is only a faculty responsibility that can be disregarded. When it is proposed as a student right that might be enforced, it becomes objectionable.

There is a reason that the Academic Bill of Rights and the Faculty Handbook have nearly identical wording. Both are derived from the long-standing academic freedom guidelines of the American Association of University Professors, which the present leaders of the AAUP have turned their backs on now seek to repudiate: Thus, the *1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* of the AAUP states: “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.”

The real problem has now been revealed, and the third of the three objections to the Bill – the complaint that this would be a legislative interference in academic affairs – is answered: it wouldn’t be an interference because the university itself has already adopted the principles of this Bill; the problem is that it will not enforce them.

The reasons for enacting Senate Bill 24 are that too many faculty members at our universities no longer observe their responsibility to teach and not to indoctrinate students; that university administrations no longer enforce their faculty guidelines on academic freedom; and that the existing guidelines are not codified as student rights; as result students currently have no way to redress their grievances. In this situation legislatures have a fiduciary responsibility – as the elected representatives of the taxpayers who fund these institutions -- to step in and provide a remedy. If they do not, the future of our universities is bleak.

## 2. VICTORY IN COLORADO

In the early summer of 2003, we launched a campaign for academic freedom in the state of Colorado. We met with the President of Colorado University, the governor and a dozen state legislators to discuss the problem of intellectual intolerance on Colorado's public university campuses. We were concerned about the treatment of conservative students as second class citizens and the abuse of the classroom by faculty who used their positions of authority as educators to pursue political agendas. We were concerned about the absence of intellectual diversity in the collegiate curriculum and by the practices of some professors who used their classrooms for political indoctrination. The remedy we offered was the Academic Bill of Rights which had been drawn up our organization, Students for Academic Freedom.

When we met with Elizabeth Hoffman, the president of Colorado University, she told us that she didn't think these were significant problems at her university and that existing protections for academic freedom already adopted by the university covered all the protections that might be contained in the Academic Bill of Rights. Public statements by other college administrators echoed these views, and all parties refused to take active steps to correct the situation. So we turned to the legislators for a remedy for our concerns.

From the moment we met with legislators, our efforts in Colorado were subjected to an all-out attack from the political left, whose partisans were entrenched in the faculty organizations of the public universities, the Colorado media and the Colorado Democratic Party. The head of the faculty senate at Denver's Metro State College called for an investigation of the "secret" meetings I allegedly had with state legislators and the governor – elected representatives of the people of Colorado. The

Democrats' Senate Minority Leader, Joan Fitz-Gerald, denounced the bill as "affirmative action for conservative Republicans, to get them into universities," and warned: "There is something chilling and troubling about a movement like this. They're going to create a climate of fear in our universities, fear of being the professor who says the wrong thing."

In fact, the Academic Bill of Rights we were proposing did just the opposite. It explicitly forbid the hiring (or firing) of professors (conservative or liberal) on the basis of their political opinions. What it did not sanction was the abuse of classrooms and the use of grades to indoctrinate students in the political prejudices of their professors—something the American Association of University Professors has been on record as opposing for more than half a century.

A bitter political argument ensued. At the request of Colorado Senate President John Andrews, a legislative hearing was held in December of 2003 on a proposed bill to incorporate provisions of the Academic Bill of Rights in a Senate resolution. Many students and faculty members came forward to share their personal experiences of discrimination and harassment on campus because of their political or religious views. Among the evidence presented at this December hearing was testimony from a student at the University of Northern Colorado who told legislators that a required essay topic on her criminology mid-term exam was: "Explain why George Bush is a war criminal." When she submitted an essay explaining why Saddam Hussein was a war criminal instead, she was given an "F."

Another legislative hearing was held in the Colorado House in February to support similar legislation introduced by Representative Shawn Mitchell. At one point a student at Metro State testified that his teacher had thrown him out of the course he was taking, stating, "I don't want your right wing views in my classroom." The student told legislators that he hoped that passage of the Academic Bill of Rights would put a "chill" on this type of abusive behavior. As the student stepped away from the microphone, he was immediately

confronted by a man who was subsequently identified as the head of the philosophy department at Metro State, the school the student attended. In front of over 100 witnesses, the professor jabbed his finger at the student and said in a loud voice: “I got my Ph.D. at Harvard. I’ll see your f—ing ass in court. Then we’ll see a chilling effect.”

Representative Keith King, a member of the legislative committee who witnessed the nose-to-nose confrontation, called the professor out on his inappropriate behavior, declaring: “Sir, you are the very reason we need this bill.” Representative Shawn Mitchell, the primary sponsor of the House resolution, observed, “If he behaves that way in a hearing room, in front of legislators and the press, imagine how powerful he feels in his own classroom.”

After the hearing, Shawn Mitchell’s resolution (House Bill 04-1315), passed the Education Committee in a party-line vote of 6-5.

The hearings and impending legislation were sufficient to convince university administrators that intellectual diversity faced serious problems on their campuses. After the Education Committee vote was announced, and passage of the bill by the Colorado House appeared likely, Representative Mitchell was approached by President Hoffman and the presidents of Colorado’s other major public universities to see if he would be willing to withdraw the bill if they would voluntarily adopt those provisions of the Academic Bill of Rights their regulations did not already cover. Mitchell agreed. The result was a Memorandum of Understanding, signed in March of 2004, in which the universities pledged to provide protections to students of all political viewpoints, emphasizing that “Colorado’s institutions of higher education are committed to valuing and respecting diversity, including respect for diverse political viewpoints.” Subsequently, the Colorado legislature as a whole overwhelmingly adopted Senate Joint Resolution 04-033, commending the university presidents for their leadership and

willingness to revise campus policies and procedures to provide these needed protections, and requesting that the administrators regularly report to the legislature on their progress.

To anyone familiar with the state of American college campuses today, where the suppression and harassment of conservative viewpoints is routine, this was a momentous victory—one that might well mark the beginning of a change in American higher education itself. All this was provisional, however, on whether the university presidents would put into practice what they had agreed to.

Colorado legislators were determined to see that they would. Senate President John Andrews called the presidents of each of the major state universities before a joint legislative committee at the opening of the fall school term to see what had been accomplished. The results were impressive.

President Elizabeth Hoffman of Colorado University reported that a task force of students, faculty, and administrators had been appointed to incorporate protections and support for political diversity into the codes and policies of the entire CU system.

Over the summer, the faculty senate of the Colorado University Law School adopted a new binding Rule on Political and Religious Non-Discrimination which, among other things, adopts this crucial provision of the Academic Bill of Rights: “Students shall 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.”

Law School Dean Lorenzo Trujillo further demonstrated his determination to enforce the new code of non-discrimination on the basis of political views by swiftly disciplining a property law professor who in the first week of class had told his students, “Everyone knows that the ‘R’ in Republican stands for ‘racist,’” and called a student who challenged his statement a “Nazi.” Dean Trujillo is also actively inviting conservative speakers to an upcoming conference on international law, something

one might think would be taken for granted at an educational institution but unfortunately is not.

The president of Colorado State University reported that the Fort Collins and Pueblo campuses had revised their policies to protect students from “discrimination or harassment on the basis... religion, creed [or] political beliefs.” In addition they had provided instructions to students on how to use campus grievance procedures in the event of a violation of the new policies. These guidelines have already been published in the 2004-2006 Course Catalogue, and have been incorporated into presentations given to each student during orientation. The Memorandum of Understanding and the Senate Joint Resolution have been published on the web page of the president along with a letter in which CSU President Penley emphasizes his personal “commitment to a campus environment that respects the rights of students and faculty to express diverse, and at times, unpopular opinions, [since] that is at the heart of what it means to be a great university.”

