



Campus Blacklist

David Horowitz

Students for Academic Freedom Information Center
1015 15th Street NW, Suite 900, Washington DC 20005
202-969-2467

www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org

ISBN: 1-886442-37-1

\$3⁰⁰

Campus Blacklist

Contents

Introduction: The Problem and Its Solution 5

Part One—A Personal Survey

- 1. Missing Diversity 9
- 2. Blacklist 14
- 3. The Campus Public Square 23

Part Two—Studies

- 1. Report on Faculty Bias 31
- 2. Report on Commencement Speakers 37

Appendix: The Academic Bill of Rights 45

Introduction: The Problem and Its Solution

Universities are among our most important social institutions. They educate our youth, train future leaders, provide information and research, advance scientific and medical knowledge, generate technological innovation, and shape the attitudes that define us as a people. Yet universities are also anomalies in our national framework. Vital as they are to the functioning of our democracy, they are themselves undemocratic.

Overall, there is little or no accountability on the part of these institutions to the wider community that supports them and underwrites the affluence to which their principals have become accustomed. Whether private or public, whether operating under the aegis of state-appointed boards or private corporations, universities are effectively ruled by internal bureaucracies, which operate under a cloak of secrecy and are protected from oversight by privileges and traditions that date back to feudal times.

Academic hiring committees are elitist and self-selecting, and function like medieval guilds to insulate themselves from external scrutiny. Once an academic hire is made, faculty “tenure” provides lifetime employment to the competent and the incompetent, the scholar and the ideologue alike. This means that outside the hard sciences and practical professions, there is no bottom-line in the university for bad ideas or discredited doctrines. Working in combination with these academic realities, the tolerant attitudes of a free society have made it possible for ideological minorities in the social sciences and related fields to enforce a political conformity otherwise incomprehensible in a modern democracy.

As a result, while the red and blue electoral map reveals an America that is almost evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals, in the nation’s universities Republicans (and conservatives) have become almost as rare as unicorns. In most schools, Republicans are less well represented than Greens, Marxists and sects of the far left. This is an indefensible situation with far-reaching implications.

“Diversity” may be one of the contemporary university’s most cherished values, but university officials with near universality have interpreted diversity to mean anything but a plurality of viewpoints—arguably the most important diversity of all. What is knowledge if it is thoroughly one-sided, or intellectual freedom if it is only freedom to conform? And what is a “liberal education,” if one point of view is for all intents and purposes excluded from the classroom? How can students get a good education, if they are only being told one side of the story? The answer is they can’t. Even for \$30,000 a year.

In the spring of 2002, a dinner was held at Harvard to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the *Salient*, a conservative campus paper not supported by the university. One of the dinner speakers was the *Salient*’s lone faculty sponsor, Professor Harvey Mansfield—so notorious for being the only outspoken conservative at Harvard that this oddity was the focus of a *New York Times* feature story. The other speaker was *National Review* managing editor Jay Nordlinger, whose talk was titled, “The Conservative on Campus:”

I attended the University of Michigan, class of ’86. To say the place was soaked in political correctness is to say too little. You got the clear sense that if you weren’t careful in what you said or did things could turn out badly for you. Ideology—not scholarship, not learning—was king on that campus (“dictator” would be a better word.)

A fellow student who took chemistry, physics, and the other hard sciences came back to the dorm one day to say that one of his instructors had spent the whole session talking up the Communist guerrillas in El Salvador. This was in math or some similar subject.

Professors and—even more—teaching assistants were using their lecterns as political podiums. They were proselytizing and indoctrinating. I thought this was wrong—quite apart from my own political beliefs, which were just forming. I thought: “You know, I wouldn’t do this, if I had this power, this responsibility—the academic lectern.”¹

Political indoctrination in the classroom and the exclusion of conservatives from college faculties are violations of academic free-

¹ *National Review Online*, May 23, 2002. The text above has been edited.

dom and an offense to the very concept of a liberal education. The introduction of political agendas into the curriculum is a product of forces unleashed in the 1960s, which have consciously transformed universities into the political monoliths they have become.

It is time to remind ourselves that not so long ago the consensus of educators was that political indoctrination in the classroom by professors of whatever persuasion was an unacceptable abuse. The 1967 “Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students” adopted by the American Association of University Professors clearly states that the “freedom to teach and freedom to learn” are inseparable.² Responding to a controversy over a course at UC Berkeley in the spring of 2002, UC Chancellor Robert Berdahl said, “It is imperative that our classrooms be free of indoctrination—indoctrination is not education.” Unfortunately, there is virtually no college administration today—including that of UC Berkeley—that is willing to defend this student right.

What can be done about the current state of affairs? The answer begins with the recognition that this situation has developed because of the public’s inattention to what happens inside the institutions that its tuition fees, tax dollars, and voluntary contributions make possible. The remedy lies first in insisting on greater scrutiny of these institutions, and second on resolving that the abuses will be corrected.

To this end, the Center has created an Academic Freedom Information Center at www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org and is calling on university and legislative officials to adopt the “Academic Bill of Rights,” the text of which is included in this publication.

We call on university administrations to implement the following remedies:

- 1) Conduct an inquiry into political bias in the hiring process for faculty and administrators, and seek ways to promote fairness towards—and inclusion of—diverse and under-represented mainstream perspectives;
- 2) Conduct an inquiry into political bias in the selection of com-

² William Van Alstyne, *Freedom and Tenure in the University*, Duke 1993 Appendix C, pp. 411-418. A discussion of the concept of academic freedom along with an account of recent abuses is to be found in Harvey Silverglate and Alan Kors, *The Shadow University*, NY 1998

mencement speakers and seek ways to promote fairness towards—and inclusion of—diverse and under-represented mainstream perspectives;

3) Conduct an inquiry into political bias in the allocation of student program funds—including speakers’ fees—and seek ways to promote fairness towards and inclusion of diverse and under-represented mainstream perspectives;

4) Institute a zero tolerance policy towards the obstruction of campus speakers and meetings and the destruction of informational literature distributed by campus groups.

5) Adopt a code of conduct for faculty that ensures that classrooms will welcome diverse viewpoints and not be used for political indoctrination, which is a violation of students’ academic freedom.

6) Adopt the “Academic Bill of Rights” as university policy.

Some may be skeptical of an appeal to university authorities to solve a problem which they have helped to create. We believe, however, that the principles of fairness and inclusion resonate so deeply with the American people and the American character that they will find a response in the university community.

The principle of diversity is well established in federal law and has been accepted by virtually all existing collegiate administrations. By adopting the “Academic Bill of Rights,” the means are readily available—without jeopardizing the integrity and independence of the university system—to redress an intolerable situation involving illegal and unconstitutional hiring methods along with teaching practices that are an abuse of academic freedom.

PART ONE: A PERSONAL SURVEY

1. Missing Diversity

In the fall of 2001, I spoke at a large public university in the eastern United States, which will remain nameless to protect the innocent. It was one of more than 30 colleges I had visited during the school year and, as usual, my invitation had come from a small group of campus conservatives who also put together a small dinner for me at a local restaurant. Our conclave reflected the current state of conservatism in the American university. Not only were our numbers small, there were no deans or university administrators present, and only one professor. Open conservatives are an isolated and harassed minority on today's college campuses, where they enjoy little respect and almost no support from institutional authorities.

Although I am a nationally known public intellectual, the author of many books and a Fox News contributor, the absence of administration representatives at these dinners that normally precede my campus speeches is entirely predictable. (In nearly 200 campus appearances in the last 10 years, I can think of only two exceptions.) When I spoke to 1,000 students at the University of Michigan in the spring of 2002, there were three university vice presidents seated in the balcony, but not one thought to introduce himself to me before or after my remarks. My experience as a conservative in this regard is not unique. By contrast, if I were an anti-American, radical like Angela Davis, deans of the college would wait on me and professors would confer academic credits on students for attending my appearances. On many occasions my speech would be an official campus event.

Angela Davis—a lifelong Communist zealot with no identifiable scholarly achievement—is a celebrated campus figure (there is even an “Angela Davis Lounge” at the University of Michigan to honor her). Consequently, her attraction for like-minded peers now entrenched in university administrations is understandable, if regrettable. But the same disparity would be discernible between a less well-known leftist and almost any comparable conservative. It reflects a reality of campus life. While conservatives often make up

a large proportion of the student body—and in some cases even a plurality—conservative professors and administrators are notably hard to find. Not only are the overwhelming majority of college professors fashionably “liberal” and Democratic Party partisans, most faculties also feature a strong contingent of hard leftists whose views can only be regarded as extreme, whose concentrated numbers allow them to dominate (and even define) entire academic fields. These faculty radicals are also available to sponsor an impressive array of campus political groups, which—if the university is large enough—may receive hundreds of thousands of dollars for their activities from general student funds.

Among those invited to my dinner was a silver-haired history professor at the university, who served as the faculty sponsor of the Young America’s Foundation club that invited me. This man represented a dying breed of faculty conservatives who had become tenured in an era when hiring committees were not yet applying a litmus to exclude those whose political views were not suitably left. The transformation that followed was succinctly described by the distinguished intellectual historian, John P. Diggins, at an annual meeting of the American Studies Association in Costa Mesa, CA, a decade ago. Diggins told the assembled academics: “When my generation of liberals was in control of university faculties in the Sixties, we opened the doors to the hiring of radicals in the name of diversity. We thought you would do the same. But you didn’t. You closed the doors behind you.”³

Diggins’ observation provides the template for what has happened to American universities in the last thirty years. The liberal academy of the 1950s and 1960s, whose ideals were shaped by Charles Eliot and Matthew Arnold and whose mission was “the disinterested pursuit of knowledge” is no more. Leftists tenured after the 1960s first transformed these institutions into political battlegrounds and then redefined them as “agencies of social change.” In the process, they first defeated and then excluded peers whom they perceived as obstacles to their politicized academic agendas.

