This headline is not about the national primaries. It is about AAUP. This year there is an especially hotly contested election. There are two slates of long-term AAUP activists competing for the top leadership positions. Both slates recognize the serious, even critical challenges facing AAUP – structural, financial, and membership challenges. Your ballot should be arriving if it hasn’t already. You have until APRIL 15 to vote.

As we all know, the AAUP is the primary national organization committed to the defense and preservation of academic freedom and tenure. It is the only national organization challenging the growing “corporatization” of higher education. It is the organized voice for shared governance and contingent faculty.

Join us at our Annual Meeting as we discuss these matters and organize ourselves to build AAUP into the powerful organization it needs to be if we are to have the quality higher education required to deal with the challenges and opportunities ahead.

There will be a discussion of academic freedom centered on prominent recent tenure and retention matters led by Mehrene Larudee. There will also be a panel discussion of governance featuring Michael Haskins, Harper College, Ken Anderson, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, and Brian Frederking, McKendree University. There will also be time to plan and organize. Please join us. We need you.

Saturday, March 29 at St. Xavier University, 3700 W. 103 St. Chicago, 12:30pm to 3pm.

In Memorium

The Illinois AAUP joins everyone in mourning the murder of five students at Northern Illinois University. We want to see the college campus as a place for free exchange of ideas, for growth and for challenge. To see the death of those who come to a campus for the opportunity to enrich their lives and that of our society heightens the sense of loss.
To the editor:
Imagine the surprise of members of the AAUP chapter at Roosevelt University when the latest copy of Illinois Academe was mailed last month. There we were on the front page—“Academic Freedom Case Settled at Roosevelt University.”

Except that we, the Roosevelt chapter of AAUP, wasn’t there. At least not by name.

I’m not quite sure why your reporter John K. Wilson saw no need to consult the AAUP chapter at the very campus where this “case” was tried. Why, among numerous members of its editorial staff have resigning. The resigning members felt that their ability to function as journalists was impeded upon by university officials who sought to prevent information from being brought to the public.

First, we would like to thank the university community that has been extremely supportive of our publication. We have been, both personally and professionally, and this could not be done without student and faculty support. Even when reporting on events that are negative in nature, the student body has been extremely supportive of our information gathering and news presenting practices. For that, we can not express our gratitude enough.

It is of the opinion of the resigning students that The Flyer be a steward of the university’s image, nor should it consider such image problems when reporting on stories. To do so would designate The Flyer as a newsletter and not a newspaper; as a tool used for publicity and news presenting practices. For that, we can not express our gratitude enough.

As a result of actions taken by representatives of Lewis University’s administration, we have found ourselves without the ability to serve the news needs of the university population with the breadth and depth of reporting we were able to provide. There have been arrests for various drug related crimes, an arrest for battery, a citizen issued in relation to a firetruck struck by a cat, and a fight.

Because the university owns The Flyer, it can prevent such reporting when they feel it. We did not report on numerous arrests because we felt we could not accurately report the arrests without also publishing the names. There have been arrests for various drug related crimes, an arrest for battery, a citizen issued in relation to a firetruck struck by a cat, and a fight.

Matthew Gardner is the only person whose name appeared within The Flyer in relation to a crime committed on campus, despite others who have been arrested by police. We have been told explicitly that, following the initial report, the names of students arrested cannot appear in The Flyer.

We have also held back a story about a university trustee who has been involved in illegal proceedings with a government agency. We have been told that to publish the story, it would have to be cleared with university officials. We feel that this is a move that undermines the purported independence of a student publication. As a matter of principle, we feel articles should not have to be cleared with university administrators.

Finally, as many of you know, a black history month flyer was defaced. In reporting this, an internal discussion began regarding whether or not to reprint the slur as it appeared on the defaced flyer. The editorial staff came to the conclusion that it would be responsible reporting.

In the event of the oldest of our nation’s colleges and universities, the resigning members felt that in light of the discussion with the Lewis community, we would publish the word as it was appeared on the defaced flyer.