In terms of today’s college campuses, this is a revolution in the making, and an idea whose time has come.

### 3. WARD CHURCHILL IS JUST THE BEGINNING

It will probably come as a surprise to many people, both friend and foe alike, that I am opposed to any attempt to fire Colorado University professor, Ward Churchill for the essay (now part of a book) that has become notorious in which he denounces his own country as a genocidal empire, supports America's terrorist enemies, and says that 9/11 was a case of the "chickens coming home to roost."

We live in country whose cornerstone document is a Bill of Rights that guarantees Americans a right to make fools of themselves if they so desire. State institutions like the University of Colorado are forbidden by our Constitution from firing people for expressing opinions, however offensive, idiotic or evil (and Churchill's comments on 9/11 qualify as all three). If, on the other hand, as some have charged, Churchill is not really a Native American as he claims, then of course he should be fired for fraud.

Yes, Churchill is a self-declared ally of our enemies in the terrorist war against us. But so are many academic leftists, including those now rallying to his defense. A decent university system with serious academic standards would probably not have hired Churchill in the first place, let alone promoted him to a position of responsibility and honor as the chair of the Ethnic Studies Department. But that does not give the regents of the university the right to fire him because he has embarrassed them now.

The real question is why wasn't anybody embarrassed before? In 1998, to cite one example, Churchill published a book - *Pacifism as Pathology* - which was essentially an argument for violent revolution to overthrow America's democracy. It was

dedicated to an American terrorist who blew herself up while making a bomb intended to kill Army recruits and their dates at a social dance at Fort Dix. Why weren't any of his colleagues or superiors upset about this?

Churchill is most widely known, in fact, for his academic writings in defense of the Black Panthers, a leftist gang that murdered a dozen people, and for his academic treatises accusing America of plotting and carrying out genocide against minorities throughout its history.

Those who marvel at the current spectacle should keep in mind the fact that there is absolutely nothing new here, nothing that has not been not publicly known for years. The offending essay itself was published three years ago. No, whatever sin he has committed has not only been a matter of public record for more than 30 years, it has been reviewed over and over by duly constituted academic authorities at CU. The opinions that have suddenly catapulted this professor into the limelight have been examined and applauded by his university professors, the search-and-hiring committees that put him on the faculty of CU-Boulder, the promotion-and-tenure committees that made him a full professor, and the department that elected him chair.

In sum, Churchill's views, which are both hateful and ignorant, represent the views of a substantial segment of the academic community at Boulder and on campuses generally. Robert Jensen, a leftist professor at the University of Texas whom I have debated on TV over the Churchill matter, fully shares Churchill's views that America should lose the war on terror and that the terrorists are in fact "resistance" fighters opposing the American empire. A well-known required text for "Peace Studies" programs authored by two professors at well-known universities teaches students that the word "terrorist" describes the American Founders, that "one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter" and that America is the world's "most terrorist state." Churchill's new book, *On the Justice of Roosting Chickens*, which contains his offending essay,



is up for a Gustavus Myers Award, a “civil rights” award administered by academics.

The Churchill affair is an expression of the degenerate state of American social science and humanities faculties. It illuminates the political subversion of the academic enterprise by tenured radicals who have made universities like Boulder political institutions of the left, and in the process so diminished the presence of conservative, libertarian and even centrist thought from university faculties that hate-America radicals like Churchill are now pillars of the profession.

The remedy for this situation is not to purge the Ward Churchills from academic faculties. Their ideas are by now entrenched in the university curriculum and cannot be stamped out by firing an individual even if that were advisable (which it is not). They need to be confronted intellectually. Their scholarly incompetence needs to be exposed, and students need to be presented with an alternative view of history that is closer to reality.

The remedy for the Churchill problem is first of all to embrace the idea of intellectual diversity as a primary university value. This will insulate the university from attempts by legislators to remedy the situation themselves. The American public will accept the presence of an extremist like Churchill on a university faculty if they are convinced that the university is a true marketplace of ideas and that Churchill’s perverse views will be answered by his peers.

The real problem is that there is no such diversity at the University of Colorado at Boulder today. In the present academic system, conservatives are as rare as unicorns, and have an almost impossible barrier to overcome in order to get hired. That is because search and hiring committees are composed of professors like Ward Churchill. That is the problem that the regents of the University of Colorado (and similar institutions) need to begin to address, now.

## **4. THE STRANGE DISHONEST CAMPAIGN AGAINST ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

Ever since I launched the campaign for an Academic Bill of Rights some eighteen months ago in October 2003, the most salient feature of the battle against it has been the dishonesty of its academic opponents. The opposition has gone so far as to compare my campaign for intellectual diversity on college campuses to Mao Zedong's purge of the Communist Party elite, during the "cultural revolution," surely an unintended reflection on the critics themselves. And this is only the beginning of the attacks. William E. Scheurman, chair of the American Federation of Teachers' higher education division, called the legislation "crazy," "Orwellian," and McCarthyite. Scheurman, president of United University Professions, which represents faculty members at the State University of New York, said that the legislation's provisions requiring equal representation of views on controversial issues would require courses on the Holocaust to change so that "on Monday we would hear that the Holocaust was bad, on Wednesday that it was good, and on Friday that it never happened." There is no such provision in the Academic Bill of Rights.

The fact is that I planned this campaign to repair a broken academic process as a non-partisan effort, and specifically to be viewpoint neutral. The very first principle of the Academic Bill of Rights, for example, forbids the firing of professors on the basis of their political views. In launching the campaign I hoped to restore the educational guidelines that had been in place when I was an undergraduate at Columbia University in the 1950s.

These guidelines had protected me as a student with left-wing views in the McCarthy era. My parents were both Communists, teachers who had lost their jobs during the loyalty

investigations of that time. I was then a budding “New Leftist,” and my views reflected my Marxist upbringing. Yet in all the years I was at Columbia, my professors never singled me out for my political leanings, but treated me instead like any other student. The papers I wrote were examined for the way I handled the evidence and constructed my arguments, never for the political conclusions or judgments I made.

Today, I am grateful to my Columbia professors for their professionalism, for the fairness with which they treated me as a student and for their faithfulness to the educational concept. They did not regard the classroom as a place for airing their political prejudices or where students were expected to adopt opinions their teachers regarded as politically correct. As I set out on my campaign of academic reform in the year 2003, the educational environment I experienced at Columbia in the 1950s was the gold standard of what I wanted to achieve.

It is my view based on thirty years of experience around college campuses, that American universities are less intellectually free today than they were in the McCarthy era. The difference is that then the commissars of political correctness were political figures who were outside the university community and whom the university community regarded with hostility as well as fear. Today, the commissars of political correctness are an integral part of the university itself. They are professors and administrators who think it is the university’s place to train students in “progressive” attitudes and ideas, and enlist them in the armies of “social change.” But the university is not – and should not be – a political party. As the liberal scholar Stanley Fish put it in a well-known article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, “Save The World On Your Own Time.”

