



REVUE MALIENNE DE LANGUES ET DE LITTERATURES

REVUE SCIENTIFIQUE DE LANGUES, LITTERATURES ET SCIENCES HUMAINES

N° 002

JUIN 2018

REVUE SEMESTRIELLE DE L'UNIVERSITE DES
LETTRES ET DES SCIENCES HUMAINES DE BAMAKO

ISSN 1817 424X

Administration

Directeur de publication : Pr Denis DOUYON, Ecole Normale Supérieure
amadougnon@gmail.com

Rédacteur en chef : Dr Mamadou DIA, FLSL / ULSHB
Oudidiam55@gmail.com

Secrétaire de la revue : Dr Moriké DEMBELE, FSHSE / ULSHB
morikdembele@yahoo.fr

Responsables financiers et marketing : Dr Afou DEMBELE, FLSL / ULSHB
afoudem@gmail.com

Chargé de production : Dr Aboubacar COULIBALY, FLSL / ULSHB
aboubacarscouly@hotmail.com

Délégué Afrique : Dr Kawelé TOGOLA, FSHSE / ULSHB
kawoletogola@yahoo.fr

Délégué Etats Unis : Dr Fatoumata KEITA, FLSL / ULSHB
fatoumatakeita808@gmail.com

Délégué France : Dr N'Bégué KONE, FLSL / ULSHB
konenbegue@gmail.com

Comité scientifique

Pr Samba TRAORE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Emile CAMARA, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Boniface KEITA, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Ntji Idriss MARIKO, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Doulaye KONATE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Moustaph DICKO, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Jean Bosco KONARE, Université des Sciences Sociales et des Gestion de Bamako
Pr Drissa DIAKITE, Université des Sciences Sociales et des Gestion de Bamako
Pr Salif BERTHE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Bakary CAMARA, Université des Sciences Juridiques et Politiques de Bamako
Pr Issiaka SINGARE, Université des Sciences sociales et de gestion Bamako
Pr Famakan Oulé KONATE, Université des Sciences Sociales et des Gestion de Bamako
Pr Moussa DAFF, Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar
Pr Hamidou Nacuzon SALL, Université Cheikh Anta Diop Dakar
Pr Meke MEITA, Université Felix Houphouët Boigny de Cocody
Pr Adama COULIBALY, Université Felix Houphouët Boigny de Cocody
Pr Arnaud RICHARD, Université Paul Valéry de Montpellier 3

Pr Jean François DURAND, Université Paul Valéry de Montpellier 3
Pr Celestin Djah DADIE, Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké
Pr Manhan Pascal MINDIE, Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké
Pr Arouna DIABATE, Université de Koudougou
Pr Valéan F. TINDAOGO, Université de Koudougou
Pr Jean Emile CHARLIER, Université Catholique de Louvain (ULC) de Bruxelles
Pr Catherine MAZAURIC, Université de Marseille Aix Provence
Dr Denis DOUYON, Ecole Normale Supérieure
Dr Oumar KANOUTE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Pr Mamadou Bani DIALLO, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Dr Balla DIARRA, Institut Supérieur de Formation et de Recherche Appliquée de Bamako
Dr Cheikh Tidiane SALL, Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar
Dr Ndo CISSE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Dr Idrissa S. TRAORE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Dr Bougoutié COULIBALY, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Dr Mahamady SIDIBE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Dr Modibo Bah KONE, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako
Dr Ahmadou MAIGA, Université des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Bamako

