I first want to say a big thanks for the invitation to speak to you. It feels really good to be in the company of right-thinking people after a side trip into the world inhabited by administrators. To have made that trip was to have been controlled for the briefest of moments by what I now realize was “momentary insanity.” But that is another story for another day.

Second, a disclaimer. I am now officially retired – both from daily work in the academic area but also from official duties in the AAUP – save from serving as a consultant to the Committee on Accreditation, formerly known as Committee D. That status brings with it a certain freedom – the ability to speak as an individual and not have my views taken as official AAUP policy. I can be free to express all my views and as frankly as I feel necessary.

Now to the subject of the day – The Value of Liberal Education.

To be asked to speak on this topic is a source of enormous frustration to me in some senses. How did we ever get to the point in our history when we had to talk about the value of liberal learning? What happened to the understanding of the common good that results from liberal learning? Have I been so insulated in a career devoted to liberal learning that I did not really understand the growing concern about the work that has been my life-long work? But talk about the value of liberal learning we must. The skeptics are not only biting at the edges of our enterprise, they want to devour the whole pie.

We need only look around to understand that the Illinois Conference has been insightful in scheduling a meeting theme in Washington this coming June is “The Value of Liberal Education.” The follow-up panel discussion focused on multiple perspectives of academic freedom. Jane Buck, our current national President, spoke of the relationship between academic freedom and liberal education; Cary Nelson, vice president of AAUP, spoke of academic freedom post-9/11; our third panelist, John Wilson, a graduate student at ISU whose research is on the history of academic freedom in America, spoke of the importance of student academic freedom. A lively discussion followed the panel presentation. My only regret is that despite the quality of the program and its wide publicity, we still had empty seats in the Stevenson auditorium. Those who could not attend the meeting can read the text of these informative and inspirational presentations in our current edition of The Illinois Academe. They are also posted at our web site, www.iliaup.org.

At our annual meeting I announced a few new initiatives for the next academic year. One is the establishment of a Speaker Bureau, a directory of experts on AAUP matters who can visit your institution for a presentation at no cost to you. The state office will undertake all their travelling expenses. Look for a list of speakers and how to contact them in the fall e-newsletter. The list will also be posted on our web site. Another initiative for next year is to expand our web site and enable us to poll our members periodically on a number of crucial issues. We hope to establish this service by November 2003.

In other news, we are sending four delegates to the AAUP annual meeting in Washington, DC this June. Furthermore, two of our members have also been nominated for scholarships for the AAUP Summer Institute in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I was happy to visit the St. Xavier chapter and to be in close communications with numerous other chapters like those at National Louis, Loyola and De Paul Universities. Many members of the Council have also visited or contacted chapters throughout the state. This is an ongoing part of our efforts to enhance direct communications with all our chapters and as many of our members as possible.

Finally, I am happy to welcome John Wilson as the new editor of the Illinois Academe. We promise to make it rich and dynamic, and to hold it true to its original mission, to be the voice of all who seek the excellence of AAUP, who completes the commitments that I made for my first year of service as your president. Together with the support and guidance of an energetic Council, we have delivered all that was promised you last year: the creations of our web site and our electronic newsletter, a Chapter Development program which involves the awarding of grants and on-campus visits; an annual meeting in a central location in the state and a restructure of the Illinois Academe.

I wish to thank all the members of the Council, and to wish a fond farewell to those whose term has expired: Jim Johnson (Loyola University), Melba Bauxum (Blackburn College), and past treasurer Connie Caveny (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), who now has a grandchild to babysit for. A very special thanks goes to our new Executive Director, Lynne Meyer, who has worked tirelessly to update our technology needs and communications infrastructure.

I welcome on board our new Council members, Anne Draznin (University of Illinois-Springfield) as the new Treasurer, Fred Widiak (National Louis University), Lisa Townsley (Benedictine University) and John Wilson (Illinois State University). Much gratitude goes also to Joe Felder (Bradley University), who agreed to serve a second term as our Secretary. Joe serves also on the national AAUP Council.