We feel that the situation was handled professionally but the university felt otherwise, and has prevented us from presenting the word as it appeared.

In resigning, we are taking a stance that is in alignment with our morals and ethics, and to our interpretations of our Lewis University education. We don’t feel we can continually suppress news of the university population with such rules laid before us. Rather than break the rules we’ve been given, we’ve chosen not to participate in the production of The Flyer.

The Flyer will continue its operation and continue serving the needs of the university population without some of its most senior editors. For the sake of the editorial staff that has remained, we ask for your continued support.

Respectfully,

Pete Nickeas, Editor-in-chief

Letter to the Editor

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 collegefreedom@yahoo.com.
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TIAA-CREF and Social Responsibility

Dear Friends,

It’s morning in America—do you know where your 401K or pension fund assets were last night?

Would you upset to you to know that TIAA-CREF—the nation’s largest retirement fund, with over $40 billion and three million participants—is a major investor in Wal-Mart, Nike, Rite Aid, and Coca-Cola. Millions of TIAA-CREF-invested retirement funds contributed to the success of these companies and their abusive human and labor rights practices.

Yet TIAA-CREF says it provides financial services “for the greater good.” The Walton family has received the greatest gift from TIAA-CREF’s irresponsible investments.

In 2007, the 600,000 member New York State University Teachers (NYTST) and 1.4 million member American Federation of Teachers (AFT) passed resolutions critical of TIAA-CREF’s continued investment in these companies (see below). Educators and those working alongside them have started careers helping to teach students the truth about the world around them. The truth is that TIAA-CREF continues to invest in these corporate bad actors.

It’s time for faculty, staff, organizations, and citizens across America to tell TIAA-CREF that it must use its considerable shareholder power to influence Wal-Mart, Nike, Rite Aid and Coke for the better—or stop investing in them.

We’ve influenced TIAA-CREF on issues of social responsibility in the past and can do so again with your help. What can you do? Here are three actions you can take:

1) Turn up the heat on TIAA-CREF to truly invest for the “greater good.” Help us educate faculty/staff/organization leaders—say what you know—publicly state your concerns (see action below).

Instead, Mr. Wilson built a story around one source who talked, at length, with lots of collateral sources available back up. And conveniently enough, the other side in the case, the university and Professor Weininger, were told by their legal counsel not to speak about the case. The reasoning couldn’t have been more simpler. The story practically wrote itself: a tale of one man fighting a university, saved only by his union’s tireless efforts on his behalf. No nuance required.

If only good journalism were actually that easy. It’s not, though, and those of us who have had the misfortune to be in Illinois Academe were based on solid reporting and substance is rethinking. We will see your articles in future issues in a different light.

Pete Nickeas, Editor-in-chief

TIAA-CREF Ethical Coalition (www.makeTIAA-CREFethical.org)

1) Turn up the heat on TIAA-CREF to truly invest for the “greater good.” Help us educate faculty/staff/organization leaders—say what you know—publicly state your concerns (see action below).

* TIAA-CREF has remained, we ask for your continued support.

The Flyer will continue its operation and continue serving the news needs of the university population with the breadth and depth of reporting we were able to provide. There have been arrests for various drug related crimes, an arrest for battery, a citizen issued in relation to a firetruck struck by a cat, and a fight.

Because the university owns The Flyer, it can prevent such reporting when they feel it. We did not report on numerous arrests because we felt we could not accurately report the arrests without also publishing the names. There have been arrests for various drug related crimes, an arrest for battery, a citizen issued in relation to a firetruck struck by a cat, and a fight.

Matthew Gardner is the only person whose name appeared within The Flyer in relation to a crime committed on campus, despite others who have been arrested by police. We have been told explicitly that, following the initial report, the names of students arrested cannot appear in The Flyer.

We have also held back a story about a university trustee who has been involved in illegal proceedings with a government agency. We have been told that to publish the story, it would have to be cleared with university officials. We feel that this is a move that undermines the purported independence of a student publication. As a matter of principle, we feel articles should not have to be cleared with university administrators.

