
Indiana Academe

Fall 2005

Newsletter of the Indiana conference of the American Association of University Professors

Presidential Update

By Richard Schneirov
Acting President, Indiana
Conference of the AAUP

Our elected President, K. Vinodgopal is in Melbourne, Australia on sabbatical. For the fall semester I am serving as acting president of the state body. Vinod will be back in January and will serve out his term as president.

One of the prime functions of the State Conference is to lobby for state legislation of concern to the faculty of this state. In the past five years we have worked quite strongly for a bill that would add a nonvoting faculty member to the boards of trustees of our state's public universities. That bill almost passed the legislature three years ago but since has foundered. With the recent shift in control of the Indiana House our lobbyist has advised us that it would be a waste of effort to reintroduce the bill at this time. That issue is not dead, but work on it has been suspended until such time as our lobbyist tells us it is worth reintroducing.

Our state AAUP will continue to lobby on other matters that concern the faculty of our state, including the funding of higher education. Together with representatives of the state universities, we have supported continued funding for higher education and opposed cuts.

We are proud to say that AAUP lobbying played a vital role

in the defeat during the last legislative session of House Bill 1531, authored by State Rep. Luke Messer. This bill, which originated in the campaign of David Horowitz's national group "Students for Academic Freedom" against Ball State Professor

If we are to continue to expand the voice of the faculty in this state and across the country, it is imperative to step up our work in membership recruitment.

George Wolfe (see article in this issue), called for an academic bill of rights at state universities. It would have required the boards of trustees at public colleges and universities to develop academic guidelines for all faculty to assure political diversity and pluralism in classroom teaching, grading, curricula, hiring and on-campus speaker selection. In short, the bill would create government oversight for all faculty activities, whether those faculty members were conservative or liberal. It would effectively end academic freedom on campuses in Indiana. As a result of our lobbying, the bill never received a hearing and was not reported out of the Committee on Education.

Interestingly, Horowitz's

efforts achieved far greater success in the legislatures of Ohio and Pennsylvania, states far less conservative than Indiana. It took long and concerted efforts to defeat them. Here in Indiana, little was accomplished by the opponents of academic freedom due in large measure to our efforts. It is likely that in this session the Messer bill will be reintroduced. Our lobbying efforts will continue to be important factors in sidetracking or defeating this pernicious piece of legislation.

We haven't forgotten our initiative, Investing in Indiana: New Priorities for Quality Education, which calls for upgrading the conditions for the faculty at the Ivy Tech community college campuses. Our goals remain:

- 1) An increase in the share of the fulltime faculty among all community college faculty to at least 50 percent.
- 2) Establishment of a peer-reviewed process to offer the possibility of tenure to all fulltime faculty along with multi-year contracts to part-time faculty with seniority provisions. Tenure should also include written guarantees for academic freedom as defined by AAUP's 1940 statement.
- 3) Establishment of campus-based faculty senates with power and authority over curriculum and academic matters approximating that

of the four-year Indiana universities.

4) A substantial increase in the pay for full-time and part-time faculty

About a year ago, the Indiana Efficiency Commission Report on Higher Education, authored by Tom Reilly, advocated similar kinds of reforms to the community college system. Our state AAUP wrote a response (see our website), which we delivered to the Governor's Office through Sen. Murray Clark, strongly backing this report. Unfortunately, up

to this point, the new administration of Governor Mitch Daniels has not followed up on the Efficiency Commission's recommendations. We remain interested in pursuing these recommendations with likeminded allies of both parties. That topic will be prominent in the spring meeting of our state conference.

There is one other important issue of urgency: membership recruitment. In the past several years, AAUP membership in our state has declined. This loss cannot continue without seriously

affecting the work we do at the state level, including our struggle to preserve academic freedom. If we are to continue to be an effective vehicle for the protection of tenure and academic freedom and shared governance, and if we are to continue to expand the voice of the faculty in this state and across the country, it is imperative to step up our work in membership recruitment. Beginning with the fall meeting, we have asked our local chapters to inaugurate or continue membership recruitment drives on each campus.

Arguments Against the Horowitz Agenda

By George Wolfe, Director
Ball State University
Center for Peace and Conflict
Studies

1. Status of Academic Freedom at Ball State.

Academic freedom is alive and well at Ball State University. Of all the universities across the United States that were subject to attack for "liberal bias" by political extremist David Horowitz and his group, Students for Academic Freedom, in only one did senior administrators come to the defense of their faculty and their academic programs. That university was Ball State.