The success of any organization depends on the degree to which its members fully participate and commit time and energy for the cause. I assure you that the current members of the Council have proven themselves willing to work in an unfishy way, serving you while promoting and defending the principles of AAUP. It is up to all of us, not just the Council, to educate our colleagues of the strong heritage and tremendous influence that AAUP has, and continues to have, in shaping academia in this country. It is important to remind all those who work in academia that, whether members of AAUP or not, we are all the beneficiaries of AAUP’s enduring spirit. The very principles of our academic lives were shaped years ago by AAUP’s unsung heroes, thinkers and martyrs, whose collective and courageous contributions provided the foundation of academic freedom, shared governance, tenure and due process. Be involved. Tell others about these principles and the role of AAUP.
A common thread for over two thousand years in the definitions of a liberal education was the liberal arts, as defined by Isocrates in 380 B.C. He argued that a liberal education included the following aspects of the social sciences which have survived in its definition of the humanities: "Languages, both modern and classic; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archeology; the history, criticism, and theory of the arts; and those temporary notions of a liberal education usually included in the definitions of a liberal education. A liberal education, designed to allow access to poetry, rhetoric, and any "liberal and disinterested" pursuits, is a training designed to allow access to poetry, rhetoric, and any "liberal and disinterested" pursuits, is a training.

Athenian democracy depended upon the free exchange of ideas among free men and women, and the free exchange of ideas upon rhetorical skill, defined not merely as oral oratorical ability, but as the ability to make a problem and propose a solution. A liberal education, designed to allow access to political forums, was afforded free men, and technical skills were provided to slaves. The medieval liberal arts curriculum included rhetoric, grammar, and logic (the trivium) as well as astronomy, and music defined as a division of metaphysics (the quadrivium). Contemporarily, the liberal arts curriculum still includes the humanities and the natural and social sciences. In establishing the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1966, President Lyndon B. Johnson defined the humanities in its definition of the humanities: "Linguistics, both modern and classical, and all the sciences connected with them, are among the liberal arts." The humanities, Congress included the following disciplines in its definition of the humanities: "Language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; the history, criticism, and practice of the arts; and those temporary notions of a liberal education usually included in the definitions of a liberal education. A liberal education, designed to allow access to poetry, rhetoric, and any "liberal and disinterested" pursuits, is a training designed to allow access to poetry, rhetoric, and any "liberal and disinterested" pursuits, is a training.
Academic Freedom Under Fire

Academic freedom in America is always under threat, and in the past two years, colleges gave in to temptation to censor. The “war on terror” provide justification for many of the worst infringements of academic freedom, but beneath the veneer of “proprietary correctness” a deeper assault on academic freedom is accelerating—this corporatization of higher education. During a time of budget cuts at campuses across the country, whether caused by state deficits or stock market woes, academic freedom sometimes is sacrificed for the bottom line.

The corporate influence on academia is often direct, via corporate sponsorships of athletic programs, buildings, pro-business departments, and scientific research. But the threat to academic freedom is not emanating solely from the private sector. Government, increasingly the owner of higher education, is eliminating the quest to duplicate the authoritarian CEO model, and its protection of dissent is dismissed as a threat to the economic survival of the institution. Fighting for academic freedom, and against the corporate domination of higher education, requires an understanding of the principles upon which colleges are founded: the expansion of knowledge, and the teaching of this knowledge through the widest possible freedom of thought and expression.

Drake had a false email sent in her name denouncing Islamic radicals for international travel by scholars. A climate of suppressing dissent was evidenced in an incident at the University of California at Berkeley. Candace Falk, a director of the Emma Goldman Papers Project, used anti-war quotes from Goldman in a fundraising letter. The Boulder police then arrived to the Falk’s home and arrested Sami Omar Al-Hussayen, a Ph.D. computer scientist from Saudi Arabia, while interrogating 20 international students for more than four hours. Government prosecutors have charged Al-Hussayen for lying on his visa application (because studying was supposed to not his “sole” reason for coming to America) and ordered him deported for illegal earning money (because he was paid $200 for working on a website).