Finally, as many of you know, a black history month flyer was defaced. In reporting this, an internal discussion began regarding whether or not to reprint the slur as it appeared on the defaced flyer. The editorial staff came to the conclusion that it would be responsible reporting.

In no attempt to measure audience response to reprinting the word, members of the staff met with the Black Student Union, various university officials, and spoke with other concerned leaders. We felt it was clear that students found the word offensive, and various points were made both for and against publishing the word, the editorial staff felt that in light of the discussion with the Lewis community, we would publish the word as it appeared on the defaced flyer.

We feel that the situation was handled professionally but the university felt otherwise, and has prevented us from presenting the word as it appeared.

In resigning, we are taking a stance that is in alignment with our morals and ethics, and to our interpretations of our Lewis University education. We don’t feel we can continually suppress news of the university population with such rules laid before us. Rather than break the rules we’ve been given, we’ve chosen not to participate in the production of The Flyer.

The Flyer will continue its operation and continue serving the needs of the university population without some of its most senior editors. For the sake of the editorial staff that has remained, we ask for your continued support.

Respectfully,

Pete Nickeas, Editor-in-chief

Erin Devers, Senior layout editor

Mike Howlett, Opinions editor

The Make TIAA-CREF Ethical Coalition (www.makeTIAA-CREFethical.org)

TIAA-CREF Ethical Coalition (www.makeTIAA-CREFethical.org)

Yours,

The Make TIAA-CREF Ethical Coalition (www.makeTIAA-CREFethical.org)

Scholars in Peril

Ninety-fourth Annual Meeting of the AAUP
June 12–15, 2008
Omni Shoreham Hotel, 2500 Calvert St., NW
Washington, DC 20000

Featured Speaker: Adam Habib, deputy vice-chancellor of research, innovation, and advancement at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. He has repeatedly condemned terrorism and has urged governments to respond to the terror threat with policies that are consistent with human rights norms and the rule of law. Under the United States’ War on Terror, Habib denigrated his visa in October 2006 without explanation, he never experienced any trouble entering the United States; in fact, Habib lived in New York with his family for years while completing a PhD in political science from the City University of New York. Professor Habib will speak on the history and status of academic freedom in South Africa.

Special Panels of Interest: “Retiring with Health Security:” a look at alternative plans for funding postretirement medical insurance; and “Fair Use”- publishers and librarians examine fair-use policies and their application in the academic world.

For more information and to register, go to www.aap.org.
The governor has stated on more than one occasion that nursing education is a priority. To show how these investment steps function in regard to priorities one would look at an example such as Eastern Illinois University FY 2009 operations budget. Funding for nursing programs is not included in steps 1-3 but appears in step 4 which would include an overall 4.5 percent increase for the university. The assumption is that if the General Assembly wishes to fund nursing as a priority, they would fund EU at a step 4 level.

I doubt if either the Governor or the General Assembly will buy into this approach. By proposing a flat budget in step 1 the IBHE set up a situation of no budget increases.

This is exactly what happened in the Governor’s Budget Address of February 20, 2008, when it became apparent that funding for higher education would remain at the FY 2008 levels even though the General Assembly approved additional funding last year. The governor’s new budget would, in effect, cut higher education by $11 million dollars. In public universities, this would be a public relations disaster to maintain a viable revenue stream except for another round of tuition increases or for some of the public community colleges local district tax increases.

As the state support for higher education continues to decline, the affordability for Illinois students continues to be an increasing problem. According to IBHE data tuition and increases made in the past three years are as follows:

- Public Universities (entering students) 115.7%
- Community Colleges 75.2%
- Independent Institutions 72.1%

CHAPTER UPDATE: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT SPRINGFIELD

Issues Concerning Faculty Salary Equity: AAUP Salary Report

On October 5th, 2007 the UIS Chapter of the AAUP sponsored another of our “AAUP Forums” addressing the issues concerning faculty salary equity. John Curtis, director of the Department of Research and Public Policy of the national office of the AAUP, was the featured speaker. The forum was held in the recently published AAUP handbook, and critique the campus salary equity (internal) model that has been in use for the last two years. Approximately 25 faculty attended this forum and another 15 attended a luncheon and a morning meeting with the senate budget and planning committee and the campus salary equity committee.

