**Censoring America:**

*The Censorship Conflicts in American Academe*

Izzy Swank

Research Paper

Senior Division

2,489 Words

*"Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and it’s free exposition." [[1]](#footnote-1)*

* *The American Association of University Professors*

**Defining Censorship in Academia** To be censored is to have your work changed, omitted from the public domain, or driven to the point of inaccessibility[[2]](#footnote-2). The denial of tenure, lack of funding through the educational institution, and the disapproval to use resources that gives a researcher's work validity are hard to claim as censorship. Lack of definity concludes that there is not one single compromise; however, freedom of speech keeps radical and ideological driven ideas from festering outside of the public eye, encourages open dialog, and allows for the progression of a field of study. Censorship in academia is an issue that has occurred since the very beginning of academic institutions; therefore, conflicts have existed, compromises have been made, but upon further investigation into United States academia, the search for resolution has only been attempted.

**Organizations Seeking to Find Compromises for Academic Freedom**
 The American Association of University Professors is a nonprofit organization for academic professionals. Founded in 1915, the AAUP has helped both American educational associations and American academics maintain their rights, further their push for academic freedom, and promote governance of labor unions within higher education[[3]](#footnote-3).
 In the year of 1934 a series of joint conferences were conducted by the American Association of Professors and American Association of Colleges to establish a document that outlines academic freedom as a right[[4]](#footnote-4) (Not to be confused with the 1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure). The principals were not agreed upon until the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure was officially published. Since its release, it has been endorsed by over 240 national scholarly and educational institutions[[5]](#footnote-5).
 To this date, the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom remains the most conclusive document on this matter and is referred to even today[[6]](#footnote-6). The document, which is split up into two sections - academic freedom and tenure - states eight main points[[7]](#footnote-7):

* Teachers are entitled to full autonomy of their research and work, but research should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution;
* Teachers are entitled to speak about whatever they wish in the classroom about their field, but should be careful when broaching controversial issues that have no relation to their realm of study;
* College professors are members of the community as well as their institutions insofar as they have autonomy to their speech and as long as they make an effort to clarify that their utterances are not the opinion of the institution they represent;
* After the expiration of a preliminary period, university professors are entitled to tenure. However, the precise terms and conditions should be in both the hands of the teacher and institution before the contract is consummated;
* The preliminary period for tenure should be no longer than seven years;
* During the preliminary period, all instructors should have the same rights to academic freedom as tenured professors;
* Termination of tenure should be considered by both the faculty committee and governing board of the institution;
* Termination of tenure due to the bankruptcy of the institution should be demonstrably bona fide.

 There are several other organizations that are dedicated to upholding the civil liberties of students and faculty members in higher education such as The Foundation of Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), The David Horowitz Organization[[8]](#footnote-8), and The University of Chicago with their Chicago Statement Endorsement Letter to University.

**The Private Sector versus the Public Sector** It is to be noted that what distinguishes private religious institutions and their secular counterparts is their mission statement: One, is to teach religious practices alongside the curriculum, and the other, is to uphold a nonsectarian stance. How an institution of higher education defines academic freedom, how academic freedom is perceived to differ among religious universities and nonsectarian universities, and religious ‘restrictions’ on academic freedom are all questions that cannot be readily defined or analyzed[[9]](#footnote-9). According to The Foundation of Individual Rights in Education, “The Constitution of the United States protects individual freedoms from government interference. It does not, as a rule, protect individual freedoms from interference by private organizations, such as corporations or private universities. Thousands of church-based schools and colleges exist in America, and these private, religious organizations are free to mandate religious practice, to forbid what they judge to be immoral behavior, and to restrict speech. Private organizations have freedoms denied to government—the freedom to impinge on constitutional liberties that are protected from governmental interference.”

 The educational private sector, particularly in higher education, is a whole different issue, as it is not under direct government control and generally holds particular religious beliefs and the right to maintain them. It is to be noted, however, that many private universities do uphold the AAUP’s Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, although they are not under public or institutional pressure to do so.