Patriotic Correctness: The War on Terror and Civil Liberties on Campus

Academic freedom in America is always under threat, and in the past two years, colleges gave in to temptation to censor. The “war on terror” provide justification for many of the worst infringements of academic freedom, but beneath the veneer of “proprietary correctness” a deeper assault on academic freedom is accelerating—this corporatization of higher education. During a time of budget cuts at campuses across the country, whether caused by state deficits or stock market woes, academic freedom sometimes is sacrificed for the bottom line.

The corporate influence on academia is often direct, via corporate sponsorships of athletic programs, buildings, pro-business departments, and scientific research. But the threat to academic freedom is not emanating solely from the private sector. Government, increasingly the owner of higher education, is eliminating the quest to duplicate the authoritarian CEO model, and its protection of dissent is dismissed as a threat to the economic survival of the institution. Fighting for academic freedom, and against the corporate domination of higher education, requires an understanding of the principles upon which colleges are founded: the expansion of knowledge, and the teaching of this knowledge through the widest possible freedom of thought and expression.

Drake had a false email sent in her name denouncing Islamic radicals for international travel by scholars. A climate of suppressing dissent was evidenced in an incident at the University of California at Berkeley. Candace Falk, a director of the Emma Goldman Papers Project, used anti-war quotes from Goldman in a fundraising letter. The Boulder police then arrived to the Falk’s home and arrested Sami Omar Al-Hussayen, a Ph.D. computer scientist from Saudi Arabia, while interrogating 20 international students for more than four hours. Government prosecutors have charged Al-Hussayen for lying on his visa application (because studying was supposed to not his “sole” reason for coming to America) and ordered him deported for illegal earning money (because he was paid $200 for working on a website).

Patriotic Correctness: The War on Terror and Civil Liberties on Campus

Academic freedom in America is always under threat, and in the past two years, colleges gave in to temptation to censor. The “war on terror” provide justification for many of the worst infringements of academic freedom, but beneath the veneer of “proprietary correctness” a deeper assault on academic freedom is accelerating—this corporatization of higher education. During a time of budget cuts at campuses across the country, whether caused by state deficits or stock market woes, academic freedom sometimes is sacrificed for the bottom line.

The corporate influence on academia is often direct, via corporate sponsorships of athletic programs, buildings, pro-business departments, and scientific research. But the threat to academic freedom is not emanating solely from the private sector. Government, increasingly the owner of higher education, is eliminating the quest to duplicate the authoritarian CEO model, and its protection of dissent is dismissed as a threat to the economic survival of the institution. Fighting for academic freedom, and against the corporate domination of higher education, requires an understanding of the principles upon which colleges are founded: the expansion of knowledge, and the teaching of this knowledge through the widest possible freedom of thought and expression.

Drake had a false email sent in her name denouncing Islamic radicals for international travel by scholars. A climate of suppressing dissent was evidenced in an incident at the University of California at Berkeley. Candace Falk, a director of the Emma Goldman Papers Project, used anti-war quotes from Goldman in a fundraising letter. The Boulder police then arrived to the Falk’s home and arrested Sami Omar Al-Hussayen, a Ph.D. computer scientist from Saudi Arabia, while interrogating 20 international students for more than four hours. Government prosecutors have charged Al-Hussayen for lying on his visa application (because studying was supposed to not his “sole” reason for coming to America) and ordered him deported for illegal earning money (because he was paid $200 for working on a website).