In devising the Academic Bill of Rights, I was careful to make it viewpoint neutral, since it was my intention to protect *all* students – not just conservative ones -- from McCarthy-like attacks on their political affiliations and beliefs. For the same reason, I believed I could marshal support for my reforms from

members of the academic community even if they came from the left side of the political spectrum.

Of course, I realized that the existing university situation worked against my non-partisan intent and would make such a broad-based coalition difficult. Over the last thirty years there has been a general intellectual cleansing of conservatives from the faculties of American universities, so that by now libertarians, conservatives and religious Christians are a dwindling remnant in any university department. Consequently, most of the abuses of academic freedom were being committed by leftwing professors and most of those on the receiving end of these abuses would be conservative students. At the same time, the university has become increasingly politicized, so that many professors no longer think it improper to introduce their political agendas into their academic classrooms.

I did not delude myself into imagining that it was possible to correct the glaring exclusion of conservatives from university faculties by administrative or legislative fiat. To attempt such a “cultural revolution” would destroy the university itself. Therefore, I concentrated my efforts on the problem of professorial behavior, specifically the unwarranted intrusion of political agendas into the classroom to the detriment of the educational process.

My Academic Bill of Rights can be seen as a modest attempt to restore academic manners to the academic classroom, the decorum appropriate to the tasks of education and the enterprise of learning. This would be a decorum appropriate to an institution dedicated to “the disinterested pursuit of knowledge,” as my own alma mater, Columbia University, had described its mission in the 1950s. Consequently, my Academic Bill of Rights stresses the importance of respecting students’ political and religious views, of not grading them for their political opinions, of not intruding controversial matters that are irrelevant to the subject matter, and of making students aware of the “spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints.” Surely these are not radical

or particularly conservative ideas.

I also realized that since tenured radicals had come to see the university as their political base, and to regard their captive audiences as potential recruits to political causes, there would be a reaction and a howl of disapprobation from some radical faculty quarters once I got started. This reaction was likely to be magnified by the fact that I am a conservative intellectual, and therefore not the best messenger for a non-partisan campaign. On the other hand, these problems have been festering for nearly twenty years in the university, and there appeared to be no other candidate volunteering to address them or to promote institutional reform.

To make my proposed reforms as unassailable as possible in these imperfect circumstances, I took several precautionary measures. In particular, in drafting the Academic Bill of Rights I based the text as closely as possible on the academic freedom principles that had been established by the American Association of University Professors. These principles were first articulated in the 1915 *General Report on Academic Freedom and Tenure*, which was written for the AAUP by the celebrated philosophers John Dewey and Arthur Lovejoy, and is generally regarded as the canonical document of academic freedom.

When I completed drafting my Bill, I sent it to be reviewed and revised by Stephen Balch, a former academic himself and now the president of the National Association of Scholars. Following his revision, I submitted it to Professor Eugene Volokh, one of the pre-eminent scholars of First Amendment law, and to Professor Alan Kors, the head of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education.

I then submitted it to three prominent leftwing academics – Stanley Fish, Todd Gitlin and Michael Berube -- and asked them to review and criticize it. When their reviews were in, I removed everything from the draft to which they objected, without exception. In fact, there was only one provision in the draft to which they did object, and that was a clause that would

have required all hiring, promotion and tenure deliberations to be recorded, and the records to be made available to “duly constituted authorities.” The phrase “duly constituted authorities” was designed to be deliberately vague so that faculties themselves could decide whether the review of these deliberations would be by departments, faculties or administrations. I did not want to be seen to be imposing external authorities on the university process.

In short, I took whatever measures occurred to me as necessary to make my Bill as acceptable to the university community as possible. It was fully my intention at this stage in its development that the Academic Bill of Rights would be adopted by universities themselves as a statement of university policy, and not by legislatures as matter of law.

Two of the three professors to whom I submitted the draft – Todd Gitlin and Michael Berube -- objected to the provision about recording deliberations of hiring and tenure committees. I can’t remember if Stanley Fish concurred with their objection or thought that the provision wouldn’t make any difference at all. In any case, I removed the provision. The point of all this is that the Academic Bill of Rights that has become the basis of legislation in many states, and also the target of uncompromising attacks from the political left was found completely unobjectionable by three prominent leftwing academics at the outset of the campaign to make it the policy of academic institutions (rather than to make it a legislative statute).

I have made this point publicly before with little impact. In fact, the only result of my reviewing these facts has been to inspire an attack on my integrity by the American Association of University Professors, which is the chief opponent of the Bill, through a spokesman named Graham Larkin, who is a faculty member at Stanford. Larkin contacted the three leftwing professors I had consulted and, in an article titled, “More Than a Stretch: David Horowitz’s Imagined Supporters Speak Out,” accused me of misrepresentation, and later escalated the insult,

in a defamatory rant in the online magazine InsideHigherEd.com, a magazine “of record” whose agendas seem indistinguishable from those of Larkin and the AAUP. In the article, Larkin referred to me as a “liar extraordinaire” for repeating the claim about the three academics on a PBS show we appeared on together. Graham’s claim that the professors’ support for the Bill was imaginary is based on his deceptive reporting of what I actually said and, in particular in eliding the distinction between the original design of the Academic Bill of Rights as a proposal for an academic policy that universities would adopt, and the fact that eventually – and only after being frustrated by university administrators and the AAUP itself - - I decided as a last resort to appeal to legislators for redress. I never presented the Academic Bill of Rights as a *legislative* proposal to the three professors I shared the text with, and I have always expressed my willingness to see the legislation withdrawn if universities will institute their own guidelines to protect students in these matters.

Consequently, when Larkin emailed the three professors and asked them if they had endorsed not the text of the Bill but the *legislative* option, they said they had not which I could have told Larkin myself and which I never claimed they did. So the “stretch” and the “lie” is really Larkin’s fabrication not mine. By blurring the distinction between the text of the Academic Bill of Rights, and the legislation based on it, Larkin created the illusion that it was I who had engaged in a deception. The fact remained (and it was the only fact I claimed) that while objecting later to the Bill as proposed legislation, none of the three objected to the *text* of the Academic Bill of Rights itself.

There were other evasions as well. One of the three professors, Michael Berube, wrote Larkin in the email, which gave his article its title, “It’s more than a stretch for David to suggest now that I endorsed the *final* Academic Bill of Rights” (Emphasis added.) As I shall show in minute, Berube did just that. Berube explained to Larkin long after the fact that he

had objected “because it would lead to all manner of absurd conclusions, under the seemingly benign banner of ‘diversity.’ We should ask David if he really wants, for example, the al-Qaeda perspective on the Middle East more widely taught in American universities, because right now it is severely underrepresented.”

But Berube’s memory of the Bill is faulty (what he is remembering are the AAUP’s disingenuous talking points). The only appearance of the word “diversity” in the text of the Academic Bill of Rights occurs in point 4, which Berube had emailed me he especially liked (see the quoted text below). The word “diversity” appears in the following sentence from point 4: “Academic disciplines should welcome a diversity of approaches to unsettled questions.” It’s “more than a stretch” for Berube to suggest now (as he did not in his original email to me) that this sentence would lead to a requirement to include al-Qaeda’s perspective on the Middle East in an *academic* curriculum. Al-Qaeda does not represent part of the “significant spectrum of scholarly viewpoints,” which is how the Academic Bill of Rights describes the diverse viewpoints about which students should be made aware.

