Dear colleagues:

Despite pleas from students and faculty, and the 14-11 vote by the DePaul Faculty Council in favor of keeping Barat College of DePaul University open, the Board of Trustees decided to close it down in 2005. It was an emotional experience as I listened to dozens of students, some in tears, making a strong plea for keeping Barat open. I talked to them, as well as to alumni and faculty of Barat College.

Representing AAUP-IL, I made a brief presentation to the DePaul Faculty Council on the 4th of February. My first of two points was that in such deliberations the Faculty Council should consider the educational, human and historical elements associated with Barat College and not only the cost of repairing its buildings. My second and strongest point was that, should DePaul decide to shut down Barat, then every effort must be made to accommodate the students and to honor not only the tenure but the tenure track rights and privileges of its faculty as much as possible. Defending and preserving tenure, even in extreme cases such as closing down a campus branch, is the litmus test of our organization and the principles for which it stands. Many other AAUP members were present at the meeting; the strong AAUP presence was noticeable and well received by the Faculty Council and the administrators.

I feel proud that our organization was called upon to be part of this difficult moment in the history of DePaul University, and that we responded well through a clear and effective communication of vital and relevant AAUP principles. I wish to commend the AAUP chapter of DePaul, whose members, under the leadership of Mike McIntyre, stood up to the occasion. Their voice was energized by their strong convictions. This was an educational experience for many of us and a good test of our organization and the principles for which it stands.

In spite of it all, we are reassured that in tough times faculty do rise up and deal with challenges in academia with tremendous energy and courage. They make maximum use of the different types of resources available to them at the state and national AAUP office, reminding administrators and other faculty of the standard academic practices that AAUP has managed to fashion over the years.

While no one has ever fully counted the contingent faculty in all the relevant subsectors, I estimate that there is a minimum of 16,000 contingent faculty working in the Chicago area alone. These figures, drawn from my recent

Contingent Faculty continued on page 7

Illinois AAUP Annual Meeting
Saturday, April 17 — Chicago

You are cordially invited to our AAUP-Illinois annual meeting, which will be held on Saturday the 17th of April at Columbia College in Chicago. The theme of our meeting this year is Contingent Faculty: their contributions and rights as well as their overall impact on academia, particularly in the areas of tenure and academic freedom. We have arranged for excellent speakers that include Dr. Sylvia Manning, chancellor of the University of Illinois at Chicago, and Joe Berry, a part-time instructor at Roosevelt University and a leader of contingent faculty in Chicago. Free and open to all faculty, the IL-AAUP meeting will be held at the Hokin Auditorium in Columbia College’s Wabash Building (623 South Wabash). We plan to begin at approximately 10:30am. For more information and to RSVP for our free lunch, call our main office at (773) 510-5923 or email immeyer@mindspring.com

Featured Speaker: Sylvia Manning

Sylvia Manning came to the University of Illinois as Vice President for Academic Affairs in 1994 from the University of Southern California, here she was Executive Vice Provost. In July, 2000, she was named Chancellor of UIC after serving as Interim Chancellor since September, 1999. She is a Professor of English with an undergraduate degree from McGill University and graduate degrees from Yale University.

The Academic Bill of Rights:

Does David Horowitz’s crusade against leftists threaten academic freedom?

John K. Wilson investigates, pages 4-7

Illinois College News:

DePaul faculty speak out on Barat College closure; tenure under attack; funding Illinois higher education.

pages 2-3

National News:

The NEA “terrorists”; scholars banned from Cuba; civil liberties & Chief Illiniwek; federal control over international studies

American Association of University Professors
5658 South Meade Ave. #2
Chicago, IL 60638-3504

Contingent Faculty in Chicago and Illinois

This casualization of the faculty workforce, its progressive disempowerment within the institutions and its increasing need to struggle to piece together a living constitutes a wider opening of the door to the progressive corporatization and commercialization of higher education.

On the Web: Read the AAUP’s new statement on contingent faculty at www.aaup.org.
Tenure Under Attack in the Illinois House

On February 25, 2004, Illinois House Bill 4073 was scheduled for a hearing by the Higher Education Committee of the Illinois General Assembly. The bill was sponsored by Monique Davis (D) of Chicago. The purpose of the bill was to radically change the method by which tenure and promotion criteria are established and the method by which tenure is granted or rejected. In addition, the bill would also have effectively remove the faculty from its traditional role in the tenure process.