Patriotic Correctness: The War on Terror and Civil Liberties on Campus

Academic freedom in America is always under threat, and in the past two years, colleges gave in to temptation to censor. The “war on terror” provide justification for many of the worst infringements of academic freedom, but beneath the veneer of “proprietary correctness” a deeper assault on academic freedom is accelerating—this corporatization of higher education. During a time of budget cuts at campuses across the country, whether caused by state deficits or stock market woes, academic freedom sometimes is sacrificed for the bottom line.

The corporate influence on academia is often direct, via corporate sponsorships of athletic programs, buildings, pro-business departments, and scientific research. But the threat to academic freedom is not emanating solely from the private sector. Government, increasingly the owner of higher education, is eliminating the quest to duplicate the authoritarian CEO model, and its protection of dissent is dismissed as a threat to the economic survival of the institution. Fighting for academic freedom, and against the corporate domination of higher education, requires an understanding of the principles upon which colleges are founded: the expansion of knowledge, and the teaching of this knowledge through the widest possible freedom of thought and expression.

Drake had a false email sent in her name denouncing Islamic radicals for international travel by scholars. A climate of suppressing dissent was evidenced in an incident at the University of California at Berkeley. Candace Falk, a director of the Emma Goldman Papers Project, used anti-war quotes from Goldman in a fundraising letter. The Boulder police then arrived to the Falk’s home and arrested Sami Omar Al-Hussayen, a Ph.D. computer scientist from Saudi Arabia, while interrogating 20 international students for more than four hours. Government prosecutors have charged Al-Hussayen for lying on his visa application (because studying was supposed to not his “sole” reason for coming to America) and ordered him deported for illegal earning money (because he was paid $200 for working on a website).

Patriotic Correctness: The War on Terror and Civil Liberties on Campus

Academic freedom in America is always under threat, and in the past two years, colleges gave in to temptation to censor. The “war on terror” provide justification for many of the worst infringements of academic freedom, but beneath the veneer of “proprietary correctness” a deeper assault on academic freedom is accelerating—this corporatization of higher education. During a time of budget cuts at campuses across the country, whether caused by state deficits or stock market woes, academic freedom sometimes is sacrificed for the bottom line.

The corporate influence on academia is often direct, via corporate sponsorships of athletic programs, buildings, pro-business departments, and scientific research. But the threat to academic freedom is not emanating solely from the private sector. Government, increasingly the owner of higher education, is eliminating the quest to duplicate the authoritarian CEO model, and its protection of dissent is dismissed as a threat to the economic survival of the institution. Fighting for academic freedom, and against the corporate domination of higher education, requires an understanding of the principles upon which colleges are founded: the expansion of knowledge, and the teaching of this knowledge through the widest possible freedom of thought and expression.
Censorship of Student Publications

Suppressing the Press

(a) Governors State University (Illinois): In the most critical defeat for the college press in American history, Illinois Governors State University administrators forced alumnus Richard Nibley to resign from the university and then refused to allow Nibley to keep his student paper, the Chicago Student Press.

(b) Utah State University (Utah): Utah State University administrators forced the editor-in-chief of the student newspaper, the Park Record, to reinstate a fire control ban after Nibley was transferred to another campus.

(c) University of Idaho (Idaho): Administrators shut down The Reporter for the rest of the semester after its April Fool's edition included a political cartoon with a satire of the Idaho governor.

(d) Ohio State University (Ohio): Administrators refused to allow The Lantern to publish a column that criticized the school's lack of diversity.

Legal Threats

(h) California State University at Fullerton (California): A U.S. District Court judge awarded California State University at Fullerton $10,000 to compensate Nicholas A. Tafur for the university's failure to pay him for work he had performed for the university.

Legal Basis

The cases were decided on the basis of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees the right to freedom of the press.

Conclusion

The cases illustrate the conflict between the university's desire to maintain control over the student press and the students' right to free expression. The cases also highlight the challenges faced by student journalists in advocating for their rights and freedoms.
Commencement support for abortion rights.

The University claimed speech by Thor Halvorssen, executive director of FIRE, stated: "We are going to bring them all down. We are hereby petitioning your office to consider speech codes at public universities.