Some years ago a distinguished member of this radical generation, Richard Rorty, summarized its achievement in the following

³ Quoted in David Horowitz and Peter Collier, *Surviving the PC University*, Center for the Study of Popular Culture, Los Angeles, 1993. I was present when Diggins made the statement.

words: “The power base of the left in America is now in the universities, since the trade unions have largely been killed off. The universities have done a lot of good work by setting up, for example, African-American studies programs, Women’s Studies programs, Gay and Lesbian Studies programs. They have created power bases for these movements.”⁴ Rorty is a professor of comparative literature and philosophy at Stanford University and one of the nation’s most honored intellectual figures. Rorty is also a leading light of the democratic socialist magazine *Dissent* and a moderate in the ranks of the left. That such a figure should celebrate the conversion of academic institutions into political “power bases” speaks volumes about the tragedy that has befallen the university.

On the occasions of my campus visits, I am always curious to discover the local circumstances that conspire to create a situation so otherwise inexplicable in an open society. How, in particular, does an institution that publicly promotes itself as “liberal” and “inclusive,” as dedicated to “diversity” and the “free exchange of ideas,” devolve into such a political monolith? The conservative history professor who had come to my dinner was obviously a senior member of his academic department, which was really the only status a conservative faculty member could have, since the hiring doors had been closed nearly a quarter of a century earlier. So I asked how his faculty colleagues treated conservatives like him.

Catching my drift he replied, “Well, they haven’t allowed me to sit on a search committee since 1985.” He was referring to the committees that interview prospective candidates to fill faculty openings. “In 1985, he continued, “I was the chair of the search committee and of course we hired a Marxist.” “Of course,” I said, knowing that for conservatives who believed in the traditional mission of academic inquiry, diversity of viewpoints would make perfect sense. Others might be guided by different imperatives. Their very dedication to “social change” would commit them to an agenda, which is about power, and which inspires them to clear rivals from their path.

The professor went on: “This year we had an opening for a scholar of Asian history. We had several candidates but obviously the

⁴ Ibid.

most qualified one was from Stanford. Yet he didn't get the job. So I went to the chair of the search committee and asked him what had happened. 'Oh,' he said, 'you're absolutely right. He was far and away the most qualified candidate and we had a terrific interview. But then we went to lunch and he let out that he was for school vouchers.'

In other words, if one has a politically incorrect view on K-12 school vouchers, one must be politically incorrect on the Ming Dynasty too. This is almost a dictionary description of the totalitarian mentality. But there is more than dogmatism at work in this calculation. This attitude also reflects the priorities of an entrenched oligarchy, which fears to include those it cannot count on to maintain its control.

A certain focus on control is normal for bureaucrats in any institution. But in an institution like the university, whose very structures are elitist, there are few natural limits to such political agendas. Outside the hard sciences and the practical professions, what is the penalty for bad ideas? There is none. Once a discredited dogma like Marxism is legitimated through the hiring process, there is no institutional obstacle to its expansion and entrenchment as a scholarly discipline.

The structural support for ideological conformity is intensified by the introduction of overt political agendas. These agendas were originally imported into the university by radicals acting as the self-conscious disciples of an Italian Marxist named Antonio Gramsci. As an innovative Stalinist in the 1930s, Gramsci pondered the historic inability of Communist parties to mobilize workers to seize the means of production and overthrow the capitalist ruling class. Gramsci's new idea was to focus radicals' attention on the means of *intellectual* production as a lever of social change. He urged radicals to acquire "cultural hegemony," by which he meant to capture the institutions that produced society's governing ideas. This would be the key to controlling and transforming the society itself.

To illustrate how ingrained this attitude has become and how casually it is deployed to justify the suppression of conservative ideas, let me cite an email I received from a professor at Emory University in Atlanta. The professor was responding to an article I

had written about the abuse of conservative students by administrators at Vanderbilt and the exclusion of conservatives from the Vanderbilt faculty.⁵

The academic author of the email was not especially radical. Yet he did not have so much as a twinge of conscience at the picture I drew of a faculty cleansed of conservative opinions. “Why do I and other academics have little shame here?” he asked rhetorically, then answered the question: “We are not the only game in the marketplace of ideas. We are competing with journalism, entertainment, churches, political lobbyists, and well-funded conservative think tanks.”

In other words, contemporary academics see themselves not primarily as educators, but as agents of an “adversary culture,” at war with the world outside the university. They are oblivious to—or contemptuous of—the fact that the university was not created, and is not funded, to *compete* with other institutions. It is designed to train a productive citizenry—future employees, and leaders of those institutions—endowing them with appropriate knowledge and skills. Because of its strategic function as an educator of elites, it can also be effectively used, however, in the way Gramsci proposed: to subvert those institutions.

There is an organic connection between the political bias of the university and the political bias of the press. It was not until journalists became routinely trained in university schools of journalism, in the post-Sixties era, that mainstream media began to mirror the perspectives of the adversary culture. As Professor Rorty observed, universities have now become a power base of the political left. The Emory professor’s argument only makes sense, in fact, from the vantage of someone who is part of this left, and who is so alienated from his own society as to *want* to subvert it. His suggestion that universities somehow are there to “balance” conservative think tanks of the wealthy—is patently absurd. “Well-funded” conservative think tanks may stand in intellectual opposition to subversive agendas, but what wealthy think tank can compete—to take one example—with Harvard, its centuries of tradition, its hundreds of faculty members, its government subsidies and its \$18 *billion*, tax-free endowment?

⁵ See “The Campus Public Square,” later in this booklet.

The power of the academic left does not derive merely from its own numbers. Academics who are not particularly radical may also harbor resentments against the larger culture and be inspired to seek like-minded colleagues. When these several viewpoints are imbued with a sense of social mission that requires ideological cohesion for success, the result is an intellectual monolith.

How can students get a good education, if they're only being told half the story? The answer is, they can't. The state of affairs on our university campuses is an offense to the spirit of free inquiry. The hiring practices that have led to this situation are discriminatory and illegal. They violate the Constitution, which forbids hiring and firing on the basis of political ideas and also patronage laws that bar state institutions from servicing a particular political party. Yet university administrators have not shown any inclination to address this problem, or to reform the practices that perpetuate it.

2. Blacklist

The most successful and pervasive blacklist in American history is the blacklist of conservatives on American college campuses, their marginalization in undergraduate life and their virtual exclusion from liberal arts faculties, particularly those that deal with the study of society itself. Because it is a blacklist enforced by academics, there has been no academic study of the problem. Consequently, the evidence regarding its mode of operation and the extent of its impact is anecdotal or confined to research that is incomplete. Nonetheless, its reality is undeniable.

In the spring of 2003 I spoke at more than a dozen universities, while conducting my own inquiries into this problem. In my speeches, I always try to cover a broad menu of subjects, hoping in the hour or two available to jar students who may be seeing their first conservative speaker in the flesh into thinking in new ways about issues that confront them. These include the war, race relations, and the pervasive influence on campus of leftist viewpoints. In my speeches, I always make it a point to begin with the subject of the university blacklist, and open my remarks with these words: "You can't get a good education, if they're only telling you half the

story—even if you’re paying \$30,000 a year.” This is the slogan of a campaign I launched two years ago, which is beginning to gain traction on the campuses I have visited as conservative student groups take up the cause of intellectual diversity in their academic institutions.

Tulane Law School—one of the institutions I visited that spring—has not a single Republican or conservative faculty member; the Duquesne Law School—where I also spoke—has one. The students I met at the University of Michigan could not identify a single conservative on their faculty, although they could name several Marxists. At Bowling Green, conservative professors were isolated in a research center that has no teaching responsibilities. Out of 15 professors in the Department of Political Science at the University of Richmond, a private school with a decidedly conservative student body there is one Republican. The only school where there seemed to be even a handful (a literal handful) was at the University of South Dakota, a state which Bush carried in the 2000 election by 26 points.

The Center for the Study of Popular Culture has conducted a survey of the voting registrations of professors in the social sciences at 32 elite universities and colleges. The results confirm the above impression.* At a recent lunch I had with the Dean of the Journalism School at the University of Southern California I asked him if he could name a single conservative on his faculty. He confessed he could not. You could throw a dart at a list of all American universities and be virtually certain of hitting one where Republican and conservative faculty members constitute less than a dozen members of a liberal arts faculty made up of hundreds.

At the beginning of April, after the United States and Great Britain had liberated Iraq, and after the streets of Baghdad were filled with people celebrating their freedom, the Academic Senate at UCLA voted to “condemn America’s invasion of Iraq” by a vote of 180-7. Such a politically partisan vote would itself have been regarded once as an abuse of the university, more appropriate to a political party than an institution devoted to scholarship and research. But the more extraordinary fact was that in a nation where 76% of the population support the war after the fact, 95% of the

* See Part 2 of this booklet.

faculty senate at a state-funded academic institution were passionate enough in their opposition to “condemn” it.

The absurd under-representation of conservative viewpoints on university faculties obviously does not happen by random process. It is the result of a systematic repression (and/or discouragement) of conservative thought and scholarship at so-called “liberal” institutions of higher learning.