The threat posed by this bill produced a flurry of e-mails and phone calls to me from around the country. Conversations with Mark Smith, AAUP Director of Government Relations, led to a plan for testifying against this bill. The Minority Caucus in the House (the Democrats) was working on a competing bill to protect the faculty. The Democrats were persuaded to support the AAUP’s position on tenure. The members of the caucus have agreed to support the bill to insure that the rights of our colleagues are protected.

On March 2, 2004, the DePaul chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) decided to protest the bill. AAUP’s policy on tenure is that tenure is granted or rejected based on the merit of the candidate, as determined by the faculty, with appropriate university administration. The AAUP does not support the end of tenure in any form. Tenure is a fundamental right of academic freedom. Any move to eliminate tenure would be a violation of AAUP’s educational standards. The threat posed by this bill produced a flurry of e-mails and phone calls to me from around the country. Conversations with Mark Smith, AAUP Director of Government Relations, led to a plan for testifying against this bill. The Minority Caucus in the House (the Democrats) was working on a competing bill to protect the faculty. The Democrats were persuaded to support the bill to insure that the rights of our colleagues are protected.

On April 17, 2004, the Illinois House Committee on Higher Education held a hearing on House Bill 4073. The purpose of the hearing was to consider the bill and to hear testimony from interested parties.

The hearing was well attended, with over 20 people testifying. The majority of the testimony was in support of the bill, with only a few people testifying against it. The committee members were also well informed, with many of them asking thoughtful questions.

The hearing lasted for over two hours, with testimony from a wide range of individuals and organizations. The most vocal supporters of the bill were the representatives of the University of Illinois at Chicago, who argued that the bill was necessary to protect the institution and its faculty.

The representative of DePaul University, Professor Paul Jaskot, spoke against the bill, arguing that tenure is a fundamental right of academic freedom. He cited AAUP’s policy on tenure, which states that tenure is granted or rejected based on the merit of the candidate, as determined by the faculty, with appropriate university administration. The AAUP does not support the end of tenure in any form. Tenure is a fundamental right of academic freedom. Any move to eliminate tenure would be a violation of AAUP’s educational standards.

The hearing was adjourned without a vote on the bill. The committee members will likely vote on the bill at a later date.
Educators know that asking the right question is essential to eliciting a useful response from students or helping a committee use time wisely and derive useful conclusions. Asking the wrong question(s) can have disastrous effects. Are the Governor and legislators asking the question, “Can we afford to support higher education at the levels being requested?” Perhaps they and Illinois need to ask a different question. Can the state of Illinois afford not to improve its level of support for higher education?

The Governor’s emphases in the proposed FY 05 budget are K-12 education, health care, and public safety. The Governor has recommended a 5.9% decrease in state support (3% excluding SURS) for higher education although the publicity stresses that the “all funds budget” shows an increase due in large part to tuition increases. Yet, enrollments are at an all time high. Can the state afford these cuts on top of the last two years of severe cuts?

Higher education is no longer a luxury. It is not a choice. It is a necessity. Paul Lingenfelter in a recent presentation to the IBHE Faculty Advisory Council said, “knowledeh and skill have become the most valuable resources in the world. Most developed countries are catching or surpassing the United States in degree attainment, and education has become essential to economic prosperity and mobility for communities and individuals.” And for individuals, educational level is tied to such factors as improved health and increased life expectancy.

If Illinois, indeed the nation, is to remain competitive in the international economy, a highly educated workforce is a sine qua non. As Alan Weber put it (USA Today, Jan 26, 2003), “The only way to have a future is to invest it. It makes little sense for politicians to bewail the loss of jobs. The real quest is for the next source of jobs and economic activity.” “We’re not going to get back the 3 million manufacturing jobs that have vanished from our economy.” Higher education is part of the required infrastructure of economic viability in today’s world, even more so in the future.

Universities are central to the research that produces new ideas leading to new products, new enterprises, new jobs. A higher education system that is the envy of the world not only is key to much of the research enterprise but also produces the individuals that can build it and build it upon it. The two Nobel prizes at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign are one indication of the central role universities play in generating and disseminating knowledge. The daily work of educators in the classroom is another.