A Chicago State (California): In addition to remaining open to certain zones, Chicago State limits expression within these zones. In April 2003, an anti-abortion group was denied the right to hold a free speech zone because its posters of aborted fetuses offended people at an event sponsored by the Women’s Center.

(Fire OscarConnor.org, May 1, 2003)

University of California: Community College (California): The campus speech zone policy limits protests to Rm-5 within three specified zones, located in the heart of the main campus even within the zones. Protesters must notify the College Security Office about the content of the message. What a mess! The University of Arizona sought to hold a “Pro-America” rally and also to protest Go. Gray Davis’ decision to cutback education funding. It was warned that he would be arrested and expelled if he went outside the free speech zones. Only registered student groups are allowed to hold events outside the zones. Two pro-life activists were arrested on Nov. 13, 2002 for stepping outside the zones. They refused to return to the city. Its College President Louis Zellers told the protesters “not only the people who want to speak or demonstrate, but also our students who are intimidated by it.”

(Circle College.edu, May 4, 2003)

Speech Zones on Campus

In March 2003, the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) launched a crusade on behalf of individual rights against speech codes, beginning with vague harassment policies at Shippensburg University. Thomas L. Havens, executive director of FIRE, stated: “We are going to bring them all down. We are here to focus on the freedom of speech codes at public universities.

City University of New York: several conservative speakers boycotted a Fall 2002 conference on biotechnology at the college's Laguardia Community College. Sidney Hook because Cornel West was invited to speak. (Chronicle of Higher Education, July 5, 2002)

c) Colorado College: Palestinian activist Hanan Ashrawi spoke on campus Sept. 11, 2002, despite protests against her presence.

(Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 15, 2002)

d) College of the Holy Cross: A Nov. 1, 2002 speech by Rev. Michael Prior, chair of the Holy Land Project Research Group at St. Mary’s College in England, was cancelled because of allegations of anti-Semitism.

(Massachusetts Telegram & Gazette, Dec. 10, 2002)

e) Collotown (Maryland): Daniel Pipes was disinvited in Oct. 2002 from a speech sponsored by a consortium of Baltimore area colleges because of the controversy over his website www.CampusWatch.org since it “might cause unseemly reactions among both the participants and the audience.” (National Review, Jan. 7, 2003; Chronicle of Higher Education, January 31, 2003)

g) Harvard University and University of Vermont: rescinded an invitation for a poetry reading by poet Tom Paulin because he was quoted in April 2002 in Al-Ahram Weekly saying about Jewish settlers on the West Bank: “They should be shot dead. I think they are Nazis, racist. I feel nothing but hatred for them.”

(Harvard’s English department voted on Nov. 19, 2002 to reinstate the poetry reading. (New Yorker, Jan. 27, 2003)

(f) Stanford University (California): In December 2002, the Stanford Israel Alliance rescinded an invitation to Daniel Pipes because “there has already been a great deal of controversy over Campus Watch.” (National Review, Jan. 7, 2003)

(j) University of Michigan: columnist and attorney Debbie Schlussel filed a lawsuit Oct. 8, 2002 for the Michigan Student Zontists to ban the Second National Student Conference on the Palestinian Solidarity Movement at the University of Michigan.


Speech Zones on Campus

1) University of Houston: After its administrators approved a large anti-abortion exhibit on the main campus in March 2002, the Pro-Life Cougars student group tried to bring it back in June 2002.

When university officials refused, citing its disruptiveness, the students then planned to demonstrate in a federal district court. Judge on June 24, 2002 declared the speech policy, which limits free speech to four zones, unconstitutional. The next day, the University of Houston president unveiled a new speech policy that eliminated all zones. However, because students must register 10 days in advance for protests. University of Houston allowed gay rights rally outside the university’s free speech zones because it was a university sponsored event not one sponsored by a student group. (National Law Journal, October 28, 2002; Houston Chronicle, March 17, 2003)

2) University of Maryland at College Park: The College published a new policy on free speech and student groups are allowed to hold events in those limited areas where such activity is ever permitted, the university severely restricts the times, days and locations in which it is allowed.” University spokesperson George Catlett declared, “People also have the right to go to class and not be harassed, so it’s always a balance of those things, but the university does make a tremen- dous effort to make sure that people have an opportunity to ex- press their views, no matter how unpopular they may be.”