Dr. Curtis led the UIS faculty in a discussion of equity considerations for a changing faculty. He provided an overview of the consequences of higher education’s success in promoting innovation and providing access to student population. He suggests that these successes have led to changing expectations. Specifically it has led society expecting a “return on its investment” and a number of social objectives concerning equity, diversity and economic development. However, at the same time higher education has seen a steady decline in public funding and increased calls for accountability. The impact of all of this is found mostly in the “non-elite” institutions where we have seen an increase in the use of contingent faculty, heavier teaching loads, increased expectations for working with students and institutional prestige directly related to the amount of needed funding found at the public universities. As a result, some faculty have sought full-time positions with less emphasis on student service at the individual faculty level and a culture that reinforces the “individual deal” between faculty and institution. In summarizing trends found in the latest AAUP salary report he notes the following trends:

- Enrollment of women continues to climb.
- Women faculty are more likely to be in part-time positions.
- Women are underrepresented at the full professor rank.
- All types of institutions, women full-time faculty earn less than their male colleagues at the same rank. Overall, women faculty earn about 80% of what men earn.
- Among full-time faculty, slow diversification over the last thirty years (1975-2005). Slightly more than 20% of FT faculty are minority in 2005.
- Most rapid growth is among Asian (2.2% to 7.2%) and Latino (1.4% to 3.6%).
- Also a growing number of non-resident alien faculty.
- Asian faculty are much less likely than other US citizen groups to be employed part-time.
- He encouraged the UIS faculty to consider the following in a critical examination of the UIS salary equity model:
  - Enrollment of women continues to climb.
  - Women faculty are more likely to be in part-time positions.
  - Women are underrepresented at the full professor rank.
  - All types of institutions, women full-time faculty earn less than their male colleagues at the same rank. Overall, women faculty earn about 80% of what men earn.

The IBHE Budget: A Stop Forward

By Ken Andersen

For the last several years IBHE seems not to accept an advocacy role for the needs of higher education. This year marks a partial reversal. They have provided a budget recommendation (I suspect to the displeasure of the Governor) that provides for a series of steps in terms of increase and a demonstration of what that could do to help the state to prevent its decline in the coming decade.

The budget battle will be severe, what with the short-term in this year’s budget to be overcome, and the urgency of the pension systems with a big ramp-up set this year.

Never been a more important time for us to be in contact with our legislators and to mobilize public support for the needs of higher education if it is to serve the citizens of the state to the degree that it can and should.

This trend is pricing student out of the opportunity for higher education and does not bode well for the future of the State of Illinois. Legislators will argue that they support higher education, but they will also ask “where is the revenue?”

Several Labor unions and education coalition groups are attempting to answer the question by calling for a moderate increase in the state income tax. This proposal will again be sent to the General Assembly and the Governor to help fix funding in education.

The chance of a tax increase in an election year, however, is probably doubtful.

So once again higher education is facing declining state support even though both legislators and the public are expecting increased performance of higher education.

IBHE Appointee Sparks Controversy

By John K. Wilson

The appointment of Jay Bergman to the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) in December 2007 has sparked criticism about his views. The pollution committed by his company, and the large donations he has given to the man who appointed him, Gov. Rod Blagojevich.

Bergman has donated $42,000 to Blagojevich’s campaign since 2002, which appeared to be his primary qualification when he was appointed by Blagojevich to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. Accusations against Blagojevich have drawn front-page headlines as Tony Rezko goes on trial for breaking the law in his campaign contributions to Blagojevich and influence peddling with friends he arranged to have Blagojevich appointed to state boards.