Educators at public and private institutions alike face daunting tasks:

· We are being asked to find new ways of ensuring learning.
· We are being asked through our institutions to set up for technology.
· We are being asked to educate a significantly more diverse student body despite a trend of diminishing con- stant dollar state support.
· We are being asked to hold down tuition in- creases while preparing for continued reduction in state support for higher education in the future.
· We are being asked to find new ways of ensuring access to a quality education at significantly less cost.
· We are being asked to avoid creating a sharply differentiated multilayered system of educational qual- ity within and between public and private education.

As educators we must respond to these challenges. But to respond we must have the support required to ensure that our higher education system does not place out stu- dents, our state, our nation at risk economically or politi- cally or risk surrendering the American dream of an en- hanced quality of life not just for ourselves but for all.

Hence, the one consistent address issue of a taxation level that does not support the essential shared needs of the state and country. There will always be waste and graft and efforts to eliminate them must be on- going. But eliminating all waste and graft (defined by any reasonable standard) will not meet our needs. An increase in the state income tax and a reduction in the property tax as a means for previously excluded institutions have long been advocated in Illinois. That shift may depend upon the courts mandating it by ruling the current financing of public el- ementary and secondary schools illegal or unconstitutional.

We may find that our higher education policy will provide a tem- porary but not a permanent solution. We might move to a graduated tax in Illinois or alter the levels of the gradu- ated national income tax. We might even consider extend- ing sales taxes beyond goods—much less dominant ele- ment in contemporary society—to services—a much more prominent feature of the information/service economy of the future.

Yes, I have come to “understand” that taxes that help “them” are harmful—not just to the economy and to me but to “them” as well—while the taxes that serve my needs are not. But one of the responsibilities of being educators is to help people understand the difficulty of defin- ing a “them” in our community and understanding the breadth of my “needs” in a complex society.

Further, I remember Hume’s happy dictum (freely restated) that as human beings we underweight the long- term future and overvalue the short-term present. We and our legislators must ask ourselves why we are being asked to support higher education now and make long- term. But one of the responsibilities of being educators is to help people understand the necessity of defini- ing a “them” in our community and understanding the breadth of my “needs” in a complex society.

Can the state of Illinois afford not to improve its level of support for higher education?

---

Death By a Thousand Cuts: Higher Education in Illinois

By Gretchen Knapp

Testimony by Gretchen Knapp in February, 2004 to a General Assembly committee on higher education in Illinois.

I am here to give you the perspective from the Illi- nois State University classroom on how the budget cuts have affected student learning and access to education. My colleagues at Eastern Illinois and Northern Illinois University share my concerns.

Since the budget cuts, class sizes have increased, which is not conducive to optimum student learning. Certain courses have been cancelled or offered less fre- quently. This means that students may not be able to graduate on time.

Our IBHE-award-winning course for freshmen, Foundations of Inquiry, is the first general education class on the chopping block. This course guaranteed a small class atmosphere of 30 students and improved retention. And the course was a major recruiting tool for retaining K-12 graduates. Contact IL AAUP who are paying for their education to replace trained librarians and library technicians who are there to help them.

Since the budget cuts, only bare-bones additions to the book, periodical, and electronic databases in the library have been possible. This does not serve our mandate to keep student learning current, especially in the fast-moving fields of science, technology, business, and nursing.

Since the budget cuts, even basic resources have become hard to obtain. In many units, staff and stu- dents must ask for toilet paper and paper towels. In some departments faculty must purchase their own zip disks and other storage media to use in “smart rooms” set up for technology.

Budget cuts at Illinois State have led to the removal of daytime building service workers from most of the campus area. In science labs, this has led to hazardous situations that have harmed people and damaged tax- supported equipment and buildings.

Deferred maintenance at the library has meant not keeping up with annual adjustments of the roof leak management system. Plus the library’s electrical sys- tem has been rated so poorly that it may well be the next “Law and Justice Center” disaster. You may re- member that the county’s “Law and Justice Center’s elec- trical system literally exploded, closing the building for months — and costing taxpayers. Illinois State could not function without its library.

Other hidden costs of the budget cuts affect student learning. Faculty have tried to use technology to allevi- ate problems caused by restricted photocopying of class materials. But the lack of computer technicians and tech- nical support has made reliance on computer technol- ogy to provide electronic readings, tests, and study ma- terials very difficult. Add to that the lack of personnel to maintain and update existing software and hardware, and protect faculty and students against viruses — and you see a disaster waiting to happen.