3) University of South Florida: Since students planned a march through campus to the building where the hearing about Sami Al-Arian was scheduled to be held. The university in- decideded to move the hear- ing off-campus, to the Embassy Suites, where protesters on private land were kept more than 50 yards away in a “free speech zone.”

(USF Oracle, Jan. 27, 2003)

4) University of Texas at El- Paso: The AFL-CIO filed a lawsuit March 7, 2003 accusing university officials of discrimination in the freedom of speech by refusing re- quests for permits to speak at the two free speech zones on campus. According to UTEP student government president Ruben Reyes, “Dean Schaefer would demand to know the content of the speech of par- ticular speakers, hence making the content of a speaker’s speech a criterion for whether that indi- vidual could be allowed to speak.” After Reyes’ requests for events were repeatedly denied, Reyes spoke extemporaneously at the site of the speakers and officials threatened to expel him for speaking outside the zones.


Free Speech Victories

(i) Illinois State University: The Academic Senate voted overwhelmingly in Oct. 2002 to op- pose a proposed “speech zone” code that would limit protests and demonstrations to a well-de- fined areas on campus. There is still a formal ban on all ampli- fication on campus. (S.P.L.C, Nov. 9, 2002)

(k) Iowa State University: A new policy will allow protesters to escape out of the two official “free speech zones,” although restrictions are still placed on the size of groups and the proximity to buildings. In September 2002, the Campus Greens had been asked to move away from a building where they wanted to protest against a new pro- fessor. (AP, Nov. 21, 2002)

(i) University of California at Berkeley: administrators replaced a ban on “fighting words” with a narrower policy against harassing speech. (AP, April 29, 2003)

(m) University of Illinois: On Jan. 27, 2003, three activists op- posed to the construction of a new chief. Illiniwelk, filed a $2.5 mil- lion federal civil rights lawsuit against the university for alleged police and security stiff. They were ordered to leave a Jan. 27, 2002 women’s basketball game for yelling that the Chief Illiniwelk was a “white racist.” Cook was convicted of resisting arrest for refusing to leave. Chancellor Nancy Cantor has written that the removal of Chief Illiniwelk was not designed to или it from the campus and is liable for $5,000 for damages and $300,000 in ACLU legal fees. (Daily Illini, November 11, 2002)

(n) University of Texas at Aus- tin: a November, 2002 report pro- posed a ban on “free-speech zones,” but the university did not change its policy and is willing to pay $5,000 for damages and $300,000 in ACLU legal fees. (Daily Texan, February 2002; AP, Nov. 11, 2002)

(q) Western Illinois Univer- sity: in May 2003, the university dropped a speech policy which required 48 hour advanced reservation for a free speech zone. After students and faculty held a protest against the policy, university officials removed the restrictions and de- clared, “There is no better place for free speech than a campus that is not controlled by the university.” Our entire university represents the ideal of freedom of expression. I do not believe that we would ever want to restrict free speech to a specific area on campus.” (Peoria Journal-Star, May 6, 2003; AP, May 9, 2003)

SPEAKING PROTESTS
Silencing Dissent

(a) Boston University: In May 2003, Chancellor Silber forced the resignation of dean Brent Baker. Baker was named the target of a forum run by students who had been expelled for the attack. Administration apologized and allowed the posters back up after federal officials informed the college that federal privacy laws could not prohibit a rape victim from discussing her attack.