In state universities the political bias against conservatives in the hiring process amounts to an illegal political patronage operation, which provides huge advantages to the Democratic Party and to the political left. Democratic and leftwing activists are subsidized and provided platforms at institutions with billion dollar budgets. Allegedly scholarly reports on capital punishment, racism, poverty and other volatile political issues that make their way into the national media are virtually guaranteed to have a leftwing spin. Leftwing political journalists are themselves provided sinecures in the form of university professorships, while politically left journals are often underwritten by university presses. Leftist journalism schools provide a steady stream of cadre to the nation’s media institutions. Campus funds available for political activities are inequitably distributed to student groups with radical agendas. These fees underwrite an army of radical speakers and agitators who operate nationally, while skewing the politics of the campus strongly to the left. Among its other effects is the spread of political hypocrisy. The same people who demand campaign finance reform in national politics enjoy the benefits of a system in which students are taxed to provide funds almost exclusively to one side of the political debate.

How has this ideological monopoly on the academic campus come about? To begin with, universities are feudal institutions whose organizational structures are hierarchical and collegial and thus closed to scrutiny and oversight. The dean at the aforesaid journalism school who agreed that a faculty without conservatives was antithetic to the very idea of a university confessed that there was absolutely nothing he could do to alter the situation. Faculty hiring is controlled by senior members of the faculty itself, at the departmental level. Unless bound by greater scruples, they can hire—and do hire—only people who agree with them and share their preju-

dices. Since outside the hard sciences, there is no bottom line for bad ideas or discredited perspectives, ideological prejudice is a self-perpetuating phenomenon.

That is why sociological flat-earthists—Marxists, socialists, and other intellectual radicals—whose ideas of how societies work have been discredited by historical events can still dominate their academic fields. In the Sixties and Seventies centrist liberals controlled academic faculties. Because they were committed to pluralistic values, they opened the door to Marxists and other political ideologues. But as soon as the ideologues reached a critical mass on these faculties, they closed the doors behind them. The feudal hierarchies of the university made it relatively easy to create the closed system that is evident today.

Now it is virtually impossible for a vocal conservative to be hired for a tenure-track position on a faculty anywhere, or to receive tenure if so hired. The conservative faculty members I encounter who have achieved this feat, invariably tell me that they were forced to keep their political orientation to themselves until they achieved tenure. Alternatively, they were hired and tenured twenty years ago before the left secured its grip on the hiring process.

The blacklist really begins with the politicization of the undergraduate classroom and the systematic political harassment of conservative students by their radical professors. The chief effect of this harassment is to discourage conservatives from pursuing academic careers. Leftist professors think nothing of intruding their political passions into the classroom in a manner that is inappropriate and abusive, and unprofessional. Professorial remarks denigrating conservative ideas and personalities—often in the most inappropriate context imaginable—powerfully convey the message that conservative ideas are unacceptable in the academic community. While reading lists are stripped of conservative texts, professorial expectations are defined as agreement with the ideology and political biases of the instructor. Grades often (but not always) are employed to make the bias stick.

In the informal interviews I conducted at the universities I visited, I talked with students who had been called “fascists” by their own professors (in one case for inviting Fox TV host Oliver North

to campus). At the University of Oregon a student was labeled a “neo-Nazi” in class for expressing the view that former Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott had been the victim of a political double standards. At the University of Richmond I encountered a student whose Spanish Language professor referred to the President as a “moron” in the classroom.

At each of these venues I generally get to interview a dozen or more conservative students personally. I ask them whether they have been subjected to this kind of classroom abuse. Invariably the majority have. Far from being aggressive themselves, these students who come to my events in suits and ties, have a scrubbed, honor scout look and it is I who have to point out to them that they have been abused and should think about protesting the abuse.

Leftist professors think nothing of posting anti-Bush or anti-Israel cartoons on their offices where students come for consultation and guidance; or of recruiting students to political demonstrations, or leading campus political protests themselves, or gratuitously voting in an academic context—as at UCLA—to take extreme positions on divisive issues. What does this communicate to the students in their class who do not share their political views? What adverse impact does this have on the responsibility of teachers to teach all their students and not just those who share their political prejudices?

These outrages have only begun to elicit a remedial reaction from the public at large, and that largely because of the war. This is why I have undertaken the task of organizing conservative students myself and urging them to protest a situation that has become intolerable. I encourage them to use the language that the left has deployed so effectively in behalf of its own agendas. Radical professors have created a “hostile learning environment for conservative students. There is a lack of “intellectual diversity” on college faculties and in academic classrooms. The conservative viewpoint is “under-represented” in the curriculum and on its reading lists. The university should be an “inclusive” and intellectually “diverse” community.

I have encouraged students to demand that their schools adopt an Academic Bill of Rights that stresses intellectual diversity, that demands balance in their reading lists, that recognizes that political

partisanship by professors in the classroom is an abuse of students' academic freedom, that the inequity in funding of student organizations and visiting speakers is unacceptable, and that a learning environment hostile to conservatives is unacceptable.

In my visits to college campuses I have found that conservative students respond to this message enthusiastically and that even liberal students are concerned when it is brought up. Fairness, equity and inclusion are American values, and will be supported by the American public whenever they are at issue. In my campus campaign I have begun to receive the kind of responses to these agendas that give me hope for the future.

My visit to the University of Missouri in Columbia is a case in point. Before I even arrived, the students informed me that a leftist biology professor named Miriam Golomb was offering her students credits to come and protest my speech. Normally, leftist professors provide students academic credits for attending leftist speeches, but withhold the same privilege from conservative speakers. This cuts down the audience for conservative speakers and creates the impression that there is something wrong with conservatives generally. They are "controversial," "extreme," "irrational" and worse.

One of Professor Golomb's students asked if she would provide credit for attending my speech. Golomb replied, "No, why would I, since I don't like what he has to say? He's a racist." Then Professor Golomb had a second thought, "But I will give you twice as many credits if you go to protest." Golomb, who is white, then went to the black students association which at Missouri is called the "Legion of Black Collegians" to try to incite the group to protest my appearance. Her appeal backfired and several of the students reported what had happened to their friends among the College Republicans. Professor Golomb also sent an email to students urging them to protest, and a leaflet with my picture was created (my student sources are convinced that Professor Golomb was the creator) calling me "A Real Live Bigot" and accusing me of being "on the payroll of a rightwing foundation."

The immediate impact of this professorial agitation was to cause the university to beef up its security and assign seven armed guards to the event. I was thus transformed into a "controversial" speaker

whose very appearance was a public danger. The left-wing college TV station ran promotional ads describing me as “an extreme rightwing conservative” to complete the effect.

As soon as I arrived in Columbia, I had the students take me to the university office of the Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs. I expressed my outrage at being slandered by Professor Golomb and wondered whether this treatment of a visiting speaker was appropriate to an institution that billed itself as one dedicated to the “higher learning.” I pointed out that I was a nationally known and respected commentator, that my views were representative of at least half the political population, and that I had been a civil rights activist for fifty years. I said I would like an apology from Professor Golomb and a university statement deploring her actions.

These actions were harmful to the principle of academic freedom, to the free exchange of ideas and to the educational mission of the university. How could students feel free to express themselves in such an atmosphere? I was the ostensible target of these attacks, but the real victims would be the students who invited me. I would only be at the university a couple of hours. But the stigma the professor’s slander imprinted on this event would stay with the students throughout their college careers. They would be known as students who had invited a racist to campus, however false and malicious that accusation might be. The Vice Chancellor listened sympathetically to what I had to say and blandished me with typical bureaucratic assurances. I did not get the impression that any action would be taken. Since I was only there for a few hours, I was forced to content myself with having made the point and I urged the students who accompanied me to carry on the effort to see that something more was done.

My speech was delivered two hours later in the business school theater. When I walked into the room, it was packed to the rafters with 500 people who gave me a standing, cheering ovation. I was introduced by the faculty adviser of the College Republicans, Richard Hardy. He waved the obscene attack leaflet and began to describe what Professor Golomb had done. It turned out that she herself was in the audience, and rose—according to her own account later—to protest his “misrepresentation.” According to her account, she said she had not offered the credits to her students to protest the event, but to attend it. This version was contradicted by her own students, but in

any case neither Professor Hardy nor I were able to hear what she was saying above the din from the audience. Professor Hardy thought she was apologizing for the slander and asked me if I accepted her apology. I said I did.

When I walked to the podium to speak, the audience again rose to its feet and gave me a second ovation (a third would come at the conclusion of the talk). I began by describing who I was—how I had marched on my first civil rights demonstration for American blacks in 1948 when I was nine years old, and had continued my efforts for civil rights ever since. To put flesh on this statement, I told them how the previous week I had gone to San Diego to receive an award from an organization called Operation Hope, headed by a charismatic black leader named John Bryant. Bryant had formed Operation Hope in 1992, in the wake of the Los Angeles riots. Since then he had brought tens of millions of dollars in investments and loans into five inner cities, helped hundreds of poor black and Hispanic families to purchase their own homes and taught economic literacy skills to more than 100,000 inner city residents. I have been working with John Bryant since 1996, and the award recognized my efforts in behalf of Operation Hope. I have raised half a million dollars for the organization and have opened doors for John in Republican Washington after his Democratic patrons were turned out of office. As a result of these efforts John Bryant was welcomed at the Bush White House, where he extended an invitation to the President to come to South Central Los Angeles. The event took place on the 10th Anniversary of the Los Angeles riots, and the President was given a warm welcome by community activists at an event hosted by Bryant and Operation Hope.

In the past, I had been reticent to talk about these efforts, but Professor Golomb's "protest" prompted me to break my silence. I wanted the students who invited me to have ammunition to defend themselves and those attending to see just how malicious the attacks on us were. After establishing my credentials, I launched into the opening set piece of every speech I give on college campuses. I said, "You can't get a good education, if they're only telling you half the story. Even if you're paying \$8,000 a year" (the tuition at Missouri). I talked about the longest, most successful blacklist ever conducted in America. I talked about the "political harassment" of conservative

students, the creation of a “hostile learning environment,” and the need to get representation for “under-represented viewpoints,” on their campus. I talked about the need for “intellectual diversity.”