For example, the Illinois State University Technol- ogy Foundation has proposed a computer technology in the classroom last summer under the sponsorship of State Farm Insurance. Sadly, one of the major software packages faculty prepared for use in the fall semester was not up to par when the semester began — by the university, which could not afford the license.

Even the Faculty Technology Support Services divi- sion, a major lost state funding program, is now a Secre- tary to technology to improve student learning. For example, faculty routinely made PowerPoint presentations into regular slides when giving talks to church groups and civic organizations that have slide projectors, but not expensive PC projectors. FFTS no longer has this capa- bility.

While Illinois State’s Foundation has started a suc- cessful capital campaign and established endowed ac- counts which can be used by selected departments for particular purposes, this is not an answer to the budget crisis either.

The Foundation’s board decided that there were to be zero disbursements on the endowed accounts for FY 04, and most of the funds that have been raised are es- tablished for waste and graft decades from now when they are available — but certainly not now.

We appreciate that the budget situation is very diffi- cult. But we also hope you understand that adult learning is being affected by these cuts in the budget.

I ask you that the legislature, not cut our budget any further.

---

We invite all our chapters and members to use this Speakers Bureau and bring these stories to your constituents.

Joseph Felder, Executive Director Lynne Meyer at (773) 516-5923, lmeyer@mindspring.com. We are accepting nominations and applications from experienced AAUP members who wish to serve on this bureau.

---

Write to Illinois Academe

Write us a letter, express your opinion, or submit an article or a book review.

Email editor John K. Wilson at jkwilso2@ilstu.edu.

---

Ken Andersen

On Asking the Right Questions

---

SPEAKERS: Ken Andersen, Speech Communication, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, past president, IL AAUP; Joseph Felder, Executive Director, Bradley University, Secre- tary, IL AAUP; Jack Leahy, Religious Studies, DePaul Uni- versity, and past president, IL AAUP; Pan Papacosta, Colum- bia College in Chicago, and president, IL AAUP; Lawrence Poston, English, University of Illinois at Chicago; Leo Welch, Biology, Southern Illinois College, and past president, IL AAUP; John K. Wilson, editor, Illinois Academe.
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Academic Freedom Under Fire: David Horowitz

By John K. Wilson

In the latest installment of the culture wars, right-wing activist David Horowitz has launched a personal campaign of denigration engendered by a certain political correctness. The label of "academic freedom" is clearly a fiction for many of the authors Horowitz challenges. The University of Nebraska, headquarters of the Center for the Study of Popular Culture (CSPC), is a frequent target of Horowitz's vitriol. All of this is typical of the academic freedom debate, and yet the title of the CSPC report, "The Academic Bill of Rights," is a misnomer. The report's authors have misused the term in their attempt to foster an illusion of academic freedom. The CSPC report's claims are misleading and unsupported.

The Academic Bill of Rights is a compilation of selected articles by Horowitz. It is intended to promote the idea of academic freedom by highlighting perceived threats to it. The CSPC report, on the other hand, seeks to identify and address actual threats to academic freedom. By doing so, the CSPC report challenges the legitimacy of Horowitz's campaign.

The Academic Bill of Rights is a compilation of selected articles by Horowitz. It is intended to promote the idea of academic freedom by highlighting perceived threats to it. The CSPC report, on the other hand, seeks to identify and address actual threats to academic freedom. By doing so, the CSPC report challenges the legitimacy of Horowitz's campaign.

The Academic Bill of Rights is a compilation of selected articles by Horowitz. It is intended to promote the idea of academic freedom by highlighting perceived threats to it. The CSPC report, on the other hand, seeks to identify and address actual threats to academic freedom. By doing so, the CSPC report challenges the legitimacy of Horowitz's campaign.