Vice President for Academic Affairs Beverly Pitts, President JoAnn Gora, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Randy Hyman, and Chair of the Department of Political Science, Joseph Losco are to be commended for their public stance against political extremism and their efforts to refute the false accusations directed towards Peace

Studies at Ball State University. As a result of their efforts, two newspapers in Indiana, the Fort Wayne Journal Gazette and the Muncie Star Press, ran editorials criticizing Mr. Horowitz's propaganda campaign. In addition, both newspapers called for state legislators to ignore requests for an "Academic Bill of Rights." University faculty, therefore, should not be intimidated by Mr. Horowitz or his student organization. Nor need any professors experience a "chilling effect" that forces them to compromise their freedom to teach as they deem appropriate in the classroom.

The surge in publicity from Mr. Horowitz's smear campaign ironically resulted in renewed interest in the Peace Studies program at Ball State. The 18-hour Interdisciplinary Peace Studies minor grew from only six students, enrolled in September of 2004, to seventeen enrolled by the end of the fall semester. The spring semester Introductory to Peace Studies core class doubled in size

from 13 in the spring of 2004 to 26 at the beginning of the spring semester of 2005. The student activist group, "PeaceWorkers," had as many as twenty members. In addition, several people in the Muncie community made significant contributions to the Peace Studies Foundation Account.

What began in September 2004 as a concern over liberal bias grew into the absurd and shameful accusation by Mr. Horowitz that Peace Studies at Ball State was anti-American and was supporting terrorism. Armed with this unjust accusation along with his previous false allegations, I was able to discredit Mr. Horowitz in newspaper interviews, successfully calling public attention to his extremist political agenda.

2. The "New McCarthyism"

Back in the 1950s, many Americans suspected that the Soviet strategy for taking over the United States was not only military in nature, but included efforts to

train people in Marxist ideology. It was feared that over time individuals embracing communist doctrine would work to corrupt and indoctrinate youth in the US, and over several generations the US would politically embrace the Soviet economic and political system.

Senator Joseph McCarthy took advantage of this fear and the Smith Act, which made membership in organizations advocating the forceful overthrow of the government illegal, to intimidate people in sensitive government positions and harass US citizens who dissented from US policy or called into question American social values. Arthur Miller's famous play "The Crucible" was written to call public attention to the McCarthy "witch hunt."

There is a striking parallel between Senator McCarthy's intimidating tactics in the 1950s and the extremist political climate that has evolved in the United States since 9/11. Now the fear is not subversive communist infiltrators, but would-be terrorists and people who may privately embrace extremist Islamic views. Rather than the Smith Act, it is now the controversial Patriot Act. David Horowitz, in using language that accuses peace studies professors like myself of supporting terrorism and falsely accusing the Ball State Muslim Student Association of having ties to terrorist organizations, is invoking the Patriot Act in an attempt to intimidate Americans who believe it was a mistake to invade Iraq or who identify themselves with the religion of Islam. According to my colleague, Political Science professor Joseph Losco, Horowitz's tactics are "...reminiscent of something that

would take place in the McCarthy era or the period of the John Birch Society of the 50s and 60s." (TheStarPress, Muncie, Indiana. September 27, 2004).

The historical parallel with the 1950s McCarthy campaign is the reason I give for calling the offensive, dishonest, and sensationalized tactics of Students for Academic Freedom "the new McCarthyism." University faculty must be proactive in speaking out against this threat.

3. Confusing the Concepts of Academic Freedom with Student Rights

It is important that we not confuse academic freedom with student rights. Academic freedom has a long tradition and is designed to protect faculty who may be teaching controversial subjects or conducting controversial research. It also prevents administrators, government officials, and yes, even students, from dictating what can or cannot be taught in a class or what teaching strategies should be used to present educational material. Professors therefore are free to "profess," to teach in their own way, to assemble and present course material according to their educated judgment regarding the research and subject matter in their respective fields. Keep in mind that if we take this protection away from liberal professors, we also take it away from conservative professors.

Of course, this does not mean that students have no rights in keeping with university policy. But we shouldn't confuse student rights with faculty academic freedom. Students, for example, have the right to non-discriminatory

treatment regardless of race, religion, gender, national origin, or sexual preference. They have a right to express their concerns or disapproval of a teacher to a department chair or other administrator according to university policy. They have the right to be graded fairly and to appeal a grade they believe is unjust. They can also evaluate a teacher anonymously at the conclusion of the semester, to drop a class during the first half of the semester, and to register for a class taught by a different teacher if multiple sections are available. Students should also be treated with the same respect that professors expect from their students.

The vast majority of public and private colleges and universities have policies designed to protect these student rights. Confusing these rights with the concept of academic freedom traditionally applied to faculty merely muddies the waters and impedes legitimate discussion of student rights within the academy and in the public arena.

As pointed out by a statement issued by the American Association of University Professors: "...there are a variety of internal mechanisms within the academy that are responsive to student complaints. Students who feel they are punished for their views should contact department chairs, deans, or the Provost. The first option must not be to attack and malign the professors in public. Students engaged in such slanderous activity are not furthering genuine debate and discussion. They are undermining the civility necessary for genuine academic freedom to flourish."