I then related these observations to the war in Iraq. I talked about the role of the leftwing university in undermining American self-respect and self-confidence at a time when the nation was facing enemies who were deadly. I showed them another way to look at American history using the history of black Americans as an example. I pointed out that slavery had existed and been accepted for thousands of years in black Africa and in every society until the end of the 18th Century when white Christian males in England and the United States concluded for the first time in human history that slavery was immoral and should be abolished. I reminded them how a white slave-owner named Thomas Jefferson put into the founding document of this nation the revolutionary idea that all men are created equal and how within a generation as a direct result of the efforts of England and America slavery had been abolished in the Western world.

I said that the proper way look at America is not just that it shared in the crimes of all nations, but—more importantly -- that it became the pioneer of human equality and freedom for all nations; that as a result of America’s efforts to realize the ideals of equality and freedom, blacks in America are now the freest and richest black people anywhere on the face of the earth including all of the nations that are ruled by blacks. I pointed out that our Islamo-fascist enemies are supporters of slavery in Libya and the Sudan, and of tyranny and oppression everywhere; that we are in a civil war which pits the forces of freedom led by the United States against the forces of social darkness and oppression who rallied to the defense of the regime in Iraq. I pointed out that it was important for them to learn to be proud of their country, because if they were not proud of their country they could not defend themselves.

This was the end of my speech and resulted in another ovation. The response—particularly after the attacks—was immensely rewarding. But my greatest gratification came afterwards, as the conservative students were taking me back to my hotel. One of them had a roommate who was a member of the Legion of Black Collegians and who had attended my talk. As a black student in a

leftwing educational system that extended back to the very first grade, she was the most focused target and most vulnerable victim of the left's campaign of slander against America's heritage, and thus against her heritage as an African American. What this black student told her roommate when my speech was concluded was how much she had learned by coming to the event. "Everything I have been told all my life," she said, "has been a lie."

3. The Campus Public Square

Vanderbilt University is a venerable academic institution in Nashville, and the premier seat of higher learning in the state of Tennessee. Like every one of the nearly 200 colleges I have visited in the last ten years, it has long ceased to be a liberal institution in the meaningful sense of that term. In the hiring of its faculty and in the design of its curriculum, in the conduct of its community dialogue and in the shape of its public square, Vanderbilt—like most American universities—is for all intents and purposes an intellectual monolith, an ideological subsidiary of the Democratic Party and a base for the far side of the political left.

No aspect of the university system exposes this bias so readily as the process by which tribunes of the nation's culture wars are invited to speak at college forums. Only authorized student groups with faculty sponsors can extend such invitations. Moreover, they must come up with funds to underwrite travel and lodging arrangements, along with an honorarium that can range from \$1,000 to \$20,000 depending on the speaker's celebrity. If the speaker is a political activist, these appearances can provide a substantial supplement to personal income and a significant subsidy to the speaker's political cause.

In the spring of 2002, I spoke at 23 universities and appeared at Vanderbilt on April 8th. The invitation had come from a conservative student group called Wake Up America, which was formed three years earlier for the purpose of bringing speakers to campus. Despite its dedicated agenda, however, Wake Up America has only managed to put on four events in the three years of its existence. This is not because of a scarcity of conservative speakers ready to speak on college campuses. It is because Vanderbilt refuses to pro-

vide funds to Wake Up America to underwrite its aspirations. Vanderbilt's attitude towards Wake Up America is in fact anything but supportive. Vanderbilt officials have treated the group like an alien presence from the moment of its conception.

Thus, when Wake Up America's founder, Dan Eberhart, approached Assistant Vice Chancellor, Michelle Rosen, to gain approval for his group, she told him, "there is no need for your organization because a student group already exists, namely the Speakers Committee." This was an Orwellian subterfuge. The Assistant Vice Chancellor knew that the Speakers Committee was a partisan student group dedicated to bringing left-wing speakers to the Vanderbilt campus. James Carville, Ralph Nader, Kweisi Mfume and Gloria Steinem, for example, are recent visitors, courtesy of the Committee. These are pricey celebrities and the Vanderbilt student activities fund has granted the Speakers Committee \$50,000 a year in the past to make their wish list real. The year I spoke, the Student Finance Committee, which administers the fund, increased the Speakers Committee grant to \$63,000. By contrast, in its entire three-year existence Wake Up America had never been granted a single cent to bring conservatives to the Vanderbilt campus.

The Speakers Committee is actually only one of an array of left-wing groups that are the beneficiaries of Vanderbilt funds. In a recent press release announcing the disbursement \$1,143,963 to student groups, the Student Finance Committee defined its purpose in these noble words: "to fund activities that will have broad campus appeal and that will guarantee a diversity of activities within our community." A glance at the roster of funded groups reveals, however, that this diversity principle does not extend to the realm of ideas.

While Wake Up America, received no funds, the Vanderbilt Feminists received \$10,620; the Vanderbilt Lambda Association (a group of gay leftists) received \$12,000; the (left-wing) Middle Eastern Student Association received \$4,700; the (left-wing) Black Students Alliance received \$12,400; the (left-wing) Organization of Black Graduate & Professional Students received \$13,120; the (left-wing) Vanderbilt African Student Association received \$1,500; the Vanderbilt Association of (left-wing) Hispanic Students received \$14,200; and the (left-wing) Vanderbilt Asian American Student Association \$15,000.

How do I know that these ostensibly ethnic associations are “left-wing?” I know it as a result of my inquiries at Vanderbilt and by my own broad range of experience with similar groups on campuses across the country. They are not only political and to the left, but they are more often than not at the extreme end of that spectrum as well. For example, when I spoke at Denison College in Ohio a few weeks before my Vanderbilt appearance, I had been preceded by Angela Davis, Denison’s official Martin Luther King Day speaker the month before. Davis is a lifelong Communist who received a “Lenin Prize” from the East German police state during the Cold War, and remained a party member after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The official Denison website, on the other hand, describes her as “known internationally for her ongoing work to combat all forms of oppression in the United States and abroad.” The university closed its offices during her speech so that the entire campus could hear her unreconstructed anti-American, Marxist views. (www.Denison.edu/mlk/mlk2002.htm)

When I spoke at Michigan State, I had been preceded by columnist Julianne Malveaux, who was also the official Martin Luther King Day speaker and who had received \$15,000 from student funds some of which were supplied by the black student association. As in the case of Davis, Malveaux’s views are antithetic to King’s. She is a crudely racial Marxist who once asserted that there were “200 million white racists in America” and on another occasion expressed her wish that Clarence Thomas would have a heart attack. Her speech was called “Economic Justice: The Struggle Continues,” and included attacks on Ward Connerly, Laura Bush, the idea of a colorblind society and of King as its visionary.

I had been preceded at Duke by Aaron Magruder, a black cartoonist who had gained fame through his comic strip “Boondocks” and notoriety for attacking America after the World Trade Center was bombed. Magruder was also the university’s official Martin Luther King Day speaker. In his speech, Magruder noted that 90% of the American people supported the war and said, “I would like to believe the 10% leftover is black.” He then told the students, “your vote means nothing; you can protest if you want, they’ll throw you in jail.” Davis, Malveaux and Magruder all reflected the extremist sentiments of the black student groups on campus without whose

imprimatur no Martin Luther King Day speaker could be selected.

At Vanderbilt, the university annually provides roughly \$130,000 for left-wing agitations, including the visits of left-wing speakers. This is balanced by \$0 for conservative groups and speakers. Ironically, the faculties of these schools are strong proponents of campaign finance reform in the political world they don't control.

In the academic world, the situation at Vanderbilt is completely normal, with the exception of a handful of small conservative and religious schools like Hillsdale and Bob Jones University. At the University of Wisconsin, the Multicultural Students Association responded to the reparations ad I placed in the *Badger-Herald* in the spring of 2001 by attacking the paper as “a racist propaganda machine”—an absolutely unfounded smear—and attempting to shut it down. The MSA was rewarded for its bad behavior the following fall with a grant of \$1 million to fund its radical activities. On the same campus, the Students for Objectivism—a conservative group—received \$500 in student program funds. At Duke University, in the wake of my reparations ad and the demonstrations that attended it, president Nan Keohane announced a grant of \$100,000 in additional funds for student groups. When I spoke at Duke, which was a day after my visit to Vanderbilt, \$50,000 of Keohane's grant had been disbursed—\$500 to the Duke Conservative Union and \$49,500 to left-wing groups.

Because university funds were unavailable, my Wake Up America hosts had to raise the money from outside contributions, not an easy task for students. They managed to secure funding from three individuals and from two conservative organizations—Young America's Foundation, which underwrites the lion's share of my campus tours and the Leadership Institute. The money they raised allowed them to bring me to campus, house me and provide a fifth the honorarium I would have received if I were a leftwing ideologue like Julianne Malveaux. If I were Malveaux, or Cornel West, or Gloria Steinem, in other words, I could have collected more than \$200,000 in three months for attacking America and posing as a champion of economic justice to college students. There is probably not a single prominent left-wing activist working the campus circuit who is not making a six-figure income.

A frustrating but typical trait of college conservatives is that they don't—as a rule—complain about the inequities that are routinely inflicted on them. Because they do not make trouble for abusive and illiberal campus administrators, nothing is done to correct these problems.