The Academic Bill of Rights is a compilation of selected articles by Horowitz. It is intended to promote the idea of academic freedom by highlighting perceived threats to it. The CSPC report, on the other hand, seeks to identify and address actual threats to academic freedom. By doing so, the CSPC report challenges the legitimacy of Horowitz's campaign.
Horowitz’s Crusade for the “Academic Bill of Rights”

AAUP’s Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Horowitz’s interpretation of what should be banned on college campuses goes far beyond any mainstream concept of academic freedom. In a 1999 article in the Colorado Rocky Mountain News, Horowitz stated that he had "become appalled to find anti-Bush material on the office doors of some faculty members..." His account is clarified in another paper, titled "Reclaiming the Campus" (AAUP, 2001), where Horowitz claims to see the greatest dislocations of new Ph.D.s applying for jobs and those employed in small numbers of low-paying jobs, a problem that is not only in the humanities and the social sciences, but in every discipline. These claims are the greatest dislocations. More funding for higher education, if it led to more tenure-track jobs and better faculty pay, would attract more Republicans into academia and cause more professors to become Republicans as they grew wealthier. But Horowitz’s goal is not simply to increase the number of Republicans teaching Shakespeare; he is interested in changing the identity of the “left-wing ideologues” on campus.

Horowitz’s Attack on Academic Freedom

Horowitz’s view of what should be banned on college campuses goes far beyond any mainstream concept of academic freedom. In a 1999 article in the Colorado Rocky Mountain News, Horowitz stated that he had become appalled to find anti-Bush material on the office doors of some faculty members. He then went on to list what he considered to be examples of such material, including "anti-Bush" posters and bumper stickers, anti-Bush cartoons, and anti-Bush advertisements for college newspapers. The clear implication of AAUP policy, as stated by Horowitz, is that "anti-Bush" materials should be banned from college campuses.
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Answering the Academic Bill of Rights continued from page 5

orowitz doesn’t believe in what he says about diversity and academic freedom and hostile environments. He only finds it politically convenient to use diverse students as a means of expression to manipulate the debate. As he has admitted, “I have undertaken the task of cultivating the student angle—a reflection, and urging them to protest a situation that has become intolerable. I encourage them to use the language that the left has de- ployed in the past, and later, when they can, to change the agenda. Radical professors have fostered a ‘hostile learning environment’ for conser- vatives. These students lack of ‘intellec- tual diversity’ on college faculties and in academic classrooms. The conservative viewpoint is ‘under-represented’ in the cur- riculum and on its reading lists. The uni- versity is an institutionalization of a ‘intellectu- ally diverse’ community.” Horowitz’s rhetoric is a mix of savvy manipulation and mockery. He uses “academic freedom” as a ruse rallying cry to undermine academic free- dom, and “intellectual diversity” as his jus- tification for silencing diverse ideas he doesn’t like.

Horowitz does not believe that higher education should be a place of diverse ideas and dissent, or that colleges and universities are mere training grounds for the corporate world. According to Horowitz, “the university was not created to prepare students for dealing with other institutions. It is designed to train employees, citizens and leaders of those institutions, and to endow them with ap- propriate skills and values.” Horowitz has a chilling vision of the university as a servile institution creating good workers who will do whatever the administration orders. As he has said, “all of his complaints, colleges typically ful-

The media have reported on Horowitz’s campaign unceasingly, as reflected in the headlines of the Atlantic Journal-Constitu- tion (10/22/03), “Bill Seeks Neutral Poli- tics at College,” the Hill ("Kington Backs Academic Bill of Rights"), Huffington Post ("Kington Proposes Bill of Rights for college campuses"), and the Washington Times ("Bill backs academic freedom”). Republicans seek intellectual di-

The Dangers of the Academic Bill of Rights

In a campaign of defenses of the “Academic Bill of Rights,” Horowitz repeatedly claims that critics cannot point to anything objec- tively incorrect about the language of this Bill of Rights. But Horowitz misses the point: the question of enforcement is critical. An anal- 

The academic Bill of Rights is an at- tack on higher education. It is a threat to the concept of academic freedom, and "intellectual diversity" as his jus- tification for silencing diverse ideas he doesn’t like.