4. Confusing Liberal Education and Liberal Politics

Another problem with language that needs to be addressed is the confusion of liberal education with liberal politics. Liberal education is generally defined as a process where students are exposed to a broad range of disciplines, where students' knowledge base is broadened, where students develop higher-order thinking skills that enable them to assess and synthesize information, and where students are challenged to think critically and independently. Liberal political labels and their association with political candidates, on the other hand, are quite fickle and often change from decade to decade.

During the 2004 presidential campaign for example, the liberal Democratic candidate, John Kerry, proposed raising taxes for people earning more than a \$100,000 a year to help offset the federal budget deficit. About a month later in the state of Indiana,

the newly-elected Republican Governor, Mitch Daniels, made a similar proposal for alleviating the state budget deficit. In the 1960s a liberal Democratic president, Lyndon Johnson, led the United States into the Vietnam War. In the first decade of the twenty-first century, a conservative Republican president, George W. Bush led us into the war in Iraq. In 1968 the conservative Republican presidential candidate, Richard M. Nixon, promised a "Just Peace" in the Vietnam War and to bring the troops home; in 2004, the liberal Democratic presidential candidate, John Kerry, promised in four years to bring the troops home. Keep in mind please, that in 1968 I was one of those liberal hippies that voted for Richard Nixon, the conservative Republican candidate!

As you can see, political positions and policies and their association with party labels and candidates change from decade to decade. University professors cannot be tossed to and fro in their

teaching by the whims of politics. The Boston University paper correctly quoted me when it reported: "Peace Studies examines issues, strategies, leaders, and organizations relating to the subject of non-violence and looks critically at US foreign policy regardless of what political party is in power."

6. Conclusion

The battle I am describing is not between liberals and conservatives, but rather a battle between reasoned dialog and extremism, and there are extremists on both ends of the political spectrum. The offensive nature of extremist language provokes anger, derailing constructive civil debate on important issues. Academic faculty should promote values conducive to reasoned dialog. At the same time, we must insist that language not be used in a confusing way. Faculty academic freedom and individual student rights should be addressed primarily as separate issues.

Stepping Up Faculty Awareness of Academic Freedom

By Robert Ivie and Amy Reynolds
Indiana University, Bloomington

Have faculty on your campus become complacent about academic freedom, and a bit rusty on its purpose and operation, even in these troubled times when higher education has been subjected once again to a sustained political assault in Indiana, as well as across the nation? Are faculty at your university sufficiently aware of the seriousness of the current attack on free and unfettered intellectual inquiry, regardless of their discipline or area of study?

Unfortunately, we think the answer to these questions on our campus and most other campuses in the state, and the nation, is too much complacency and too little awareness.

Accordingly, the Bloomington AAUP chapter has decided to make a concerted effort to step up faculty recognition of the importance of exercising and protecting academic freedom. We believe that this effort cannot fully succeed in isolation but instead requires cooperative efforts and sharing of information across campuses.

The introduction of

HB1531 in the House Education Committee of the Indiana General Assembly last year by one of the state's most powerful legislators brought home the immediate threat to many of us, but not to everyone who should be concerned. Some of us began to speak out on the issue, to contact state legislators, to organize faculty forums, to lobby administrators, and to engage in other activities to raise our collective consciousness. In Bloomington, among other efforts, we invited AAUP's Robert O'Neil to speak in April on the subject of academic freedom and homeland

security. David Horowitz showed up on campus that same day to rally support for his so-called academic bill of rights, consistent with his partisan and ideological campaign to undermine academic freedom in the name of protecting it (for a critique of his Orwellian rhetoric, see Robert Ivie, "Academic Freedom and Political Heresy," at <http://www.indiana.edu/~ivieweb/academicfreedom.htm>).

This year, we have determined to organize our efforts in Bloomington around four interrelated steps, which include (1) reviewing the university's existing policies on academic freedom, (2) identifying the character and scope of the present threat to academic freedom, (3) re-articulating the case for academic freedom, and (4) taking action.

The first step, reviewing the university's existing policies, has led us to the faculty handbook, the student code, the faculty constitution and to recent speeches given by our president and chancellor. An early, but not yet

exhaustive, review of our policies clearly establishes that academic freedom is valued, defined and supported on our campus. Just as the first step aims to recover the history of our institution's commitment to academic freedom and thus to bolster the presumption in its favor, the second step aims to increase our colleagues' awareness of how the present attack on academic freedom is aimed not just at Middle-Eastern Studies and Peace Studies programs or even just at the humanities, social sciences, and the arts, but also at the sciences and other academic fields, i.e., that it is a broad-based extension of the long-raging culture wars. Step three is the difficult task of making a positive case for academic freedom when a concerted effort has been made by its opponents to co-opt the traditional terms of defense and to turn them against the protection of unfettered intellectual inquiry and communication. Our aim is to return the defense of academic freedom to its democratic roots as envisioned originally by John Dewey. The final step is to

create an action plan that moves us from a defensive position to an offensive one. We want to communicate what we've learned from the first three steps in the form of workshops for new faculty and for graduate students. We want to engage our local press and broader community in discussions about academic freedom, and remove some of the mystery that often surrounds this notion to people who don't work in the academic world. We want to keep academic freedom on our permanent agenda, so to speak, so that we have built-in responses and relationships when threats to academic freedom arise.