(c) Harvard University: After an anti-abortion student group complained that its posters showing a fetus were being destroyed, the Undergraduate Council of Students called for a resolution calling for the College to punish students who destroy posters. The Council was subsequently overridden, and posters were restored.

(d) Ohio State University: In May, 2003, the university administration, under pressure from the university police, ordered the removal of a poster claiming that President Bush was a war criminal. The poster was later restored.

Academic Freedom

(b) Purdue University: On Nov. 25, 2003, the Supreme Court of California ruled that university administrators are responsible for making sure all students are treated equally.

Copyright Restrictions

Copyright restrictions may vary from one campus to another. A complete list of the restrictions on the use of copyright material on campus is available from the university administration.

Silencing Dissent

(a) College of William and Mary: a student who put up a poster about her rape at a fraternity house had it taken down by campus security personnel. An investigator who was hired had been banned because he was regarded as "improperly collecting" and criticizing college administrators. The group that called upon the chancellor to issue a policy of non-interference with established campus policies was formed because the rapist had been accused of raping other women.

(b) DePaul University: DePaul students Giuseppe Alcoff, Matt Muchowski, and Justin Sturdevant were all expelled in May 2003 because they had been accused of defacing the campus by sticking up posters.

Copyright Restrictions

(c) University of California at San Diego: In May, 2003, police officers shut down a website with anime images, following a federal lawsuit. The posters on the website were removed after the university received a legal threat from a group that claimed they infringed copyright laws.

(d) University of Maryland: The Family Research Council was ordered to remove a website that was being used to promote its anti-gay campaign.

Silencing Dissent

(a) University of California at Berkeley: In May 2003, the university administration forced a professor to remove a poster that was critical of the university's decision to allow pro-Palestinian groups to hang a sign on campus.

Copyright Restrictions

(b) Cornell University: In April, 2003, the university administration removed a website with anime images after the university received a legal threat from a group that claimed they infringed copyright laws.
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Why would we ask about the value of such an education?

I think several things have been responsible for the decline in attending college. First we saw and are seeing with increasing intensity the need to save money at the federal and state levels. When you look at entitlements in state and federal budgets, you begin to realize the dangers that are out there for higher education. We are now at the point where the only area of the State budget that is flexible is support for higher education, and even the entitlements understood to support K-12 education are now no longer seen as being sacrosanct. And the college endowment, although it has continued unabated despite any financial crisis, programs originally funded by the federal government have since the mid-1990s been reduced. Instead, college campuses have seen their budgets strained to the limit. It has not helped that we have experienced an economic downturn and new governors are being forced to make painful decisions about who works for their state, when they might be able to cut a target of budgets because it represents a flexible part of the budget.

It is the responsibility of the faculty to do the work of the faculty. In the mid-1990s we saw the development of still another tool which has changed the focus of attention on higher education. North Central, the accrediting body in our region of the country, accredited the University of Phoenix and that institution began to establish branches in every part of the country. While there are those who will point to the nature and goals of this university, it represented a new and different model for higher education in this country. Classes are held both on campuses at regional sites and through distance learning. The faculty are not on campus full time, with only one full-time faculty in each academic area, for example in Nursing.

The argument is that faculty provide no training for faculty and that the use of "superadjuncts," individuals with less than a baccalaureate degree. It has not helped that we have experienced an economic downturn and new governors are being forced to make painful decisions about who works for their state, when they might be able to cut a target of budgets because it represents a flexible part of the budget.

The Value of a Liberal Arts Education

It all becomes highly personal. And it is true that we have not been as active as we should have been about explaining to the public what that value is. Is it important for a legislator to understand the history of a topic on which voting is scheduled. Is an understanding of Ecology and Ethics important for teachers when they are assessing the opening of the Northern Slope for oil exploitation? Is an understanding of Islam vital to the development of a successful policy to be used after a war fought for proclaimed moral reasons? Is an understanding of what attracts the biologist who seeks pleasure in areas other than work?