When I submitted the original text of the Academic Bill of Rights, which has not been changed, for Berube’s review, this in fact is how he responded:

From: Michael Berube [mailto:mfb12@psu.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2003 7:39 AM  
To: David Horowitz  
Subject: Re:  
Hi David--

The academic bill of rights looks fine to me in every respect but one: the taping of all tenure, search, and hiring committee deliberations. It’s a poison-pill clause, for one thing; completely unenforceable, for another; and last but not least, it would lead to all



manner of ugly unintended consequences, none of which would necessarily have to do with anyone's political or religious beliefs....*Otherwise, everything else looks fine.* I especially like point 4, since I regard all questions in the humanities as unsettled, and have often complained about the academic mode in which people write, "as Foucault has shown. . . ." After all, this ain't mathematics, and we don't deal in proofs. "As Foucault has argued" is a better way to proceed, followed by "Foucault's critics, however, contend. . . ." (Emphasis added.)

Michael

In a similar vein, the objection Professor Todd Gitlin voiced to Larkin was by his own account not an objection to the text I sent him but an objection to the proposal to legislate the text: "I did and do, object to interventions by such higher authorities, as is envisioned in his current campaigns directed at state legislatures," Gitlin wrote. "But the issue didn't come up in our correspondence [over the actual text of the Academic Bill of Rights]. So far as I understood matters then, it was Horowitz's intention to campaign for university resolutions, not legislative interventions." And so it was.

In sum, I have never claimed that Stanley Fish or Todd Gitlin or Michael Berube approved *legislation* in behalf of the Academic Bill of Rights, which admittedly introduces a new dimension of possible concerns into the mix. On the other hand, Todd Gitlin is a professor at a private university, Columbia, which the proposed legislation exempts from its provisions. Yet neither Gitlin nor any group of professors anywhere, has come forward to propose that their own universities adopt an Academic Bill of Rights that will protect students from the abuses that have become ubiquitous on our college campuses.

And it is for this reason that I have turned to legislatures as a *last resort*. In my efforts to persuade university officials to adopt these principles, I soon discovered that administrators live in fear of their radical faculties – a fear well founded, as

Harvard president Lawrence Summers recently discovered. Early in my campaign, I became aware that no university administrator would adopt the Academic Bill of Rights I had written, even when they agreed with it, unless it was proposed by the faculties themselves. But I already knew that this was not going to happen.

I had spent an entire year in discussions with the Republican chairman of the board of regents of a large state university system about adopting the Academic Bill of Rights. The chairman was 100% behind my Bill but he was also paralyzed by the fact that he knew his faculty would not support it. He could not mobilize even a small group of such professors to request that the regents of university adopt the policy although he had more than fifty campuses of his university to choose from. That was an instructive lesson in itself.

Nor was he the only university administrator whom I approached. When I first floated the idea of my Academic Bill of Rights in Colorado, for example, one of my first stops was to meet with Elizabeth Hoffman, then president of the University of Colorado. President Hoffman was very cordial, but told me there was no problem of missing intellectual diversity at her university and besides its official academic freedom regulations already contained all the protections I was proposing.

It took a lot of patience for me to go through these motions with university officials because I had already guessed that administrators would not act in the face of determined faculty opposition, and I already knew that this opposition was inevitable. University faculties that had purged their ranks of conservative professors and whose hostility to conservative intellectuals like myself I had tested in visits to more than 300 campuses were not going to support a policy calling for intellectual pluralism and respect for political difference.

These assumptions were confirmed when I approached the American Association of University professors and asked them to support the Academic Bill of Rights. As noted, the Bill had

been designed to conform to the academic freedom guidelines the AAUP had laid down over the course of nearly a hundred years. But I couldn't even get the AAUP hierarchy to respond to my email asking for their support. When I called the AAUP officials who dealt with academic freedom matters, they said, "we'll get back to you." The next thing I knew, and without any further exchanges or a meeting to sit down and discuss the matter, the famous AAUP Committee "A" had issued a public statement, dissecting my Academic Bill of Rights and pronouncing it "a grave threat to academic freedom."

To make the point absolutely clear: the version of the Academic Bill of Rights that the AAUP publicly denounced as a "grave threat to academic freedom" was *word for word* the same Bill that Stanley Fish, Todd Gitlin and Michael Berube had found unobjectionable. Talk about bad faith. The AAUP statement was a declaration of war on the Academic Bill of Rights that set the tone and message for the opposition in every battle in the campaign to come.

One thing the AAUP statement made unavoidably apparent was that working with the professors who dominated the academy's legislative bodies would be futile. The academy had no intention of honoring its own academic freedom tradition. This left me with only one option, which was to turn to the court of last resort: legislatures. If university administrations would not make respect for intellectual difference official university policy, the legislatures had a responsibility to step in and do so, at least as far as state-funded universities were concerned.

Once the Academic Bill of Rights moved to the legislatures, two important developments occurred. First, the campaign itself began to be noticed. Where previously our efforts had been ignored, we suddenly became a center of public concern in the states where the legislation was proposed. In Colorado, our launch state, both major newspapers -- the *Denver Post* and the *Denver Rocky Mountain News* -- ran front page articles and lead editorials on the Bill. University administrators now were

bound to make a formal response to our concerns and did. Legislative hearings featured student testimonies that began to acquaint the general public with some of the abuses that had inspired the campaign.

The second development was a change in the opposition, which became increasingly vitriolic and careless with the facts. Previously, the arguments made by defenders of the *status quo* were pretty much exhausted by Elizabeth Hoffman's two points: We have no problem, and even if we did, the protections you're proposing are already in place in our own regulations.

Hoffman was to learn the hard way that she actually did have a problem when the public controversy generated over the Ward Churchill affair led to the termination of her job. I had warned her when we met that the monolithic character of her faculty was a scandal waiting to happen. The lack of intellectual diversity on college faculties has produced a new phenomenon in American academic life: the presence of tenured extremists on faculties, and not only at some universities, but at virtually every one.

The existence of such a large cohort of ideological extremists on university faculties is without precedent in the history of American higher education and is a direct consequence of the purge of conservative academics from the university environment. It is a well-known principle of group dynamics that when the room is filled with like-minded individuals, its center moves towards the extreme. At the University of Colorado, that extreme happened to be named Ward Churchill, but it could have been any number of his colleagues in the Ethnic Studies, Black Studies, Women's Studies and Journalism Departments whose faculty majorities share his over-the-edge views.

The second part of Hoffman's argument, which is still being used by university administrations to oppose the Bill has a partial truth to it. Some of the provisions of the Bill are already official regulations, and the sentiment of the Bill is entirely in accord with existing university positions. But

university academic freedom guidelines are generally so vaguely formulated that it is easy to ignore them. Moreover, virtually all of these academic freedom provisions are formulated as faculty rights or faculty responsibilities. Virtually none codify rights that apply specifically to students.

When the academic freedom campaign moved to legislatures the opposition seized on the AAUP's argument that the Bill of Rights was a "grave threat to academic freedom" and would mean dramatic new restrictions on professorial speech. With AAUP spokesmen in the lead, opponents now began to focus on a particular clause in the proposed bills that enjoined professors from introducing "controversial material" into the classroom that was "irrelevant" to the academic subject.

An incident illustrating this problem was related by Representative Gib Armstrong, the sponsor of the Academic Bill of Rights in Pennsylvania. Armstrong referred to a biology class at a campus in the Pennsylvania State University system that was entirely taken up with a showing of *Fahrenheit 9/11*, Michael Moore's propaganda film against the Bush Administration. The film was shown to students during the presidential election campaign of 2004. The biology professor's agenda in showing the film obviously had nothing to do with biology and was clearly political.