Discriminatory funding policies are actually only a small part of the injustices that conservative students suffer and that seem like normalcy to them. They also adjust, for example, to the rampant political bias in their expensive curricula, which is the result of a faculty hiring process that bars conservatives and limits the education of all students to a relentlessly one-sided view of the world they live in. Obtaining a faculty sponsor for Wake Up America was thus even more difficult than getting the Vice Chancellor to approve its formation.

The founder of Wake Up America, Dan Eberhart, scoured the campus for a professor that would sponsor his club. He put letters of request in professors' mailboxes. He approached them directly. In the end, out of a thousand faculty members at Vanderbilt, he was able to come up with only one who would sponsor a group whose intention was to bring conservative speakers to a college campus. Vanderbilt is not only an old and traditional institution, but it is hosted by a state with a Republican governor and two Republican senators, and a citizenry whose majority voted Republican in the last presidential election. The successful purge of conservatives from the faculty of Vanderbilt is thus a sobering commentary on the politically debased condition of the American university, which has fallen victim to an academic McCarthyism more insidious (because incomparably more effective) than the academic witch-hunts of the past.

The lone professor willing to sponsor a non-left student group at Vanderbilt was a business school professor from outside the Vanderbilt community. Because his primary occupation is actually business rather than teaching, this professor flies from his home in San Francisco to Nashville twice a week to teach his course. In other words, there are really no conservative professors in residence at Vanderbilt University who are willing to publicly sponsor a group whose purpose is to bring an under-represented viewpoint to the Vanderbilt community—even though it is a viewpoint shared by a majority of Tennessee voters and half the American public.

My Vanderbilt talk was scheduled for Monday, April 8, and Wake Up America had reserved the room where it would be given on January 12. But on Thursday, April 4, the Vanderbilt Administration informed Dan Eberhart that a professor now needed the room for a review class and that my speech would have to be cancelled. Vanderbilt is a very large university and even the building I gave my speech in seemed virtually deserted that night. I didn't think it was coincidental that this happened to me on at least three other occasions during this spring tour. The University of Oregon cancelled my appearance the day I arrived in state on the grounds that a request for security for the event made two weeks earlier was one day too late and the room had been given to another event, although my sponsors were not informed until one day before my announced appearance. NYU cancelled the room for my talk there the day I arrived in New York, also because of an alleged room-scheduling problem, and James Madison University cancelled, as I was about to depart for Florida, for the same reason.

In other circumstances, a young and well-mannered conservative like Eberhart might have capitulated to this petty harassment and terminated the event. Fortunately, he held his ground, strengthened in his resolve perhaps by the fact that my office had been able to arrange a C-Span taping of the event.⁶ His resistance bore fruit and permission was given to proceed, but not until Eberhart agreed to pay “for the wear and tear to the foyer” of the hall where the speech took place. A \$100 clean-up fee was also tacked on, even though no food and beverages were served and there was no refuse to clean up.

Despite a downpour, about 250 people showed up for the speech in Wilson Hall and listened civilly while I described “How The Left Undermined America’s Security.” The attendance was even more gratifying than usual because the *Vanderbilt Hustler*, which was the student paper, did not—as it usually does—publish an advance article about the speech or inform the campus community of what I said when it was over.

Afterwards I signed books and answered questions of those who stayed to ask them. One of my interlocutors was a professor of philosophy who handed me a yellowing copy of my very first book, *Student*, published exactly forty years earlier. In it, I described the

⁶ The speech is available on videotape at C-Span.org.

first student demonstrations of the 1960s at Berkeley, where I was pursuing a graduate degree. I didn't realize at the time that we were going to transform American universities into politicized institutions where only approved ideas would be welcome. I hope I would have had second thoughts about demonstrating then if I had realized this would be the outcome.

When I asked the professor what kind of philosophy he taught at Vanderbilt, he said with a smirk, "Marxist philosophy," then asked me to write the following in his book: "To my political enemy from a foaming at the mouth rightwing ideologue." I signed the book, but with a different inscription ("second thoughts are best"), and he left. I was then approached by a group of undergraduates who by their appearance and questions were not politically conservative. A young woman with a diffident demeanor asked, in an earnest tone, what I thought of racial profiling.

Her question was inspired by a portion of my talk that addressed the problem of airport security. I had pointed out that nine of the World Trade Center terrorists were actually stopped by airport security on 9/11 because they had faulty I.D.s. But they had been allowed to board the planes anyway. I said that the Clinton Administration's failure to institute adequate security measures prior to the attack was due in part to an ideological aversion to profiling Muslim terrorists.

I tried to explain to the student the difference between factoring race into a profile and using race as the profile itself. I referred her to Heather MacDonald's article in the conservative magazine *City Journal*, "The Myth of Racial Profiling," fully realizing as I did so that this undergraduate would never have heard of Heather MacDonald or the *City Journal*. Nor would she be familiar with the writings of virtually any living conservative writer including myself. I gave her the name of the website where MacDonald's article was posted and could be located. But I did so with a heavy heart, because I knew that she had many questions not one and that her parents were paying \$30,000 a year to give her a good education, but that at Vanderbilt she would be getting only one side of the story and only one perspective on the ideological conflicts that would affect her life.

I had met students like this throughout my campus sojourns. The encounters were the saddest memories I took away with me. Millions like this young woman would pass through universities like Vanderbilt, which would routinely betray their trust. They would be given decks that were stacked, instruction that was partisan and partial, and there was nothing I, or a small contingent of conservatives could do in one hour or during one event to alter these facts.

PART TWO: STUDIES

1. Center Report on Faculty Bias

Executive Summary

by David Horowitz and Eli Lehrer

This report on political bias at 32 elite colleges and universities is the third in a series conducted by the Center for the Study of Popular Culture and researched by Andrew Jones.⁷

Methodology

The Center generated a list of 32 elite colleges and universities. We included the entire Ivy League, premier liberal arts colleges like Amherst and Pomona, well-known technically-oriented universities like MIT, highly competitive public institutions like the University of California at Berkeley, and other elite private universities like Stanford. We compiled lists of tenured or tenure-track professors of the Economics, English, History, Philosophy, Political Science and Sociology departments - choosing these because they teach courses focusing on issues affecting the society at large. We compared these lists to the voter registration lists of the counties or states in which the colleges were located, and attempted to match individual names.

The quality of our data varied. Not all faculty are registered to vote and not all reside in the county or even state which we searched. The political affiliation of these individuals was therefore not accessible. In other cases there was more than one individual with the same name, again making a positive identification impossible. In some places, the Center was able to identify most professors; at others, only a minority were positively identified. The figures contained in this report are indicators of a problem; they make no claim to definitively identify that problem. This would only be possible with greater resources than are available to the Center or with the cooperation of the institutions themselves.

⁷ A previous Center survey of 20 campuses was conducted two years ago and its results are summarized in the publication *Political Bias In American Universities*. A survey of the political attitudes of Ivy League professors was conducted for the Center by Frank Luntz & Associates and is also available in this publication. An online version is available at www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org.

We selected party registration for our study because other indices of bias would be highly subjective. The meanings of “liberal” and “conservative” are notoriously indeterminate, reflecting as much the prejudices of the cataloguer as they would the preferences of those being studied. Although the terms “Republican” and “Democrat” may seem inappropriate in the context of academic pursuits, they have the advantage of reflecting the self-identifications of the individuals under scrutiny and they are clearly identifiable.

Moreover the terms “Republican” and “Democrat” can reasonably be said to reflect a predictable spectrum of assumptions, views and values that affect the outlooks of Americans who finance, attend, administer and teach at these educational institutions. This is why we chose them. It is not our intention to suggest that there should be quotas based on party affiliation in the hiring process at universities. Rather it is our purpose to discover whether there is a grossly unbalanced, politically shaped selection process in the hiring of college faculty. While recognizing the limitations imposed on our study, we believe the figures recorded in this report make a *prima facie* case that there is.

Summary of Results

In our examinations of over 150 departments and upper-level administrations at 32 elite colleges and universities, the Center found the following:

The overall ratio of Democrats to Republicans we were able to identify at the 32 schools was more than 10 to 1 (1397 Democrats, 134 Republicans).

Although in the nation at large registered Democrats and Republicans are roughly equal in number, not a single department at a single one of the 32 schools managed to achieve a reasonable parity between the two. The closest any school came to parity was Northwestern University where 80% of the faculty members we identified were registered Democrats who outnumbered registered Republicans by a ratio of 4-1.

At other schools we found these representations of registered faculty Democrats to Republicans:

Brown	30-1
Bowdoin, Wellesley	23-1
Swarthmore	21-1
Amherst, Bates	18-1
Columbia, Yale	14-1
Pennsylvania, Tufts, UCLA and Berkeley	12-1
Smith	11-1

At no less than four elite schools we could not identify a single Republican on the faculty:

Williams	51 Democrats, 0 Republicans
Oberlin	19 Democrats, 0 Republicans
MIT	17 Democrats, 0 Republicans
Haverford	15 Democrats, 0 Republicans

Faculty registration is just as unbalanced at major research universities as it is at small colleges. At Columbia University, the Center could identify only 6 faculty Republicans. The Center could not locate a single Republican in the history, political science, and sociology departments. Cornell University was just as left-leaning: the departments of English and history were entirely devoid of registered Republicans.

Administrators lean just as far to the left: at schools like the University of Pennsylvania, Carnegie Melon, and Cornell, we could not identify a single Republican administrator. In the entire Ivy League, we identified only 3 Republican administrators.