Bousquet provides a deep understanding of how academic labor operates. He sees the importance of the academic union movement, but also understands how even unionization has failed to defeat the overwhelming movement toward corporate management theories. For Bousquet, the market-oriented approach to higher education hasn’t just failed the workers who are exploited by the low wages of academia; the corporate model has also betrayed the ultimate values of what a university must stand for. The alternative, a knowledge society rather than a knowledge factory, is the goal we must pursue.

By Leo Welch

The Illinois Board of Higher Education at its February 5, 2008 meeting in Springfield presented the FY09 budget recommendations.

The IBHE has also identified five major FY09 budget priorities. They are:

- Improving college affordability.
- Enhancing faculty and staff salary support.
- Addressing student pipeline issues: access, success and diversity.
- Protecting the state’s investment in college and university facilities.
- Addressing state workforce priorities: nursing.
Indoctrinate U.

Reviewed by John A. Wilson

Evans Croce-Malone's new movie, “Indoctrinate U.,” is probably the best document- ary ever made about higher education. That's no idle claim. Croce-Malone’s documen- tary, which told of her visit to a college where the experience left her with a deep appreciation of the value of the open exchange of ideas, is an eye-opening account of what can happen to the best and brightest students as they try to get a college education.

The documentary features a Katrina stu- dent at Foothill College, Ahmad al-Quhossi, who claimed that he had fallen asleep during a lecture about the American essay, "I was called into his professor’s office, berated for defending America, and told to seek psychological counseling," and a couple of stories about conservative professors who had been dismissed from their positions.

Maloney devotes a great deal of screen time to the case of Lydia Brodeur, who was a student at State University harshly criticized for writing a letter to the campus newspaper opposing affirmative action. But does Maloney propose to answer the question of whether that is a conservative view or not? Does Maloney agree with Brodeur’s mother who says, “It wasn’t right in any way for me to pay for his politi- cal views.”

In the movie, David French, formerly head of FIRE, cites a case at Indiana University where administrators refused to approve the showing of Mel Gibson’s movie, “The Passion of the Christ” but failed to ban a theater- ical release. He concludes that the story is meant to show a double standard against conservative views. However, it’s clear that the conservative censorship at Indiana University is being justified by the conservative stereotype that a conservative is one who suffers at the hands of the liberal establishment. Maloney doesn’t mention that this is precisely what happened at Indiana University, where the college failed to censor a flyer that was carried by a woman who was convicted for violating the college’s free speech policy.

Maloney points out the case of Yale Free Press. It’s a good example of how one- sidedness works that deals with leftist idioms who try to throw out copies of their publication. Yet Maloney never mentions that there are also examples of conservative censorship that is supported by left-wing forces.

Maloney makes it clear that he is inter- ested in exploring intellectually with a theory that he doesn’t like and even appears to suggest that thinkers like Ignatiev should be ban- ished from campuses. And since he seems unwilling to explore that option, he is angry that there are students who are not playing by his rules.

“Indoctrinate U” is most evident in this men- tion of the college’s efforts to banish political speech, or if he actually proved how many people read it.

The hypocrisy and one-sided nature of “Indoctrinate U” is most evident in this men- tion of the college’s efforts to banish political speech, or if he actually proved how many people read it.

The hypocrisy and one-sided nature of “Indoctrinate U” is most evident in this men- tion of the college’s efforts to banish political speech, or if he actually proved how many people read it.
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The hypocrisy and one-sided nature of “Indoctrinate U” is most evident in this men- tion of the college’s efforts to banish political speech, or if he actually proved how many people read it.

The hypocrisy and one-sided nature of “Indoctrinate U” is most evident in this men- tion of the college’s efforts to banish political speech, or if he actually proved how many people read it.
Mr. Wilson should be banished from academia since Maloney is annoyed that such ideas bad, since he seems unwilling to engage in—refuse to be pushed around and through of schools surveyed by FIRE have “speech trampled. And an overwhelming percentage of claimed objectivity. In the name of objectivity, media outlets require reporters to be with people about my personal perspective is preferable to the hiding behind the cloak of academic freedom. The film begins with Professor David Clemens, who describes how every course at the school must include discussions of race, class, and gender.