Opposition to the clause that would prevent professors from abusing their classrooms in this manner first surfaced in Ohio as a reaction to Senate Bill 24, a version of the Academic Bill of Rights introduced by Senator Larry Mumper. A typical "news" story in the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* expressed that paper's opposition with this editorializing headline: "Legislator Wants Law To Restrict Professors: Religious, Political Discussions Targeted." The news story went on to inveigh against the Bill:

A state lawmaker wants to monitor Ohio's college and university professors, who he says are polarizing campus classrooms by imposing their left-wing ideas on impressionable young students.

Students are being ‘indoctrinated and not educated,’ says Sen. Larry Mumper, a Marion Republican, who introduced Senate Bill 24, described as an ‘academic bill of rights.’ The measure seeks to restrict religious and political classroom discussions that Mumper believes could cross over from intellectual debate to controlling persuasion. It would force Ohio’s public and private universities and colleges to adopt policies forbidding classroom talk on topics not related to the course. It would also chastise professors for imposing their political views on students or for penalizing pupils for holding different opinions. Critics, who call the bill the ‘academic bill of restrictions,’ say it is an assault on free speech.

In another Ohio paper, Elizabeth Schuett, a columnist for the Cox News Service, made this subtle comment on the same legislation: “Good Grief Shades of HUAC and Old Joe McCarthy. The section of the Mumper Bill that elicited these cries of outrage actually reads as follows:

Faculty and instructors shall not infringe the academic freedom and quality of education of their students by persistently introducing controversial matter into the classroom or coursework that has no relation to their subject of study and that serves no legitimate pedagogical purpose.

This “restriction” (which is not actually new) seems like just plain common sense. Students are a captive and vulnerable audience. They have paid tuition to be taught biology or English literature by professionals credentialed in these fields. These professionals have been given authority and power over students and their academic careers precisely because they themselves have gone through a long and arduous credentialing process that qualifies them as “experts” in their particular disciplines. Why then should students be subjected to the political prejudices of these same professors who have no particular expertise in the

field of politics, particularly since students have not paid their tuition to attend a political lecture?

Put another way, how does the freedom to use a biology class for political agendas advance the educational process? In fact, it doesn't. It is more likely to damage the educational process by injuring the trust between the professor and students who don't share his political prejudices and values. A professor who expresses partisan passions in the classroom creates a wall between himself and students who are equally passionate on the other side. Since the existence of this wall can potentially damage the teacher-student relationship, it would seem that any educator truly committed to all the students that come under his charge, would want to avoid such partisan discourse at all costs.

The "controversial matters" clause of the Mumper Senate Bill is designed to protect the academic freedom of students – their freedom to be educated rather than indoctrinated. It would keep the university from becoming a political soapbox for professors who enjoy lifetime job security and are backed by enormous institutional power, which they can use to enforce their prejudices on captive and vulnerable classrooms of students. It would protect students from being denied the education they pay considerable sums of money to obtain.

Political propagandizing in the classroom – a behavior all too common in our universities today – is unprofessional behavior. It is abusive and offensive, and it should be unacceptable to people all along the political spectrum. In its attacks on the Academic Bill of Rights, the American Association has made these seem like controversial statements. This is the height of intellectual dishonesty. These are not controversial statements. They are *already accepted* by university administrations; the problem is they are not enforced.

Thus, the Faculty Handbook of Ohio State University instructs professors as follows: "Academic freedom carries with it correlative academic responsibilities. The principal elements

include the responsibility of teachers to ...(5) Refrain from persistently introducing matters that have no bearing on the subject matter of the course;...(7) Differentiate carefully between official activities as teachers and personal activities as citizens, and to act accordingly.”

This is precisely what the Mumper Academic Bill of Rights –which has been denounced by the AAUP, the ACLU, Ohio Democrats and the liberal Ohio press–says, and in so many words.

The distinction between what is appropriate to a classroom (academic discourse on the subject of faculty expertise) and what is inappropriate (political attitudinizing) could not be clearer than the description in the Ohio State Faculty Handbook and Senate Bill 24. The one is the responsibility of professors to engage in; the other is their duty to avoid.

The Ohio State Faculty Handbook is not unique in making this distinction. At Penn State University, where the biology professor showed *Fahrenheit 9/11* in an obvious play to influence student votes in the November election, this behavior is also forbidden. Policy HR 64 in the Penn State Policy Manual states:

No faculty member may claim as a right the privilege of discussing in the classroom controversial topics outside his/her own field of study. The faculty member is normally bound not to take advantage of his/her position by introducing into the classroom provocative discussions of irrelevant subjects not within the field of his/her study.

The Penn State Policy Manual explains the rationale behind its restriction of professorial speech in the classroom in these words:

The faculty member is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his/her subject. The faculty member is, however, responsible for the maintenance of appropriate standards of scholarship and teaching ability.



It is not the function of a faculty member in a democracy to indoctrinate his/her students with ready-made conclusions on controversial subjects. The faculty member is expected to train students to think for themselves, and to provide them access to those materials, which they need if they are to think intelligently. Hence, in giving instruction upon controversial matters the faculty member is expected to be of a fair and judicial mind, and to set forth justly, without supersession or innuendo, the divergent opinions of other investigators.

There is a reason why all these injunctions against inappropriate faculty behavior sound similar. That is because they are all taken from academic freedom principles articulated by the American Association of University Professors going back to the 1915 *General Report*. Thus, the 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* of the AAUP warns: “Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing their subject, but they should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.”

In other words, the AAUP, which is the leading force in the movement against the Academic Bill of Rights, is actually waging a campaign against its own principles, and is thus in a posture of colossal bad faith. But so are university administrations and faculties who are not only actively disregarding their own academic freedom guidelines, but opposing them when they appear in the bills sponsored by our campaign.

This bad faith of the academic community explains the need for legislative redress. If the universities will not enforce their own academic freedom guidelines, but are willing to let professors abuse the academic freedom of their students, then legislators have a fiduciary responsibility to step in and see that this situation is remedied. In the case of private universities, the same responsibility falls to professors and to the accrediting institutions for higher education.

Is it feasible for professors to keep the political opinions and prejudices they hold as private citizens out of the classroom? Why not? I attended school for 19 years from kindergarten to the graduate level, where I received my M.A. 43 years ago at the University of California, Berkeley. In all that time I do not remember a single teacher or a single professor on a single occasion in any classroom make one political comment, or reveal their political prejudices. If the teachers of my generation could be that professional, so can the teachers of this.

## **5. THE COLORADO EXAM: A CASE OF INDOCTRINATION**

My campaign for academic freedom has roused up a storm of unprincipled opposition from the academic left. Although the campaign is based on the academic freedom tradition of the American Association of University Professors extending back to 1915 it has been compared by its opponents - including the current leadership of the AAUP and the American Federation of Teachers -- to the “red scare” and the “McCarthy witch-hunt” and even Mao Zedong’s purge of Communist Party officials during the “Cultural Revolution.”