Conclusion

These figures suggest that most students probably graduate without ever having a class taught by a professor with a conservative viewpoint. The ratios themselves are impossible to understand in the absence of a political bias in the training and hiring of college instructors. They strongly suggest that the governance of American universities has fallen into the hands of a self-perpetuating political and cultural subset of the general population, which seems intent on perpetuating its control. This is an unhealthy development for the both the educational enterprise and the democracy itself.

Without further investigation it is not possible to establish with any degree of certainty why this state of affairs has come into existence, but there are many obvious factors that may be said to have contributed to it. Among them is the very exclusion of conservatives from faculty and administrative positions itself. This in itself creates a hostile environment for conservative students contemplating an academic career. This core hostility is amplified by practices that have been incorporated into academic life in the last several decades, including campus speech codes and politicized classrooms—both which represent radical departures from the pre-Sixties academic environment. A comprehensive study by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (available at www.speechcodes.org) found that over 90 percent of well-known college campuses have speech codes intended to ban and punish politically incorrect, almost always conservative, speech. (Cases available at www.thefire.org.) Student testimonies about in-classroom political indoctrination are available at www.noindoctrination.org.

The impression that conservative values and ideas aren't welcome on campus is driven home daily to students until it becomes second nature. Professors generally do not grade politically, but a large enough percentage do that students—and not just conservative students—will take the prudent course of concealing what they actually think in order to protect their academic standing. This is obviously at odds with the educational mission of the university but academic authorities have done little to address the abuse.

All these factors exert a negative influence on the choices a conservative student might make about pursuing an intellectual career. But of all these factors the lack of conservative professors is the most significant. It serves to reduce the ability of the best and brightest conservative students to pursue graduate study even when they want to. Nearly all distinguished doctoral programs rely on matching students with professors who have compatible interests. A student interested in pursuing a Ph.D. based on his or her interest in Austrian school economics, traditionalist literary criticism, conservative historiography or religious poetry will have a difficult time finding a professor who wants to take her on. In the social sciences, Marxists have an infinitely easier time finding good mentors than Hayekians or Straussians. The lack of conservative professors provides a ready-

made excuse (professors don't even think of it that way) for rejecting doctoral program applications for conservative students with stellar grades, recommendations, and standardized test scores.

For those conservatives who earn the doctoral "union card" necessary to teach at a major research university, a second obstacle awaits: hiring and tenure committees, which are stacked with their ideological and political adversaries. A number of high profile cases have occurred recently in which conservative scholars with significant records of publishing have performed according to the book and still ended up out of work.

The entire process of training graduate students, qualifying Ph.D. recipients, hiring junior faculty and granting tenure is hierarchical, arbitrary, closed to public scrutiny and designed to produce intellectual conformity in the best circumstances. Therefore special concern would be required to ensure that there are protections for students' academic freedom and for intellectual diversity. Unfortunately, in the present institutional framework no such protections exist.

We believe a remedy for this problematic situation would be for universities and state legislatures to adopt an Academic Bill of Rights stressing the importance of intellectual diversity to the goal of academic freedom, and making this goal an integral part of educational policy. We are attaching a copy of our suggested draft for such a Bill of Rights to this report.

When Ezra Cornell founded the institution that bears his name he said: "I would found an institution, where any person can find instruction in any study." American universities do not fulfill that promise when they cater to only half the population and fail to provide protections and adequate representation for the other. Presently, conservative viewpoints and values are under-represented in the academic curriculum, and conservatives themselves are relegated to second-class citizenship. While nearly all university administrations devote extraordinary resources to defend the principle of diversity in regard to race and gender, none can be said to have shown interest in the diversity of ideas. This bias has created a situation that is unworthy of the academic enterprise and unhealthy for the democracy that supports it, and in serious need of reform.

Raw Data

Total Schools Surveyed: 32
Total Democrats: 1397 Total Republicans: 134
Total Unaffiliated: 1891⁸ Total TM⁹: 790
Total Miscellaneous: 43

Amherst	55D, 3R, 23U, 0TM, 1M
Bates	18D, 1R, 18U, 0TM, 0M
Bowdoin	23D, 1R, 23U, 0TM, 1M
Brandeis	8D, 1R, 76U, 0TM, 0M
Brown	59D, 2R, 67U, 18TM, 0M
Bryn Mawr	14D, 2R, 13U, 8TM, 1M
Cal Tech	22D, 4R, 14U, 4TM, 0M
Carnegie Mellon	31D, 6R, 39U, 34TM, 0M
Chicago	79D, 8R, 144U, 0TM, 0M
Colgate	35D, 4R, 22U, 38TM, 1M
Columbia	57D, 4R, 74U, 123TM, 0M
Cornell	55D, 6R, 72U, 70TM, 1M
Dartmouth	38D, 4R, 68U, 0TM, 0M
Davidson	2D, 3R, 35U, 19TM, 0M
Duke	95D, 15R, 50U, 0TM, 15M
Harvard	77D, 11R, 127U, 0TM, 2M
Haverford	15D, 0R, 12U, 11TM, 0M
MIT	17D, 0R, 71U, 2TM, 0M
Northwestern	25D, 7R, 136U, 63TM, 0M
Oberlin	19D, 0R, 21U, 26TM, 0M
Pennsylvania	60D, 5R, 69U, 55TM, 0M
Princeton	49D, 6R, 127U, 75TM, 1M
Smith	43D, 4R, 46U, 0TM, 0M
Stanford	75D, 8R, 85U, 33TM, 8M
Swarthmore	21D, 1R, 14U, 22TM, 0M
Tufts	12D, 1R, 84U, 3TM, 0M
UC Berkeley	100D, 8R, 80U, 59TM, 6M
UCLA	137D, 11R, 90U, 55TM, 6M
Wellesley	23D, 1R, 63U, 0TM, 1M
Wesleyan	32D, 3R, 46U, 19TM, 0M
Williams	51D, 0R, 43U, 1TM, 0M
Yale	73D, 5R, 102U, 52TM, 0M

⁸ This category includes both voters who were not affiliated with a party, and those whose records we could not find within the town, county or state voter list.

⁹ This category includes voters for whom “too many” results were returned, i.e. multiple results for the same name.

2. Center Study of Bias in the Selection of Commencement Speakers at 32 Elite Colleges and Universities

Executive Summary

This study of the selection of commencement speakers¹⁰ is intended to supplement the Study of Political Bias in the Administration and to provide an independent measure of its accuracy. In this case we were able to assign an identity to all the subjects with a political profile. The results are, in fact, even more imbalanced than what we discovered in our more imperfect inquiry into the political views of faculty and administrators. The ratio of commencement speakers on the left and right was **223-15**, a ratio of over **15-1**. Removing the three schools that featured multiple speakers every year, the count of **169-15** still exceeds even the **10-1** ratio we observed with faculty political alignment.

Commencement speakers at different universities are selected through different procedures but in almost all cases through committees composed of administrative staff, faculty, and students. They may be said, therefore, to reflect the preferences of the respective campus communities.

The position of Commencement Speaker is a high honorific and the individuals chosen are generally regarded as role models for each graduating class, reflecting values that students are encouraged to emulate. The occasion—the passage of students into society as a new generation of potential leaders—makes the selection of these individuals an important statement by the selection committee as to what that leadership should entail. For these reasons, we believe that the selection of commencement speakers is a good index of the preferences of the institutions themselves.

The list of commencement speakers has the additional advantage of being transparent. The names of most speakers will be familiar to anyone examining these results. Therefore the judgments we have made in matching speakers with viewpoints is open to instant review.

For each of the thirty-two schools we acquired lists of the last ten commencement speakers and identified them using five categories: Liberal, Democrat, Conservative, Republican and No (Public)

¹⁰ Researched by Andrew Jones

Political or Partisan Identification. The last category is important since some commencement speakers are leaders in scientific, charitable and civic fields that are not partisan in nature.

In conducting our study we felt it was the public identities of speakers that were important for our purposes and not the fact that they may have cast a secret ballot for one political party or another. Molly Ivins and George Will—writers about political issues from opposite sides of the spectrum—are thus identified as “liberal” and “conservative” rather than “Democrat” and “Republican.” Actors like Alan Alda, Whoopi Goldberg, Bill Cosby and Danny Glover who publicly associate themselves with liberal causes are identified as liberals.

Summary of Results

Twenty-two of the thirty-two schools surveyed did not have a single Republican or conservative commencement speaker in the entire ten years surveyed. The same schools invited 169 liberals and Democrats to address their graduating classes in the same ten-year period.

Six of the remaining schools invited only one Republican or conservative each, as compared to 38 liberals or Democrats.

The three schools (Haverford, Swarthmore and UCLA) which host multiple speakers every year did not feature a single Republican or conservative speaker as balanced against 54 liberals and Democrats.

Overall, the ratio of commencement speakers on the left to commencement speakers on the right is 223 to 15, a little under 15-1.

144 commencement speakers were not associated with a partisan viewpoint.