This is the broad outline of the plan as it has developed to date. We turn now to filling in the blanks, hoping that others on our campus and elsewhere will join the Bloomington AAUP chapter in this effort, sharing ideas, information, and other resources along the way.

INAAUP Chapter Reports

IU Bloomington

Kevin D. Hunt, President, IU-Bloomington Chapter

The Bloomington chapter of the AAUP continues its efforts to encourage academic freedom, assure equitable treatment of faculty, and sustain strong faculty governance. Our Committee A has advised five professors this fall semester, mostly on tenure cases, but also on other issues of faculty rights. Two AAUP members, Bob Ivie and Amy Reynolds, are spearheading a project to raise faculty consciousness about

academic freedom, in particular attacks on teaching and scholarship that come in the guise of "fairness" or "balance". In light of the current widespread dissatisfaction on the Bloomington campus with leadership at IU, the AAUP has encouraged faculty to consider the risks that accompany the trend for top-down or corporate models of governance at universities. An email with links to the national website directed faculty to two 2003 articles on campus governance and a checklist meant to encourage faculty to evaluate the sta-

tus of shared governance at IU. Many Bloomington professors cite a top-down or corporate administrative style as a strong contributing factor in the failure of the Bloomington Chancellor search. In particular, keeping the names of the short-list of candidates secret prevented faculty and administrators from freely gathering critical information on the candidates and debating the strengths and weaknesses of candidates. We will continue to explore these issues in our fall social event and spring forum.

Ball State University

Ralph Baker, AAUP Chapter
President

The Ball State chapter has been monitoring the selection of a new Provost at the campus. The first search produced candidates that the faculty found unacceptable and AAUP called upon President Jo Ann Gora to conduct a new search. The president responded positively and a new search is underway.

A new AAUP-supported governance system made its debut this fall after more than two years of campus debate and planning. The new system features, for the first time, a Faculty Council consisting exclusively of voting faculty from each department where academic and fiscal matters must be approved before being sent to the broader University Senate.

Indiana State University

Scott Davis, Chapter President

The AAUP chapter at ISU continues to conduct semester meetings to which all faculty are invited, which focus attention on critical issues of concern to the faculty. This semester AAUP held a forum that allowed faculty to give input on the enrollment crisis that now besets the university. The chapter also continues to monitor the enforcement of the new policies, which relate to part-time and full-time temporary faculty, that were just approved by the Board of Trustees and are now part of our Handbook. Over the past

eight years, AAUP played a preeminent role in shaping and winning approval of these policies. Finally, our chapter continues to support individual faculty members who are the victims of administrative violations of professional standards.

Indiana University North

Chuck Gallmeier, Chapter
President

We have been working to recruit new members and revive the AAUP chapter here at IUN. We just recently published a newsletter which focused on "faculty governance" in the Managed University. We held a meeting in September and October and had close to 40 people in attendance at both meetings. We are currently facing a crisis in faculty governance here at IUN and are working hard to establish solidarity among faculty in protecting our legislative purview in deciding the mission of the university, promotion and tenure guidelines, course release for research, and other faculty rights and responsibilities.

IUPUI

Marianne S. Wokeck
Professor

Department of History

The IUPUI chapter has been suffering from the common malaise of our time, namely too much to do for the old circle of AAUP members who are overloaded with professional responsibilities, not counting life outside of academia. The

chapter's members have been watchful as part of their regular faculty governance commitments in several instances in which due process and fair treatment of faculty and academic programs seemed to be questioned or threatened. There have been opportunities for promoting the role of AAUP. In addition, the report about the need to increase membership will spur some of its members to recruit actively among regular, contingent, and part-time faculty.

Hanover College

Matthew N. Vosmeier
Chapter Secretary

The Hanover College Chapter of the AAUP is back! Since this past spring, the number of new AAUP members at Hanover has increased significantly, and the newly rechartered chapter has been meeting nearly every week to discuss and address faculty concerns. In September and October, the Hanover College Chapter decided that, in the interest of the principle of shared governance, the faculty ought to have representation on the College's Board of Trustees. Through organized faculty support, resolutions calling for faculty and student representation on the Board of Trustees were brought to a vote at the November Meeting of the Faculty. The resolutions passed 74 to 3, an important step toward the faculty's goal.