The hysterical nature of these accusations should be sufficient in themselves to demonstrate the bad faith of the opposition. The “red scare” was, in fact, a police roundup of terrorist suspects after American anarchists sent 100 mail bombs to targets earmarked for assassination, including the attorney general of the United States. The McCarthy “witch-hunt” targeted members of a conspiratorial Communist Party which is now known through the opening of the Soviet archives to have been conducting extensive espionage against the United States. Mao’s cultural revolution resulted in the disappearances and deaths of Communist Party officials and intellectuals who failed to follow his political diktats.

Likening the campaign for academic freedom to such historical events is to employ precisely the political tactics its opponents claim to deplore. The academic freedom campaign is in fact an effort to end blacklists and the imposition of intellectual orthodoxies and does not target any party or political persuasion. The Academic Bill of Rights is not about Republicans and Democrats or liberals and conservatives. It is about restoring the integrity of the academic process, and about determining

what is and is not appropriate to an academic classroom.

The campaign for an Academic Bill of Rights is not even about legislative measures to address these problems. Legislation became a last resort only when faculty organizations like the AAUP refused to discuss protecting students against these abuses and set itself against university reform. The AAUP took this position despite the fact that these provisions were drawn from the AAUP's own academic freedom guidelines.

On the other hand, when university administrators have shown a readiness to step forward to discuss the provisions of the Academic Bill of Rights in good faith, as happened in Colorado, legislators withdrew the Bill in favor of a "Memorandum of Understanding" under which all provisions are implemented by the university without legislative intervention. This was a victory of the academic freedom campaign, but it has been cynically reported as a "defeat" by its opponents.

Another dishonest tactic of the opposition has been to seize the slightest ambiguity in the information we have been gathering in order to discredit the idea that there is any problem at all. The most prominent example of this strategy involved a final exam question in a criminology course given at the University of Northern Colorado. We had drawn attention to this case to show that a fundamental principle of academic freedom - the distinction between *education* and *indoctrination* - had been ignored. Among the vigilantes who pounced on our story to discredit it were writers for *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *Media Matters.com*, *the Associated Press* and the *Greeley Tribune*, a local Colorado paper whose readership includes the University of Northern Colorado community.

It was one of hundreds of stories we had gathered and one of dozens that I regularly referred to in my speeches and articles. This one merited attention because it was dramatic and easily understood. A student reported to us in late 2003 that she had been required to answer a "question" on her final exam that

instructed students to “Explain why George Bush is a war criminal.” The test was administered approximately three weeks after the fall of Baghdad in early May 2003. In responding to the instruction, the student explained instead why she thought Saddam Hussein was a war criminal and was given an “F.”

When we initially reported this story, and throughout the academic year 2003-2004, we did not disclose the name of the student, since she was too frightened to come forward and asked us to protect her anonymity. (We did not know the name of the professor, and would not have reported it at the time in any case. Our purpose was not to indict individuals but to show the existence of a problem.) After receiving her failing grade on the exam, the student had submitted her case to a university appeals process, and - according to her testimony -- her grade was subsequently raised. The university will not make any statement about the result of the process, except to say that the student's final grade was a “B.”

For almost a year, the Colorado exam case was one of a number of examples I used in speeches and articles to deplore the tendency of faculty ideologues to use their classroom authority to indoctrinate students, betraying their academic responsibilities in the process. Then two incidents occurred to draw attention to this case. The first was the surfacing of Ward Churchill who put a face on the faculty members I was alluding to, as it happened at a Colorado University. Churchill was an academic so extreme in his viewpoints, and so unscholarly in his temperament that no one would have been surprised if he had actually imposed on his own classes an exam like the one in question. The second development was the sponsoring of an Academic Bill of Rights by a member of the Senate in Ohio.

With few exceptions the Ohio press was hostile to the Academic Bill of Rights, treating it as a threat to professorial speech, even though it was a perfectly liberal document drawn from the very canons of academic freedom devised by the American

Association of University Professors. In every state, editorial writers and reporters mostly followed the talking points of AAUP spokesmen opposing the bill. In its headline describing the Bill, for example, the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, typically misrepresented the academic freedom legislation as introducing new *restrictions* into professorial speech, even though its purpose was quite the opposite -- to introduce intellectual diversity into the curriculum and to encourage open and respectful dialogue in the classroom.

In addition to its slanted headline and story, the *Plain Dealer* also published an op-ed piece by a leftwing professor. Mano Singham, who suggested that I had made the whole Colorado incident up -- the student, the exam and the professor. To be fair I had opened myself to this line of attack possible by mistakenly referring to the case as one that had come up at legislative hearings held in Colorado in December 2003. It had actually been referred to in a *second* round of legislative hearings in September 2004, when Kay Norton, the President of the University of Northern Colorado mentioned it.

In his *Plain Dealer* column, Professor Singham claimed to have contacted the provost of the University and the political science department (even though it was a criminology exam in the Sociology Department). "They had never heard of this story," he wrote in his column, "and were all surprised to hear that they were supposedly harboring this fiend." To jump to his conclusion, Singham simply ignored the testimony by president Norton and failed to contact the appropriate department.

The leftwing smear site, MediaMatters, jumped on the case and alleged that inventing the facts was a pattern of mine and of the campaign for academic freedom. A leftwing education site, InsideHigherEd.com, then reported these malicious speculations under the headline, 'The Poster Child Who Can't Be Found,' which was two misleading insinuations in one. First, the student had never been a 'poster child' for our campaign, but was only one of the many cases we had posted on

our website at [www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org](http://www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org). Second, the only reason the student couldn't be found was that no one had really looked for her (or asked us to find her). To be fair, *InsideHigherEd.com* did report my objections to the thrust of its story, and my offer to locate the student and retract the story should it prove wrong. But this did not deter MediaMatters hundreds of leftwing blogsites hostile to the academic freedom campaign from spreading the 'story' of our invented incident across the Internet. Nor did it prompt *InsideHigherEd* to correct its own story when further information proved it fundamentally wrong.

*InsideHigherEd.com* did report my objections to the thrust of its story, and the offer I made to locate the student and retract the story should it prove wrong. Meanwhile reports of our allegedly invented incident spread like wildfire across the web on leftwing blogsites hostile to the academic freedom campaign itself.

With our story under siege, I had my staff contact the student who was on spring break and ask her for the name of the professor, which turned out to be Robert Dunkley, as well as additional information about the criminology class in question. I published the new information, and demanded an apology. In doing so I misjudged the bad faith of the opposition, which ignored the evidence that validated our story and selectively used other information we provided - in particular the name of the professor -- to escalate the attacks.

Scott Jaschik, editor of *InsideHigherEd.com* called both the university and Professor Dunkley, and wrote a story without checking his claims with us. The result was the most damaging report yet.

Titled, "Tattered Poster Child" (thus repeating the false claim that this was a singular case) the Jaschik story reported first that Dunkley, was not a "wild-eyed liberal" (implying that we had said he was) but a Republican. In fact our academic freedom campaign was never about leftwing abuses as opposed to right wing abuses. It was about academic abuses without regard

for viewpoint. I had never identified Dunkley as a liberal and I have in fact defended liberal students against conservative professors who have targeted them for indoctrination. For the record we have scoured the election roles and Republican Party contribution records and can find no evidence that Dunkley is telling the truth even in this trivial matter. But even if Dunkely were a Republican I would still have defended this student against him.

Jaschik's article further reported that the famous exam question was not "required," as the student had claimed, and that the student got a "B" grade not an "F" as we reported. Finally, he reported that according to Dunkley and the university spokeswoman, the text of question itself was different from what we had said it was.