Sommaire

Contributeurs	Titre de la contribution	Page
1- Tié Emmanuel TOH BI	Léopold Sédar SENGHOR, un zèle pour son siècle	06 -19
2- Moriké DEMBELE	Les enjeux de la diversité dans les référentiels socioculturels des manuels de lecture de la Collection Djoliba au Mali	20 - 38
3- Youssouf KARAMBE	Définitions, statuts et rôles des jeunes au Mali	39 - 54
4- Kanchi GOITA	le système éducatif traditionnel minianka à l'épreuve du changement social	55 - 74
5- Fatoumata KEITA	La poétique de la résistance dans l'autobiographie d'Aoua Kéita: genèse d'un activisme politique au féminin	75 - 87
6- Adama DIAWARA	<i>Le conte africain, outil de prévention et de gestion des conflits.</i> L'exemple d'un conte <i>Bamanan : Le coq, sa belle fiancée et le varan vantard</i> ¹	88 - 99
7- Françoise Diarra	Du développement comme exploitation de la nature à la responsabilité de l'homme	100 -109
8- Mahamar ATTINO	Challenges posed by urban sprawl pattern in wuhan/china (1990-2010)	110 - 124
9-Dahamane MAHAMANE	Academic Freedom in Times of Crisis: The Case of the Post September 11 Era in the United States of America	125 - 136
10- Boubacar TABOURE	L'éducation non formelle au Mali : analyse des forces et faiblesses	137 - 152

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN TIMES OF CRISIS: THE CASE OF THE POST SEPTEMBER 11 ERA IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dahamane MAHAMANE

Ecole Normale Supérieure de Bamako

dmbb245@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper presents an analysis of academic freedom in the United States of America in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks that targeted the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. In addition it presents a brief overview of the historical evolution of academic freedom in the United States of America since 1915, the present status of the concept, and a glimpse into its future. The first part of the paper covers the concept of academic and the ways in which it has evolved since 1915, along with an insight into the way it has been impacted by some historical events, the most recent being the 9/11 attacks. The second part of the paper provides a foresight on the future of academic freedom in the next ten years depending on the political situation of the moment. Also discussed in this paper are the possible threats to academic freedom and the way these threats can undermine or limit its actual exercise.

Keywords: Academic freedom; Tenure; September 11; National Security; crisis; American Association of University Professors.

Résumé

Cet article fait une analyse du concept de la liberté académique aux Etats Unis d'Amérique suite aux attentats du 11 septembre 2001 ayant ciblé le World Trade Center et le Pentagone. En plus il décrit l'évolution historique du concept même de la liberté académique depuis 1915, son présent et jette un regard sur son avenir. La première partie traite de l'évolution du concept face à certains événements historiques, le plus récent étant les attentats du 11 septembre 2001. La deuxième partie projette un regard futuriste sur la liberté académique dans les dix années qui suivent, et identifie les dangers qui menacent l'exercice effectif de la liberté académique.

Mots clés: Liberté académique; titularisation; 11 septembre 2001; sécurité nationale; crise; Association Américaine des Professeurs d'Université.

Definition of Academic Freedom

In 1915, The American Association of University Professors (A.A.U.P.) issued a declaration in which it defined the concept of academic freedom in these terms:

Academic freedom consists in the absence of, or protection from, such restraints or pressures—chiefly in the form of sanctions threatened by state or church authorities, faculties, or students of colleges and universities, but occasionally also by other power groups in society—as are designed to create in the minds of academic scholars (teachers, research workers, and students in colleges and universities) fears and anxieties that may inhibit them from freely studying and investigating whatever they are interested in, and from freely discussing, teaching, or publishing whatever opinions they have reached.

According to this definition which has not fundamentally changed since, academic freedom is the inalienable right that scholars—university professors and researchers in particular—have to express, or publish their opinions, thoughts, and findings without undergoing pressure,

sanctions, or threats of any kind. This implies that professors and researchers—and students very often—will not risk losing their privileges for whatever statements they make or publish in an academic setting.