Raw data

Total schools surveyed: **32**¹¹

Total speakers: **382**

Political Breakdown: **223 Left, 15 Right**

(54 Democrats, 172 Liberals, 2 Conservatives, 13 Republicans 141 Nonpartisan)

Political Breakdown: **169 Left, 15 Right**

(without Haverford, Swarthmore and UCLA which have multiple commencement speakers):

(48 Democrats, 124 Liberals, 2 Conservatives, 13 Republicans, 86 Nonpartisan)

Amherst

1994	Molly Ivins	Journalist	L
1995	Paul J Adams III	School principal	N
1996	Doris Kearns Goodwin	Historian	L
1997	Wynton Marsalis	Musician	N
1998	Joseph Hartzler	Prosecutor	N
1999	Jim Lehrer	PBS	L
2000	William J Amend	Cartoonist	N
2001	Tom Gerety	Amherst President	N
2002	Peter Jennings	NBC	L
2003	Dr. Asma Jahangir	UN official	L

5L, 0R, 0C, 0R, 5N

Bates

1994	Henry Louis Gates Jr.	Professor	L
1995	Garry Wills	Author	L
1996	Chinua Achebe	Novelist	L
1997	Oscar Arias	Nobel Peace Prize	N
1998	Doris Kearns Goodwin	Pulitzer Prize	L
1999	Richard C Holbrooke	American diplomat	D
2000	Desmond Tutu	Archbishop	L
2001	Robert B. Reich	Secretary of Labor	D
2002	Stephen Weinberg	Physicist	N
2003	Stephen L. Carter	Law Professor	N

2D, 6L, 0C, 0R, 2N

Bowdoin

1994	Dr. Angelo J Eraklis	Hospital founder	N
1995	Dr. Philip Sharp	Scientist	N
1996	James Eells Jr	Professor	N
1997	Paul R Brontas	Dukakis campaigner	D
1998	F Washington Jarvis	Prep school headmaster	N
1999	Multiple speakers ¹²		
2000	Peter Gomes	Reverend	L
2001	Mamphela Ramphele	World Bank	L
2002	Dr Kenneth Paige	Scientist	N
2003	Dr Margaret Hamburg	Scientist	N

1D, 2L, 0C, 0R, 8N

Brandeis

1994	Itamar Rabinovich	Israeli ambassador	N
1995	Daniel Schorr	NPR	L
1996	Madeleine K Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D
1997	Multiple speakers ¹³		
1998	Helmut Kohl	Germany President	N
1999	John H Glenn	Senator	D
2000	Desmond M Tutu	Archbishop	L
2001	Peter S Lynch	Business	N
2002	Ted Koppel	ABC	L
2003	Aharon Barak	Liberal Israeli	N

2D, 5L, 0C, 0R, 4N

¹¹ This count excludes University of Chicago and Davidson, which are on the list but contribute only 1 data point collectively. It does include Haverford, Swarthmore and UCLA which contribute multiple speakers per year.

¹² 2N

¹³ 2L

Brown

1994	Michael Paley	Rabbi	L
1995	James Forbes	Reverend	L
1996	Aga Khan	Muslim leader	N
1997	Bill Moyers	PBS	L
1998	Margaret R Miles	Religious critic	L
1999	John Hume	Ireland leader	N
2000	Gustavo Gutierrez	Liberationist	L
2001	Madeleine Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D
2002	Ruth Bader Ginsburg	Supreme Court	L
2003	Xu Wenli	Chinese dissident	N

1D, 6L, 0C, 0R, 3N

Bryn Mawr

1994	Ellen Goodman	Columnist	L
1995	Ilana Diamon Rovner	Judge	N
1996	Jill Ker Conway	Author	L
1997	Ariana Holborn Gray	Academic	N
1998	Zeba M Rasmussen	Liberal Muslim	L
1999	Lynne Meadow	Artistic Director	N
2000	Marian Wright Edelman	President CDF	L
2001	Drew Gilpin Faust	Dean	L
2002	Linda Fairstein	Lawyer	N
2003	David W. Oxtoby	Dean	N

0D, 5L, 0C, 0R, 5N

Cal Tech

1994	Jewel Plummer Cobb	Trustee	L
1995	Multiple Speakers ¹⁴		
1996	Bobby Ray Inman	CIA	R
1997	David Ho	AIDS Researcher	N
1998	Bill Nye	Scientist	N
1999	Tom Brokaw	Journalist	L
2000	Ray Bradbury	Writer	N
2001	Gordon Moore	Intel co-founder	N
2002	Alan Alda	Actor	L
2003	Harold Varmus	Nobel Prize	N

0D, 3L, 0C, 1R, 7N

Carnegie Mellon

1994	Lawrence Ellison	Oracle CEO	N
1995	Jack Klugman	Actor	N
1996	Steven Bochco	Producer	L
1997	Raymond W Smith	Bell Atlantic CEO	N
1998	Jared L Cohon	CMU President	N
1999	Iris Rainer Dart	Author	L
2000	Blair Underwood	Actor	N
2001	Rene Auberjonois	Actor	N
2002	Tom Ridge	Bush Cabinet	R
2003	Teresa Heinz	Philanthropist	L

0D, 3L, 0C, 1R, 6N

U Chicago¹⁵

1996	Bill Clinton	US President	D
------	--------------	--------------	---

0D, 1L, 0C, 0R, 0N

Colgate

1994	Seamus Heaney	Poet	N
1995	Vernon E Jordan Jr	Clinton Cabinet	D
1996	Andrew Rooney	CBS	C
1997	Christine Todd Whitman	Bush Cabinet	R
1998	George E Pataki	Governor	R
1999	Bill Cosby	Comedian	L
2000	John McCain	US Senator	R
2001	Dan Rather	CBS	L
2002	Charlie Rose	PBS	L
2003	Anna Quindlen	Writer	L

1D, 4L, 1C, 3R, 1N

¹⁴ 2N

¹⁵ All commencement speakers are university professors with the exception of Clinton in 1996

Columbia

1994	Fritz Stern	Professor	N
1995	Tom Brokaw	NBC	L
1996	Robert Rubin	Clinton Cabinet	D
1997	Jonathan Kozol	Writer	L
1998	Joseph A Greenaway	Judge	L
1999	Claire Shipman	ABC	L
2000	Brian Dennehy	Actor	N
2001	David Boies	Lawyer	L
2002	David J Stern	NBA	N
2003	George Stephanopolous	Clinton Cabinet	D
2D, 5L, 0C, 0R, 3N			

Cornell

1994	Dr. Mae Jemison	Astronaut	N
1995	Morris Dees	Lawyer	L
1996	Robert F Kennedy Jr	Lawyer	L
1997	Dr. Bertice Berry	Talk show host	L
1998	Keith Obermann	ESPN	L
1999	Sandy Berger	Clinton Cabinet	D
2000	Charles Schumer	Senator	D
2001	Janet Reno	Clinton Cabinet	D
2002	Danny Glover	Actor	L
2003	James Carville	Clinton Cabinet	D
4D, 5L, 0C, 0R, 1N			

Dartmouth

1994	Robert Reich	Clinton Cabinet	D
1995	Bill Clinton	US President	D
1996	David Halberstam	Author	L
1997	Paavo Lipponen	Finland PM	N
1998	Doris Kearns Goodwin	Historian	L
1999	George Mitchell	Senator	D
2000	Shirley Ann Jackson	RPI President	L
2001	Madeleine Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D
2002	Fred Rogers	Actor	N
2003	David McCullough	Writer	N
4D, 2L, 0C, 0R, 3N			

Davidson¹⁶

Duke

1994	Judy Woodruff	Journalist	L
1995	Dr. David Gergen	Professor	N
1996	Jane Alexander	NEA Chair	L
1997	Jimmy Carter	US President	D
1998	George H W Bush	US President	R
1999	Cokie Roberts	Journalist	L
2000	Elizabeth Hanford Dole	Red Cross	R
2001	Charlayne Hunter-Gault	Journalist	L
2002	Thomas K Wolfe Jr	Author	C
2003	Nannerl O Keohane	Duke President	L
1D, 5L, 1C, 2R, 1N			

Harvard

1994	Albert Gore Jr	Vice President	D
1995	Vaclav Havel	Czech President	N
1996	Harold Varmus	NIH	N
1997	Madeleine Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D
1998	Mary Robinson	UN	N
1999	Alan Greenspan	Federal Reserve	N
2000	Amartya K Sen	Professor	L
2001	Robert E Rubin	Clinton Cabinet	D
2002	Daniel Patrick Moynihan	US Senator	D
2003	Ernesto Zedillo	Mexico President	N
4D, 1L, 0C, 0R, 5N			

¹⁶ Davidson College does not have speakers for its commencement ceremony

Haverford

1994 Multiple speakers¹⁷
1995 Multiple speakers¹⁸
1996 Multiple speakers¹⁹
1997 Multiple speakers²⁰
1998 Multiple speakers²¹
1999 Multiple speakers²²
2000 Multiple speakers²³
2001 Multiple speakers²⁴
2002 Multiple speakers²⁵
2003 Multiple speakers²⁶

0D, 26L, 0C, 0R, 12N

MIT

1994	The Aga Khan	Muslim leader	N
1995	Hanna Gray	Uchicago President	N
1996	Albert Gore	Vice President	D
1997	Kofi Annan	UN Secretary General	L
1998	Multiple Speakers ²⁷		
1999	Tom and Ray Magliozzi	NPR	N
2000	Carly S Fiorina	HP CEO	N
2001	Daniel S Goldin	NASA	N
2002	James D Wolfensohn	World Ban	N
2003	George Mitchell	US Senator	D

3D, 1L, 0C, 0R 7N

Northwestern

1994	Arnold R Weber	Northwestern President	N
1995	Henry S Bienen	Northwestern President	L
1996	Robert Redford	Actor	L
1997	Bill Cosby	Comedian	L
1998	Ruther Bader Ginsburg	Supreme Court	L
1999	Walter E Massey	Morehouse President	N
2000	Robert Pinsky	Poet	N
2001	Scott Turow	Lawyer	L
2002	Kofi Annan	UN	L
2003	Wendy Chamberlin	Ambassador	N