Many pontifical universities follow the Apostolistic Constitution written by Pope John Paul II[[10]](#footnote-10). The mission statement of this particular document is often debated as it is known that Pope John Paul II was one of the most progressive popes to date, but I believe the opening quote outlines this best:
 “Indeed, the Church's mission of spreading the Gospel not only demands that the Good News be preached ever more widely and to ever greater numbers of men and women, but that the very power of the Gospel should permeate thought patterns, standards of judgment, and norms of behavior; in a word, it is necessary that the whole of human culture be steeped in the Gospel.”[[11]](#footnote-11)
 In the paper “Facility Perspective of Academic Freedom at a Private Religious University,”sponsored by the ICTTE Journal, one respondent answered the question “How do faculty perceive academic freedom differs between private religious and public universities?” by stating the following, “Institutionally speaking, I think right now we have had more academic freedom than many others. Of course, whatever I teach should come from a context of being a Christian faculty member.”[[12]](#footnote-12)

As outlined in this section,it should be noted that the following illustration is not intended to defend or criticize the liberties of religious institutions as their speech codes are readily available upon admission and are clearly defined: Students and faculty members at universities such as Liberty, George Town, and Brigham Young University are all aware that they are terminating their rights to freedom of speech.

**Famous Censorship Conflicts** John Spencer Bassett was an American scholar who is often discussed in the light of the Bassett Affair of 1903. Given the times, discussing racial relations was inevitable. In one of his most notable articles titled “Two Negro Leaders[[13]](#footnote-13),” he was one of the first caucasian academics to recognize the work of African Americans. Due to public pressure he wrote a letter of resignation, however, unbenounced to the university administration. The head of the university declined his letter of resignation and instead released a document on academic freedom. He never commented publicly on this conflict but alluded to it in several personal correspondences. [[14]](#footnote-14)
 Ironically, the second most well known academic controversy exists in near direct opposition to the Bassett Affair. Charles Murray, the author of the 1994 controversial publication “The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life,” points out several discrepancies in IQ relating to standardized test scores and inheritance. It also points out that IQ is stable throughout one's life and is not biased against any particular ethnic, racial, or socioeconomic group[[15]](#footnote-15).
 Within Charles Murray’s publication, race and ethnicity were touched upon. However, it is often mistaken as relating to race inherently. In the introduction, he states,"The debate about whether and how much genes and environment have to do with ethnic differences remains unresolved."[[16]](#footnote-16) Also, about his research team, he once again says in chapter thirteen, “It seems highly likely to us that both genes and the environment have something to do with racial differences."[[17]](#footnote-17) It is not apparent that even if Murray’s data is true or that it is based on an endorsement of prejudice. The notion that a man should be judged based on his genetic lineage and collective ethnic or racial group seems to be exactly what is feared when a sociologist proposes more extensive studies be done on the subject, and that is arguably the very thing that is endorsing prejudice.
 When taking into consideration the ethics of publishing data on discrepancies in IQ based off of ethnicity and cultural background, assuming that the findings are either valid or invalid, there is often no dialog opened about such topics. “Moral Positions on Publishing Racial Differences in IQ” published by the Journal of Criminal Justice outlines several perspectives as to the pros and cons of doing more research on this topic[[18]](#footnote-18).

* Policy decisions often rely on psychological research;
* When scientific research turns out to be false, it has disastrous societal consequences;
* In the free market, differences between populations influence marking practices.
* New knowledge can facilitate and inspire further discoveries;
* Research can aid efforts to alleviate racial disparities in opportunity, and a larger, scientifically-informed discussion of race and individual differences may be helpful in combating racist sentiments.

 Showing as how John Spencer Bassett and Charles Murray decided to speak about their controversial opinions and were attempted to be censored by both the public and higher educational administrations, public debate occurred openly[[19]](#footnote-19), and more research on both southern African American achievements and data on IQ discrepancies in race. There is no evidence to suggest, besides The Southern Poverty Law center claiming that Charles Murray is a hate figure, that either controversial case caused discourse that encouraged ideological driven hatred.