Clemens explains that this applies to courses in all subjects—math, physics and even ornamental horticulture—and criticizes the requirement as “an affront to any notion of academic freedom.” The affront is obvious to me. Wilson says it was saying, “We are free to teach whatever and however you want, as long as you somehow relate it to race, class and gender politics.” Even classes about abstract is so important. Even if your favored group is in power now, you should remember that change is the only constant through time. The problem with "does Maloney [support] intellectual freedom for the very way that Wilson accuses me of—right. It happens, and when it does, it isn’t sometimes mistreated in academia, then he’s rarely treated as though his views are tyrannical, and it is something I would oppose regardless of whether the idea is right or wrong.

And if campuses were dominated by folks who only agreed with me, the problems in academia would probably be about the same. Instead, the real enemy is groupthink, and the tendency to succumb to groupthink is a human failing. The film is not about me. It is about the state of academia, and I think it is the only way to thrive in academia. I can’t even read it. The reason why I think free speech in the abstract is so important. Even if your favored group is in power now, you should remember that change is the only constant through time. The problem with "does Maloney [support] intellectual freedom for the very way that Wilson accuses me of—right. It happens, and when it does, it isn’t sometimes mistreated in academia, then he’s rarely treated as though his views are tyrannical, and it is something I would oppose regardless of whether the idea is right or wrong.

And if campuses were dominated by folks who only agreed with me, the problems in academia would probably be about the same. Instead, the real enemy is groupthink, and the tendency to succumb to groupthink is a human failing. The film is not about me. It is about the state of academia, and I think it is the only way to thrive in academia. I can’t even read it. The reason why I think free speech in the abstract is so important. Even if your favored group is in power now, you should remember that change is the only constant through time. The problem with "does Maloney [support] intellectual freedom for the very way that Wilson accuses me of—right. It happens, and when it does, it isn’t sometimes mistreated in academia, then he’s rarely treated as though his views are tyrannical, and it is something I would oppose regardless of whether the idea is right or wrong.

And if campuses were dominated by folks who only agreed with me, the problems in academia would probably be about the same. Instead, the real enemy is groupthink, and the tendency to succumb to groupthink is a human failing. The film is not about me. It is about the state of academia, and I think it is the only way to thrive in academia. I can’t even read it. The reason why I think free speech in the abstract is so important. Even if your favored group is in power now, you should remember that change is the only constant through time. The problem with "does Maloney [support] intellectual freedom for the very way that Wilson accuses me of—right. It happens, and when it does, it isn’t sometimes mistreated in academia, then he’s rarely treated as though his views are tyrannical, and it is something I would oppose regardless of whether the idea is right or wrong.
freedom at Risk

By Peter Kirstein

A few weeks ago I spoke at a student initiation ceremony at DePaul University that is still reeling from the Norman Finkelstein and Mehrine Lardee tenure cases this past spring. In December, the Charles DeGlopper, dean of the College of Computing, issued a memo titled “The Struggle for Academic Freedom” which called for a "stakeholders’ conference to discuss the struggle for academic freedom among students, faculty and administration." The memo has a tone which suggests that there is a lack of understanding of the value of free speech, or that the university is trying to silence dissent. This is a problem across higher education.

"The university is conveying to me that they don’t want to be associated with me because I am critical of the war. This is what is going on in other universities as well," Finkelstein said.

The memo was signed by 12 other members of the university administration, including Provost John Bardo, who is in charge of the university’s academic units.

"If you’re a professor, you’re supposed to be seen as credible. And if you’re not, you’re not respected," he said. "I don’t think that’s fair, but I think it’s the reality of what’s happening."
The University in Chains: Revisiting the Militaristic-Academic Complex

By John K. Wilson

In The University in Chains, Henry Giroux points to three major threats to academic ideals: corporations, the military, and right-wing ideologues. And he criticizes educators who are “relatively silent or tacit apologists” for the “face of this assault” by the right-wing.