These were serious charges. The only bright lining for us was that the new exam question that Dunkely provided to Jaschik was very close to the one we had reported and thus was also a clear case of indoctrination. This prompted me to make a serious tactical mistake.

Instead of waiting to refer these matters to the student for her response - she was still on spring break and not easy to reach - I decided to immediately post an article conceding that we had possibly erred on some minor points. I say "possibly" because Dunkley had destroyed all copies of the exam and the students' answers, even though this was a violation of university regulations. I felt confident in offering this "correction" because even if the university's and Dunkley's claims were true, the bottom line was that the essay question still required one right answer on a controversial matter of opinion, which was a form of indoctrination. I assumed that the students' claims would be given a fair shake, particularly because of Dunkley's destructive act. I couldn't have been more wrong.

The student had reported to us that she had originally received an "F" on the exam for writing about Saddam Hussein. Dunkley claimed he gave her a bad grade (he will not say what



the grade was) because she handed in a two-page answer when three were required. Since Dunkley had destroyed her exam, this claim seemed suspicious on its face, though no independent press source mentioned this fact.

Although Dunkley and the university referred to her final “B” grade as a refutation of the student’s claim to have received an “F,” neither of them would say (and neither were asked by the press) whether they were claiming she also got a “B” on the original exam and not an “F.” If she did, why would she have gone through an appeal? In fact, the student told us that the “B” grade was her final grade in the course, while the exam grade was indeed an “F.” She had been able to raise her grade through the appeals process when the university had allowed her to receive credit for her class work even though she had been failed on the exam itself. That’s how she ended up with the “B.”

A short time later, I received this confirming email from the student: “I did fail the final exam, at least that is what I was told, however based on Dunkley’s and the school’s comments you never really know what is truthful. It has always been my understanding and my story that I got an ‘F’ on the exam but a ‘B’ in the class. I don’t think Dunkley disputed that but he is such a manipulative person you never really know.” Not a single press source that had reported the claims of Dunkley and the university spokesman so much as commented on the student’s defense of her claim.

In my “correction” article, I had included the exam question that the university spokesman provided to Jaschik, and which our student claimed Dunkley had doctored *after* the exam, and specifically for the appeals process. The exam question he supplied was this:

The American government campaign to attack Iraq was in part based on the assumptions that the Iraqi government has ‘Weapons of Mass Destruction.’ This was never proven prior to the U.S. police action/war and even President Bush, after the capture of Baghdad, stated:

‘we may never find such weapons.’ Cohen’s research on deviance discussed this process of how the media and various moral entrepreneurs and government enforcers can conspire to create a panic. How does Cohen define this process? Explain it in depth. Where does the social meaning of deviance come from? Argue that the attack on Iraq was deviance based on negotiable statuses. Make the argument that the military action of the U.S. attacking Iraq was criminal?

In reading this it occurred to me that there were several transparent peculiarities about the text. It referred to the deviant criminal behavior of states (rather than individuals), which is a complex subject appropriate to an advanced course in international law, not an introductory survey course in criminology, particularly one administered by the sociology department for sophomores. Dunkley’s course is described like this in the 2002-2003 UNC Course Catalog: “SOC 346 - Criminology. Survey criminal behavior generally, including theories of causation, types of crime, extent of crime, law enforcement, criminal justice, punishment and treatment.” The criminal behavior of states does not appear to be part of the course. States are not commonly the subjects of criminology courses because states normally commit and normally sanction acts that would be criminal if committed by individuals. This suggested to me that to defend question in the appeals process, Dunkley had substituted the United States as the criminal actor in place of the original subject, which was George Bush.

I did not bring this up in my response to this round of attacks, but confined myself to the very last sentence of the exam question, which was a declarative statement ending inexplicably with a question mark. Notwithstanding the inappropriate punctuation, the sentence enjoined students to give only one answer to a highly controversial question. It was in fact, exactly the same instruction that we had originally reported and objected to -- except that the war criminal was the United States instead of

George W. Bush. On the other hand, as the chief executive of the United States, George Bush would have been equally guilty.

Since our original point had been validated - the exam *was* an indoctrination, I decided to post these thoughts and concede that perhaps we had erred in stating our case about the grade and even the form of the question more authoritatively than we should have (I will explain our position on the issue of whether the question was "required" in a moment). I did this to show our good faith. Better to concede the uncertainties and possible error about minor points - I thought - in order to return the focus to the main issue, which was the inappropriateness of the question itself.

I wrote: "So while we apologize for not having fully checked and corrected this story, we conclude that our complaint about the exam was justified. What happened in Professor Dunkley's class at the University of Northern Colorado is not education, it is indoctrination. And that violates the academic freedom of the students who were subjected to it." I thought that would be the end of it. This was a huge mistake.

*MediaMatters* was the first to attack. I had accused *Media Matters* of slander for spreading the false story that I had invented the student, the exam and professor. *Media Matters* not only never retracted that falsehood, but now embellished its accusations: "Under fire right-wing campus watchdog admits Colorado exam story is phony after accusing *Media Matters* of slander." Literally hundreds of leftwing blogsites picked up the "phony" story angle and circulated it on the Internet: "Over the past week we've watched as David Horowitz's reputation for accuracy and integrity have taken a beating...at the hands of David Horowitz," commented leftwing blogster Roger Ailes (not the FoxNewsChannel Ailes).

Meanwhile, the *Greeley Tribune*, interviewed Dunkley and swallowed his claims whole: "Professor Calmly Refutes Test Tales," was its headline. Picking up an equally uncritical AP

story (based on the one-sided *Tribune* interview), the *Denver Post*, followed suit. Five days later, the Greeley Tribune followed its sweetheart Dunkley interview with an editorial attack on my integrity and credibility, which began: “Intentional ignorance is as bad as lying. If David Horowitz didn't know that before the essay question controversy at the University of Northern Colorado, he should now.” The entire editorial was based on no evidence or independent reporting, but solely on the questionable claims of a professor who had destroyed his exam and whose student had succeeded in getting redress at a special hearing over her unfair grade.

In its interview with Dunkley, the *Tribune* described the alleged exam he had come up with after the fact in these disingenuous words: “UNC released a copy of the test from his class last week. The instructions tell students that the question which reportedly offended the student is optional. The question is 119 words, not the one sentence reported.”

Of course UNC did no such thing, because it did not have a copy of the original exam; it had Dunkley’s “recollection” of his exam. The document he submitted with reconstructed essay questions has a roman numeral I section but no roman numeral II, an additional unexplained problem. The document contains the four exam essay questions, of which two were required and two the student had to choose between.

At the end of this article, I am appending the four essay questions supplied by Dunkley after the fact so the reader can judge the merits of this case. The reader will see that the first optional question is just as controversial as the Iraq question and also requires a single answer.

The first optional question begins like this: “The taboo (deviance) society places on homosexual relationships and gay lifestyles today is beginning to subside. Attempts are being made to allow gay marriages, which appears right around the corner. Make an argument that would support gay marriages and gay families and explain how this additional type of family

could help prevent crime...” It is not too difficult to imagine why a conservative student might regard the two “optional” questions as a requirement to write an essay expressing views with which she could not agree.

Like the Iraq war “question” the instruction to defend gay marriage requires a politically correct answer to a controversial issue. It is another unprofessional attempt by Dunkley to force his students to defend his own political agendas.