**Dealing With Controversy**

Distinguishing between two forms of academic freedom are vital to avoid conflict on the understanding of informed points of view: The first, is to have the freedom to hold certain beliefs based on factual evidence, and the second, is to conduct and publish empirical research on a given topic. It is not a matter of morality when considering whether or not someone can hold certain beliefs; noting that personal bias factors into the likelihood of employment, grant funding, tenure, and acceptance in the general academic community is necessary, however, we must recognize this is a result of political bias and virtue and is not to be used as a reasonable ethical argument when trying to reach a compromise based on controversial opinions[[20]](#footnote-20).

**Interviews… and the Lack Thereof**

Several professors were interviewed for this paper. However, all but Associate Professor of Literature, John Pruitt, at The University of Wisconsin Rock County[[21]](#footnote-21) declined[[22]](#footnote-22), asked that their identity not be disclosed, or expressed some caution.

When professor Pruitt was asked if he believes if the 1940’s “Statement on Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure” does justice to academic freedom he stated that

“The weird part about that statement is that although I (academics) am allowed to teach what I wish, I am not allowed to express my personal beliefs. So, for example, there was the professor at Florida Atlantic University, I believe, that was blogging about conspiracy theories and was fired for that. They fired him for the expressions of his beliefs publically in a blog. So while it seems I can research whatever I want, and I do - I have never, ever had a problem with that - it seems as if through public discourse we are often warranted not to.”[[23]](#footnote-23)

Following that question, Professor Pruitt was asked if he believed if universities had the right to fire facility members to protect the integrity of their status, and he stated

“I hate that idea, but it does happen. I think now since the public sector, and the private sector are starting to mirror one another, especially in Wisconsin, as they’re fighting over students and tuition money to make their universities seem as welcoming, that includes not having controversial issues front and center.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

In one email correspondence, an anonymous professor[[25]](#footnote-25) stated the following:

 “Now, given that this is my email address through my school..., and given the sensitive nature of some of the issues that you plan to discuss, it might be better if we use my Gmail account. If you don't mind, please contact me at... Of course, I recognize the irony that I would rather discuss issues of academic freedom through a \*non\*academic email address, but we are living in an Orwellian world these days, and I would not want to feel that I cannot be completely honest in my responses.”

Through these interviews, it does become apparent that the academic community is filled with the fear of not only censorship but the status of their position. Also, it does not seem as if many are for the idea of censorship in any way.

**Modern Cases of Censorship**

Wendy Kraminer, the author of eight prolific publications including A Fearful Freedom: Women’s Fight From Equality, was invited to a conference at Smith College to speak about freedom of speech and censorship in literature. When referencing the use of the ‘n-word’ in regards to Huckleberry Finn she demonstrated to the audience that the feeling it evokes in the context of historical prejudice is different than hurling it as an epithet. When she said “We’re just wild and crazy, aren’t we?” the official transcript replaced the word “crazy” by the notation: “[ableist slur].”[[26]](#footnote-26)

Courtney Lawton, a lecturer and graduate student at University of Nebraska, joined a professor in holding a demonstration beside the tabling event, calling on passersby to “fight nationalism, fight white supremacy.” The student videotaped Lawton, who responded with a middle-finger and said “Neo-fascist Becky right here . . . wants to destroy public schools, public universities, hates DACA kids.”[[27]](#footnote-27)

**Summary**

The resolutions for academic freedom and tenure that have been attempted throughout the history of American academia are ongoing. The American Association of University Professors have been diligent in their efforts to reach a compromise between the controversies that could affect public opinion, but it still seems to be a concern that weighs heavily on many academics[[28]](#footnote-28). Personal, institutional, societal, and religious bias are factors that are to be taken into account when broaching controversial issues in both research and higher level education[[29]](#footnote-29). Due to these many obstacles, it could be said that there may not even be a single resolution in finding a compromise. However, opening up the potential for dialog is the first step.
 What constitutes as censorship is still largely undefined, especially in a highly political and competitive climate such as academia, but the lack of definitely shouldn’t prevent discussion. It is the responsibility of academics to push for further study, the progression of their field of expertise, and ensure that misinformation is open for the public to see. Then, it can be thoroughly challenged, rather than radical and ideological thinking manifesting.
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