Horowitz’s National Crusade

The Washington Times (9/15/03) re- ported: “Horowitz and Republican leaders in 20 states, and he claims that several unnamed states are planning legis- lation. Horowitz has also met with the Uni- versity of California Board of Regents and the University of Oregon administration. According to Horowitz, “I first came up with the idea of an Academic Bill of Rights in the course of discussions with the chair- man of the board of regents of one of the largest public university systems in the states. The Regent was an incredibly ac- tistic about the bill and assured me he would make it a policy of his institution. He was particularly encouraging because he could see the connection to its particulars that might be raised from any quarter.” Horowitz ac-curately sees the pro-business trustees and faculty as allies in the fight to squash liberal ideas. But he realizes that the tradi- tional protections of academic freedom pre- vent his goal of intimidating leftist faculty. Horowitz made a brilliant innovation: he will use the concept of student academic free- dom in order to undermine faculty academic freedom. A Wall Street Journal editorial endorsed Horowitz’s bill, “Aca- demic freedom has long been a battle cry on campus, but what makes this push dis- tinctive is the student angle—a reflection, no doubt, of the increasing discomfort of conservative students, many of whom be- lieve that the university has not lived up to "their" views. By asserting that students have equal claim to academic freedom with their professors, Horowitz is essentially allowing students a powerful stick to wield over faculty. Any bias alleged by a student could result in professors being hauled before an ideologi- cal tribunal to evaluate their teaching tech- niques. Although this would pose a severe threat to faculty academic freedom, Horowitz justifies it by appealing to a new coalition of power—an alliance of regents and the far right. Horowitz’s Center for the Study of Popu- lar Culture created a group called “Students for Academic Freedom” which claims to have chartered chapters at campuses around the country in order to “appeal to governors and state legislators to write The Academic Bill of Rights into educational policy and law.”

The Battle for Colorado

Colorado was the first state in Horowitz’s crusade against leftists in academia. The Academic Bill of Rights on every college. Horowitz first proposed an Academic Bill of Rights at a July 2002 conference of the Associa- tion of American Colleges and Universities, where Gov. Bill Owens and Colorado Sen- ate President John Andrews heard about it. In April 2003, Horowitz met with Colorado's governor, a far-right activist from Califor- nia was invited to present his plan to help Republicans expel more control over academia.

At the Battle for Colorado

Horowitz claimed in his Sept. 12, 2003 op-ed for the Rocky Mountain News, “I have no idea what Owens or Colorado legisla- tors are proposing in their efforts to deal with the troubles on our college campuses.” In reality, Horowitz knows exactly what these top Republicans want to do. Christian- phobe Steve Firestone, Owens’s chief of staff who helped arrange the June 12 meeting between Horowitz and the Colorado Republicans about the Academic Bill of Rights, told the Governors of California that Horowitz was part of the discussion... on how to put teeth into it, to make them accountable to the legislature and the governor, how to create it in such a way that it would have teeth. From the schools had to do it, so it wasn’t just a nice warm-fuzzy statement... The discussion in- volved their funding on an annual basis, when their budget is renewed.”

Yet the Academic Bill of Rights that Horowitz is pushing declares, “No shall legislatures impose any such orthodoxy through its control of the university budget.” Horowitz is vague about the enforce- ment of his Bill of Rights, but he has pub- licly said that the bill will provide ‘a powerful stick to wield over faculty. Any bias alleged by a student could result in professors being hauled before an ideologi- cal tribunal to evaluate their teaching tech- niques. Although this would pose a severe threat to faculty academic freedom, Horowitz justifies it by appealing to a new coalition of power—an alliance of regents and the far right.

His denouncements of liberals provoke fears that he wants to restrict aca- demic freedom. Even some Republicans worry that the Academic Bill of Rights and crusade against leftists in academia goes too far. John Donley, a Repub- lican and former state lawmaker who now teaches at the Colorado community college, told the Press: “The far- right conservatives control the Colorado
How the Academic Bill of Rights Threatens Academic Freedom

House, Senate and Governor’s Mansion, but that isn’t enough – they’ve decided they want to control our classrooms.

Jesse Walker, associate editor for the libertarian magazine Reason, wrote about the Academic Bill of Rights: “As broad principles, these are solid stuff. As enforced rules, they are a disaster. Imagine a student lodging an official complaint because her professor gave short shrift to Cre- ationism.” According to Walker, “In the ’80s and ’90s the anti-P.C. backlash began, in part, because students offered by putatively biased courses were responds not by coming out strongly but by lobbying them to the collegiate equivalent of court. It would be an unpleasant irony if, in 2003, the anti-P.C. backlash ends with conserva- tive zealots fighting it out in the courts, in the same way.” Walker concluded, “There’s no such thing as a perfectly balanced debate, and a healthy debate to create one is more likely to chill speech than to encourage it. The most worrisome thing about Horowitz’s group is the sneaking suspicion that that’s exactly what they want.”