This is not a new problem. Giroux reveals that President Dwight Eisenhower’s famous farewell address in 1961 was intended to warn about the “military-industrial-academic complex” before deleting the “academic” part. Eisenhower had noted, “The prospect of domination of the nation’s scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present and is gravely to be regarded.”

Giroux cites the example of Michael Crow, who became president of Arizona State University in 2003 and reorganized along corporate lines toward the model of an entrepreneurial university. As Giroux notes, the university’s “efforts to transform the state into what we call ‘higher education as capital’ is now ‘an open and much celebrated policy.’” Academic freedom and the tenure system, however, are not considered profit centers.

The impact of corporate influence is most notable in the sciences, such as when science faculty delay publication for commercial purposes in order to allow corporate companies to patent their research findings. Giroux cites the example of the University of Toronto, which went along with the pharmaceutical company Apotex in trying to suppress negative findings by a researcher about toxic side effects of one of its drugs, suspending her and creating with dossiers that “named 8 professors as unpatriotic and supporters of terrorism.” The researcher’s book was also banned from the school’s library. Giroux notes, “The worst is yet to come.”

The Academy for Capitalism and Limited Government Fund: Faculty Authority and Responsibility

UIUC Chapter of the AAUP Statement
October 26, 2007

Two recent initiatives at the University of Illinois—The Global Campus and the Academy for Capitalism and Limited Government Fund—create a potentially hostile environment for the academic freedom guaranteed by the AAUP’s Academic Bill of Rights in Illinois.

Giroux notes that “campaigns to ‘re-frame’ the global campus debate are limited to the existing framework” of corporate finance and that “academic freedom can be lost.” The University of Illinois is about to vote on whether to accept the Academy for Capitalism and Limited Government Fund.

In his book University in Chains: Revisiting the Militaristic-Academic Complex, Giroux argues that “academic freedom can be lost.” Giroux notes that the global campus debate is “limited to the existing framework” of corporate finance and that “academic freedom can be lost.” The University of Illinois is about to vote on whether to accept the Academy for Capitalism and Limited Government Fund.
By John K. Wilson

In January, the School of the Art Institute in Chicago (SAIC) banned the docu-
mentary “Senator Obama Goes to Africa” from being shown in its Gene Siskel Film
Center, which is one of the leading independent
movie theaters in Chicago. In a press
release, SAIC announced, “As a not for
profit organization, the Gene Siskel Film Center can
not create a perceived aura of support for
any political candidate. As we are in the
middle of a political campaign, we feel it is in
the best interest of the Gene Siskel Film Cen-
ter to postpone the screening of ‘Senator Obama Goes to Africa’ until after the elec-
tion. Screening the film at this time could jeopardize our not for profit status.”

The claim by SAIC administrators that
showing a documentary about a political
candidate violates IRS rules for non-profits
is utter nonsense. A documentary is consid-
ered news coverage, which means it gets a
completely exemption from prohibitions on political
activity by non-profits. Moreover, the rules
are perfectly clear that colleges can hear from
journalists speaking about politicians, and
can even hear from politicians directly. (Oth-
erwise, all of the appearances by political can-
didates at colleges would be libelous and result in
the loss of non-profit status.)

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) spokespersones spoke out quite clearly about this
issue last fall in its Statement on Academic
Freedom and Outside Speakers (see
www.aau.org): “Committee A is concerned that
overly restrictive interpretations of Section
501(c)(3) have become an excuse for prevent-
ing campus groups from inviting politically
controversial speakers.”

According to the AAUP statement,
“The idea that a university ‘participates’ or
‘intervenes’ in a political campaign by pro-
viding a forum to hear speakers who have
something to communicate about issues of
relevance to the campaign is thus funda-
mentally misplaced.”

There is not the slightest doubt that
IRS regulations clearly allow colleges to
show documentaries and have political
speakers. In fact, by hosting a legitimate
documentary from being shown, SAIC may
be endangering its nonprofit status if the
decision was influenced by supporters of
Obama’s opponents.

“Senator Obama Goes to Africa” is on

School of the Art Institute Bans Showing of Obama Documentary