Indeed all of the exam questions devised by Dunkley, which include explications of “power theory,” “Marxism” and “feminism,” are more appropriate to a training course in leftwing theory, than to an academic course in a public university. None of these questions reflect a professorial interest in opening students’ minds to a diversity of ways in which one might look at crime and the family.

The final examination for Sociology 346, was a take home exam given to students on May 5 and due on May 9, 2003, according to the information supplied by Dunkley and the University of Northern Colorado, through its spokesperson Gloria Reynolds. As my colleague Ryan Call observed upon receiving a copy of the document the dating of the exam puts the whole matter of who is lying in this dispute between the student and Professor Dunkley in a new light.

Recall how the text of the disputed exam question begins: “The American government campaign to attack Iraq was in part based on the assumptions that the Iraqi government has ‘Weapons of Mass Destruction.’ This was never proven prior to the U.S. police action/war and even President Bush, after the capture of Baghdad, stated: ‘we may never find such weapons.’...”

Baghdad fell on April 13, 2003, and the exam question was handed out roughly three weeks later. As of this date, May 5, 2003, neither President Bush nor anyone in the White House was saying “we may never find such weapons.” Here is what President Bush actually said to reporters on May 31, 2003, three weeks after the exam:

You remember when Colin Powell stood up in front of the world, and he said Iraq has got laboratories, mobile labs to build biological weapons.... They're illegal. They're against the United Nations resolutions, and we've so far discovered two [the labs were later judged to not contain any such weapons, that they most likely were used for weather balloons]. And we'll find more weapons as time goes on, But for those who say we haven't found the banned manufacturing devices or banned weapons, they're wrong. We found them.

This statement by Bush, conclusively reiterating his belief that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and made more than three weeks after the exam was handed to students, lends credence to the student's claim that the exam question supplied by Dunkley to the university and the media was not the original exam question. The student does not have any recollection of the Bush quote appearing in the original exam, or the final sentence as supplied by Dunkley after the fact.

When I brought this evidence to InsideHigherEd.com. It's editor refused to concede that it showed anything at all about Dunkley's claims (though he did offer to link any story I wrote about the case). When I brought it to *The Greeley Tribune*, its editors came up with an AP story by White House correspondent Ron Fournier that appeared on April 24, 2003. This would have been two weeks before the Dunkley exam was handed to students. The story was headlined "Bush Says Weapons of Mass Destruction May Have Been Destroyed." Although the Bush quote in Dunkley's exam ("we may never find such weapons") did not appear in the AP article, this created enough ambiguity so that someone intent on defending Dunkley could plausibly claim that the professor had misread the Fournier piece and made up the Bush quote on the basis of its headline.

To do so, however, Dunkley would have had to ignore the actual text of the Fournier article which quoted Bush unambigu-

ously asserting that weapons of mass destruction did exist in Iraq and would be found: ‘[Saddam Hussein] tried to fool the United Nations and did for 12 years by hiding these weapons. And so it’s going to take time to find them,’ the President said at the Lima Army Tank Plant. ‘But we know he had them. And whether he destroyed them, moved them or hid them, we’re going to find out the truth.’ ”

Dunkley and others have made one further claim, which is to suggest that the professor was playing “devil’s advocate” in compelling students to make the case for gay marriage or explain why the United States and its President were conducting a criminal operation in Iraq. This seems a very large stretch when all four essay questions on this final exam required students to explain and apply leftwing theories or justify leftwing prejudices on controversial political issues. It is more plausible that both the professor and his course were committed to these points of view. This is a conclusion reinforced by the way the actual views of Bush were distorted by Dunkley to imply their opposite.

Although the destruction of the evidence by Dunkley and the refusal of the university administration to provide a candid accounting of the appeals process make a conclusive verdict impossible, it seems beyond question that Dunkley’s exam was an indefensible attempt to force students in Sociology 346 to demonstrate a knowledge of leftwing theory (and no other theories) and to argue the radical point of view on two extremely controversial issues in order to get a good grade.

This is indoctrination not education, a distinction that has been recognized for nearly a hundred years by the academic profession. As the Dunkley case shows the distinction was not observed in this Colorado exam and - more troubling -- neither the university system nor the nation’s press seems to care.

## THE TEXT OF THE DUNKLEY EXAM

(As supplied by UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN COLORADO  
spokesperson, GLORIA REYNOLDS)

I. The following questions are essay. Answer as completely as possible. Be thorough and concise, but make a solid argument and logical case for your answer. Make sure you answer all questions sought. All Students must answer questions 1 & 2. Select one question from 3 & 4 to answer. The minimum number of pages per question is three (3) typed, double spaced, and stapled to the test questions.

1) Compare and contrast Power Control Theory and Integrated-Structural Marxism. How do they analyze the family in terms of social class? How does this class discussion relate to crime? Which family members are essentially excluded in their analysis? What are the weak points of both theories and what are their strengths? Which theory do you support?

2) The Feminist movement of the 1980s offered a significant “new way” in looking at law and its affect on women. The idea of equality is an issue still unresolved. Explain what the equality doctrine is. How should women define and respond to sexual differences? Can the claim of special treatment for women be considered problematic? Why? How can this be neutralized? What do feminists mean by “Doing Law?”

3) The taboo (deviance) society places on homosexual relationships and gay lifestyles today is beginning to subside. Attempts are being made to allow gay marriages, which appears right around the corner. Make an argument that would support gay marriages and gay families and explain how this additional type of family could help prevent crime (use one of the above theories from question #1 in your discussion and Shaw and McKay’s analysis of social ecology).



4) The American government campaign to attack Iraq was in part based on the assumptions that the Iraqi government had “Weapons of Mass Destruction.” This was never proven prior to the US police action/war and even President Bush, after the capture of Baghdad, stated “we may never find such weapons.” Cohen's research on deviance discusses this process of how the media and various moral entrepreneurs and government enforcers can conspire to create panic. How does Cohen define this process? Explain it in-depth. Where does the social meaning of deviance come from? Argue that the attack on Iraq was deviance based on negotiable statuses. Make the argument that the military action of the US attacking Iraq was criminal?

## 6. 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 present-

ing 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.



INDOCTRINATION OF EDUCATION?



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

# INDOCTRINATION or EDUCATION?

[www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org](http://www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org)

AT LOCAL BOOKSTORES EVERYWHERE,  
OR CALL **800-752-6562**

OR **WWW.FRONTPAGEMAG.COM**

COVER PRICE \$10

“This year's meeting (of the American Federation of Teachers) featured a mix of discussions about those the union dislikes (David Horowitz, President Bush, corporate-style college presidents) and goals for the next year (more organizing of campuses, and a stronger push to help part-time faculty members). Horowitz, the creator of the Academic Bill of Rights, was on everyone's mind at the meeting, with AFT leaders vowing an all-out campaign against the legislation in both its federal and state versions.

~ INSIDEHIGHERED.COM

A demand for [“intellectual diversity”] is being promoted by, you might say, intellectual entrepreneurs. Perhaps the most significant is Students for Academic Freedom (SAF), founded in 2003 by David Horowitz and already boasting 150 campus chapters.

~ BRIAN ANDERSON, *SOUTH PARK CONSERVATIVES*

# STUDENTS FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

is a national organization of students dedicated to promoting intellectual diversity and educational values on college campuses.

For information contact Sara Dogan at  
[sara@studentsforacademicfreedom.org](mailto:sara@studentsforacademicfreedom.org)  
or call 202-393-0123