0D, 6L, 0C, 0R, 4N

Oberlin

1994	Romulus Linney	Playwright	N
1995	Johnetta Betsch Cole	Spelman President	L
1996	Dr. Robert Coles	Professor	L
1997	Allan Spear	Minnesota Senator	D
1998	Damon Keith	Judge	L
1999	John J Sweeney	AFL-CIO President	L
2000	Oscar Arias Sanchez	Costa Rica President	L
2001	William Grat III	UNCF President	L
2001	Dr. Judah Folkman	Medical Researcher	N
2002	Anthony Lewis	NY Times	L

1D, 7L, 0C, 0R, 2N

Pennsylvania

1994	Henry G Cisneros	Clinton Cabinet	D
1995	Jane Alexander	NEA Chair	L
1996	Tom Brokaw	NBC	L
1997	Bill Cosby	Comedian	L
1998	Jimmy Carter	US President	D
1999	Robert E Rubin	Clinton Cabinet	D
2000	Seamus Heaney	Poet	N
2001	John McCain	US Senator	R
2002	Jim Lehrer	PBS	L
2003	Desmond Tutu	Archbishop	L

3D, 5L, 0C, 1R, 1N

¹⁷ 2L, 2N

¹⁸ 5L, 1N

¹⁹ 3L

²⁰ 3N

²¹ 3L, 1N

²² 3L

²³ 2L, 2N

²⁴ 3L, 1N

²⁵ 2L, 1N

²⁶ 3L, 1N

²⁷ 1D, 1N

Princeton

1994	Wynton Marsalis	Musician	N
1995	Jane Alexander	NEA Chair	L
1996	Bill Bradley	US Senator	D
1997	William Frist	US Senator	R
1998	Ruth and Tom Harkin	US Senator	D
1999	Marian Wright Edelman	CDF President	L
2000	Queen Noor	Foreign leader	N
2001	Garrison Keillor	NPR	L
2002	Meg Whitman	eBay CEO	N
2003	Fred Hargadon	Dean	N

2D, 3L, 0C, 0R, 4N

Smith

1994	Jane L Harman	US Representative	D
1995	Gloria Steinem	Author	L
1996	Anna Quindlen	Columnist	L
1997	Marian Wright Edelman	CDF President	L
1998	Elizabeth Dole	Red Cross	R
1999	Jane Alexander	NEA Chair	L
2000	Judy Chicago	Artist	L
2001	Toni Morrison	Author	L
2002	Lani Guinier	Professor	L
2003	Madeleine Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D

2D, 7L, 0C, 1R, 0N

Stanford

1994	Stephen Carter	Law Professor	N
1995	William Perry	Bush Cabinet	R
1996	Mae C Jemison	Astronaut	N
1997	Stephen Breyer	Supreme Court	L
1998	Ted Koppel	ABC	L
1999	Robert Pinsky	Poet	N
2000	Kofi Annan	UN	L
2001	Carly S Fiorina	CEO Hewlett-Packard	N
2002	Condoleezza Rice	Bush Cabinet	R
2003	Alejandro Toledo	Peru President	N

0D, 4L, 0C, 2R, 4N

Swarthmore

1994	Multiple speakers ²⁸
1995	Multiple speakers ²⁹
1996	Multiple speakers ³⁰
1997	Multiple speakers ³¹
1998	Multiple speakers ³²
1999	Multiple speakers ³³
2000	Multiple speakers ³⁴
2001	Multiple speakers ³⁵
2002	Multiple speakers ³⁶
2003	Multiple speakers ³⁷

0D, 17L, 0C, 0R, 15N

Tufts

1994	Ted Koppel	Media	L
1995	Doris and Richard Goodwin	Authors	L
1996	Bette Bao Lord	Author	N
1997	William B Richardson	Clinton Cabinet	D
1998	Gary Trudeau	Cartoonist	L
1999	David Halberstam	Author	L
2000	Bill Cosby	Comedian	L
2001	Jim Lehrer	PBS	L
2002	Pierre and Pamela Omidyar	eBay	N
2003	Margaret Marshall	Judge	L

1D, 7L, 0C, 0R, 2N

²⁸ 3N

²⁹ 4L

³⁰ 2L, 2N

³¹ 2L, 2N

³² 1L, 3N

³³ 2L, 1N

³⁴ 2L, 1N

³⁵ 3L

³⁶ 1L, 1N

³⁷ 1L, 2N

UC Berkeley

1994	Oliver Stone	Director	L
1995	Robert Reich	Clinton Cabinet	D
1996	Pedro Noguerra	Professor	L
1997	Bill Cosby	Comedian	L
1998	Steve Wozniak	Apple Computers	L
1999	Terry McMillan	Author	L
2000	Madeleine Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D
2001	Janet Reno	Clinton Cabinet	D
2002	Jonny Moseley	Athlete	N
2003	Leon Panetta	Clinton Cabinet	D

4D, 5L, 0C, 0R, 1N

UCLA

1994	Multiple speakers ³⁸		
1995	Multiple speakers ³⁹		
1996	Multiple speakers ⁴⁰		
1997	Multiple speakers ⁴¹		
1998	Multiple speakers ⁴²		
1999	Multiple speakers ⁴³		
2000	Multiple speakers ⁴⁴		
2001	Multiple speakers ³⁵		
2002	Dov Seidman	CEO	N
2003	Zev Yaroslavsky	LA County Supervisor	D

6D, 5L, 0C, 0R, 28N

Wellesley

1994	Cokie Roberts	ABC	L
1995	Madeleine Albright	Clinton Cabinet	D
1996	Nora Ephron	Writer	L
1997	Oprah Winfrey	Talk show host	L
1998	Pamela A Melroy	Astronaut	N
1999	Lynn Sherr	ABC	L
2000	Pamela Daniels	Dean	L
2001	Jehan Sadat	Human rights	N
2002	Whoopi Goldberg	Actress	L
2003	Linda Wertheimer	NPR	L

1D, 7L, 0C, 0R, 2N

Wesleyan

1994	Lowe P Weicker	Governor	L
1995	Charles S Stone	Journalist	L
1996	A Leo Higginbotham	Judge	L
1997	Paul Simon	US Senator	D
1998	Oprah Winfrey	Talk show host	L
1999	Amartya Kumar Sen	Nobel Prize	L
2000	Harold Varmus	Nobel Prize	N
2001	Evelyn Fox Keller	Professor	L
2002	Martha Nussbaum	Professor	L
2003	Jody Williams	Nobel Prize	N

1D, 7L, 0C, 0R, 2N

Williams

1994	Michael S Dukakis	Governor	L
1995	Bernice Johnson Reagon	Composer	L
1996	George Bush	US President	R
1997	Grace Paley	Author	L
1998	Yo-Yo Ma	Musician	N
1999	Christopher Reeve	Actor	L
2000	George J Mitchell	US Senator	D
2001	Robert E Rubin	Clinton Cabinet	D
2002	Morris Dees	Lawyer	L
2003	Eric Lander	Scientist	N

2D, 5L, 0C, 1R, 2N

Yale

1994	Sargent Shriver	Peace Corps	L
1995	Kurt Schmoke	Mayor	L
1996	Henry Winkler	Actor	N
1997	David McCullough	Historian	L
1998	Tom Brokaw	Journalist	L
1999	David Gergen	Journalist	N
2000	Robert Woodward	Journalist	L
2001	Hillary Clinton	US Senator	D
2002	George E Pataki	Governor	R
2003	Thomas L Friedman	NY Times	L

1D, 7L, 0C, 1R, 1N

³⁸ 1L, 1D, 2N

³⁹ 5N

⁴⁰ 1L, 4N

⁴¹ 2L, 1D, 1N

⁴² 1D, 4N

⁴³ 1L, 1D, 2N

⁴⁴ 1D, 4N

⁴⁵ 5N

Appendix: Academic Bill of Rights

I. The Mission of the University.⁴⁶

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.⁴⁷ 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*

⁴⁶ This is a modified version of Princeton’s mission statement, as quoted on p. 62 of Alan Kors and Harvey Silverglate, *The Shadow University*, NY 1998.

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 50

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 its 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.⁴⁶

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.

⁴⁶ These principles only fully apply 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.

2. All tenure, search and hiring committee deliberations will be recorded and made available to appropriately constituted collegiate and university authorities empowered to inquire into the integrity of the process. (The names of committee members may be redacted). No faculty member will be excluded from tenure, search and hiring committees on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.
3. Students will be graded solely on the basis of their reasoned answers and appropriate knowledge of the subjects and disciplines they study, not on the basis of their political or religious beliefs.
4. Curricula and reading lists in the humanities and social sciences should reflect the uncertainty and unsettled character of all human knowledge in these areas by providing students with dissenting sources and viewpoints where appropriate. While teachers are and should be free to pursue their own findings and perspectives in presenting their views, they should consider and make their students aware of other viewpoints. Academic disciplines should welcome a diversity of approaches to unsettled questions.
5. Exposing students to the spectrum of significant scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined in their courses is a major responsibility of faculty. Faculty will not use their courses for the purpose of political, ideological, religious or anti-religious indoctrination.
6. Selection of speakers, allocation of funds for speakers programs and other student activities will observe the principles of academic freedom and promote intellectual pluralism.
7. An environment conducive to the civil exchange of ideas being an essential component of a free university, the obstruction of invited campus speakers, destruction of campus literature or other effort to obstruct this exchange will not be tolerated.
8. Knowledge advances when individual scholars are left free to reach their own conclusions about which methods, facts, and theories have been validated by research. Academic institutions and professional societies formed to advance knowledge within an area of research, maintain the integrity of the research process, and organize the professional lives of related researchers serve as indispensable venues within which scholars circulate research findings and debate their interpretation. To perform these functions adequately, academic institutions and professional societies should maintain a posture of organizational neutrality with respect to the substantive disagreements that divide researchers on questions within, or outside, their fields of inquiry.