I might tell the story of my youngest son. He went to a Fine Liberal Arts college in the East and like many of my students, he was there for the social activities as he was in academics as an undergraduate. As part of our role was to smile and be there when the inevitable occurred. After graduation with a degree in Political Science, he decided to stay in the New England area because a friend would not move to Washington, D.C. with him where he hoped to eventually use his skills. Since few jobs were available he took one in a community college in the Registrar's office entering data into spreadsheets. When it became clear a year later that his friend was not going to go with him to Washington, he decided to stay and go after friends with similar interests. He was desperate for work and he would have likely done the same thing.

His mother, in astonishment, said: "How are you going to do the job you have for you have never had a course in computer science?" He responded with some surprise with the statement "Mom, I can read." Within five years he was nominated for President of the Computer Coordinators group in the Senate.

Did he learn computer science in college? No – what he learned was the ability to read, to listen, to reason, to work with others. And he had the skills to take up the challenges as they were needed, and he learned to apply what he knew to problems that needed solutions. That is the product of a Liberal Arts education. It is what makes the continuation of the Liberal Arts core of our colleges and universities so valuable. As James Freedman says in his book on the Liberal Arts, "Liberal Education opens our eyes to what we life is principally about. It is about understanding the world and having some resources to deal with everything life throws at you. It's about developing a moral compass and some understanding of how society works, how democracy works."

We have taken steps to have taken stands in defense of the Liberal Arts. But we need to be even more vocal in that defense. We need to be at the forefront when accreditation standards are being set. We need to be there for the impact that the accreditation standards are having. And when these decisions are made to downsize institutions. We need to be at the forefront when accreditation standards are being set. We need to be there for the impact that the accreditation standards are having.
Tuition: A Chicago Sun-Times survey found that Illinois’ public universities will raise tuition by an average of 11.5 percent for Fall 2003. Chicago-area private colleges will increase tuition by an average of 6.2 percent. Tuition increases are likely to increase much more next year, because the General Assembly passed a new law (HB 1118) requiring public universities to freeze tuition levels for all tenured, full-time students for three years, effective in Fall 2004. On May 18, Gov. Blagojevich signed HB 60, which will provide in-state tuition rates to aliens who attend Illinois schools for three years. (Chicago Sun-Times, May 28)

Pensions: A plan to combine the state’s pension systems was not passed during the final week of the legislative session, but the governor’s budget director reported that the idea might be brought up again. (Chicago Urban-Neva Gaye, May 29)

Northwestern University: the student government criticized the school’s response to racial epithets found in a dormitory. In a May 29 statement, the student senate declared, “It is the opinion of the undergraduate student body at Northwestern University that the administration’s efforts to combat hate on campus are woefully inadequate.” (Chicago Tribune, May 30)

Underrepresented minorities increased at Illinois colleges, according to a report from the IBHE. Enrollment of African-American students rose nearly 5 percent and Latino enrollments increased almost 7 percent from fall 2001 to fall 2002. African-Americans earned 7 percent more bachelor’s degrees, and 21 percent more doctorates; over the past decade, the number of African-Americans earning any degree grew by 45 percent. Latino students showed a 12 percent increase in degrees in the past year, and a 9 percent increase in the past decade. (www.ibhe.state.il.us)

City Colleges of Chicago: Mohammed Salah, a part-time computer lecturer at Olive-Harvey College, was fired June 4 because he failed to list a terrorism conviction in Israel on his employment application. Salah, a U.S. citizen, served five years in an Israeli prison, accused of helping to channel $650,000 to the terrorist group Hamas. Salah claims that he was falsely convicted based on a confession extracted using torture. Salah reported that he omitted the conviction from his employment application because he thought it asked only for US convictions. (Chicago Tribune, June 6, Chicago Sun-Times, June 6)

Illinois State University: Tenure-track faculty voted on April 23 to unionize with the Illinois Education Association. Faculty voted 131-79 in favor of the union. (http://tatt.pabn.org)