Horowitz responded, “Walker suggests that my Academic Bill of Rights could have ‘chilling effects’ on academic freedom. The missing context is this: What academic free- dom? Because Horowitz believes academic freedom already has been destroyed by left-wing attacks, his bill creates new dangers legislative control over higher educa- tion might pose. Horowitz’s bill preserves a brave new academic world where faculty are kept on a short leash. In his exchange with Walker, Horowitz wrote: ‘The Bill of Rights clearly recognizes that the teacher has a right to teach the course as he or she sees fit. The only limit to this right is article 5: “Expousing students to what is oppressively labeled ‘anti-reason’ points on the subjects examined in their courses is a major requirement of faculty. Walker will not” use their courses for the promotion of anti-Christian, anti-Semitic, or anti-religious indoctrination.” Having au- dited a course at one of the premier liberal colleges in the country, where a 600-page Munsell textbook on color theory ‘in- stutional’ that as though it were a text in Newtonian physics, I can testify that this is very necessary right to protect academic free- dom in the contemporary university.”

In Horowitz’s vision the Academic Bill of Rights, a professor who merely teaches a sociology textbook disliked by Horowitz is guilty of violating these rights and should be subject to punishment. As Walker put it, “I’m concerned with preserving the idea that students should have more power on campus, but not this sort of power. I would say the best way for professors to complain against professors for the views they choose to explore in class.”

Horowitz has a Messianic vision (“our task is the support of academic freedom. The way in which the Academic Bill of Rights approaches the coming battle with the campus totalitarianism”) of his heroic cam- pusbattlers against liberal censorship. The Academic Bill of Rights is just the first step is Horowitz’s campaign for ideological control of higher education in America. Once the Academic Bill of Rights is put in place, Horowitz will then ex- pand his call for enforcement by legisla- tors and trustees, using the Academic Bill of Rights to demand the firing of professors who express political views in their class- rooms, and forcing the hiring of conser- vatives. His allies will be able to sue col- leges for breach of contract if the Academic Bill of Rights is violated by “one-sided presentations or politically-minded faculty.”

Horowitz wants to plant ideological time bombs on college campuses, first passing an innocuous-sounding “Academic Bill of Rights” and then using it as a springboard to purge left-wing and liberal ideas from academia. To learn more about the Academic Bill of Rights, go to www.aaup.org, www.collegefreedom.org, and www.studentsforacademicfreedom.org.

Joe Barry is a member of the Roosevelt University Adjunct Faculty and Chair of Chicago Coalition of Contingent Academic Faculty. He will speak about contingent fac- ulty’s organizing at the AAUP Annual Meeting on April 17, 2004 in Chicago.
Security Threats to Academic Freedom: HR3077

In the not too distant future, the US Senate is likely to take up the Higher Education Act (HEA), which would give the government the power to dictate on the campuses of the United States who may express the views that they hold. In the past, the HEA has been used to prohibit certain views with the same effect as a political police state. Now, the Senate is considering HR 3077, which would go far beyond the HEA in terms of its reach.

The HEA was enacted in 1965 as a way to provide financial aid to students and to ensure that our nation's institutions of higher learning would be accountable to the public. It has been a great success in these respects, and it has served the public interest well. However, the HEA has also been used to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies.

HR 3077 would amend the HEA to give the government the power to review and approve any institution's plan for the allocation of its financial aid funds. The government could then use this power to dictate the views that are expressed on campus.

The government could, for example, dictate that all public institutions must require all students to take courses that promote patriotism and national unity. It could also dictate that all public institutions must not allow students to protest against the government's policies on campus.

HR 3077 could be used to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies in any way. It could also be used to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies on any issues.

The government could use HR 3077 to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies on any issues. It could also be used to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies in any way.

The government could use HR 3077 to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies on any issues. It could also be used to silence the voices of those who speak out against the government's policies in any way.

To learn more about HR 3077, please visit the American Association of University Professors website at www.aaup.org. You can also find more information about HR 3077 in the AAUP's annual report, which can be found on the AAUP's website.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) is the only faculty organization devoted to the freedom of expression and academic freedom. The AAUP protects and defends the rights of faculty and students to express their views on any issue, even controversial ones. The AAUP also defends the rights of faculty and students to engage in political activity and to run for office. The AAUP is a member of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and is affiliated with the Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

Please join the AAUP today and support the freedom of expression and academic freedom. The AAUP is a member of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and is affiliated with the Service Employees International Union (SEIU).