Historical Overview

It can be said that the first winds of academic freedom came to the United States from Germany in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. At that time, German university professors were civil servants who had to take an oath of allegiance to their country. However, they had—although not very broad and explicit—some type of freedom of speech which allowed them to conduct their classes in the ways they wanted and pursue their research to any place where it took them; but outside the university, freedom of speech was not always granted to those professors. When American scholars who had studied in Germany returned home, they brought with them the concept of *lehrfreiheit*: freedom of teaching and research in German. *Lernfreiheit*, the other component of academic freedom, designated the right of German students to mainly choose or attend the classes they liked and when they liked it. German-educated American scholars adopted the concept of *Lehrfreiheit*, imported it back to the United States, and interpreted it so broadly that it came to mean freedom of speech for professors and students everywhere, including places outside the university setting.

Those professors who arrived fresh from German universities with the ideas of academic freedom found themselves in frequent conflicts with the administration of the universities in which they taught. Unfortunately, according to Metzger (1960), the administrators did not always tolerate the professors' sense of freedom of speech considered to be insubordination and, as a result, many of those professors were fired. Carter Adams at Cornell, Bemis at Chicago, Commons at Syracuse, Andrews at Brown, Ely at Wisconsin, and Ross at Stanford were some of the most popular victims of academic freedom violations in the 1880s and 1890s.

In those days, university professors looked at themselves as the possessors of the technical and scientific knowledge needed by society to develop. They, therefore, made the need of academic freedom an essential one to generate new social knowledge and make new scientific discoveries. Many universities that were prepared and willing to welcome change and progress accepted the compromise. Those universities realized that the professors were indispensable to the effort of generating new knowledge needed in an industrial era. Nonetheless, despite a great effort on the part of most universities to allow their professors to exercise all the aspect of their job, none of the measures taken here and there were explicit or strong enough to guarantee academic freedom for all.

The first really explicit and specific document about academic freedom was issued in 1915 by the A.A.U.P. The document was drafted at a meeting attended by a large number of university professors, who wanted to give a formal shape to what they had always believed in and needed: the right to teach and pursue their research activities freely and without limitations. The definition that came out of that meeting is the one quoted earlier in the *Definition* section of this paper.

From that definition it was made clear that academic freedom, in many ways, would be different from freedom of speech granted to all American citizens by the Bill of Rights. The first differentiating aspect between academic freedom and freedom of speech was that the principles defined in the A.A.U.P. document targeted a specific group of people: scholars (students, teachers, and researchers). The second aspect is the obligation for scholars to stay within the limits of scientific inquiry and appropriate and decent language. That detail made clear that academic

had restrictions and requirements as well. The 1915 A.A.U.P. Declaration specifies the limits within which academic freedom will protect scholars:

The claim to academic freedom... is made in the interest of the integrity and progress of scientific inquiry; it is therefore, only those who carry on their work in the temper of the scientific inquirer who justly assert this claim. The liberty of the scholar within the university to set forth his conclusions, be they what they may, is conditioned by their being conclusions gained by a scholar's method and held in a scholar's spirit; that is to say, they must be the fruits of competent and patient and sincere inquiry, and they should be set forth with dignity, courtesy, and temperateness of language.

Faculty, having been granted this unusual type of freedom, would also have additional requirements—in terms of conduct in society—to fulfill. University teachers would be required to have a good moral conduct both in the institution and in society. Also, they would be required to make it clear that when they made personal public declarations, those declarations did not necessarily commit their respective institutions.

The traditional conception of academic freedom has also implied freedom for faculty to govern itself and have full power in deciding matters related to academic life on campus. The claims to academic freedom have become very varied over years. As different people make claims to academic freedom, they interpret it in a way that will take their concerns into consideration. It has recently been used by universities to protest Government decisions like the Salomon Amendment (Daniel 2005) or by adjunct professors to denounce extremely difficult work conditions (Marshall 2003). Aptheker (1972) wonders if, when students and professors demand the termination of a program involving the CIA on the campus, the academic freedom of the government scientist who is working on such a project is not violated. She replies in declaring that the government scientist's academic freedom is not violated because, according to her, "the CIA by nature is subversive to the university." She also wonders if anyone can, in the name of academic freedom, teach facts—that will not have been the result of any scientific research—contrary to scientific evidence? The limitations of academic freedom made by the 1915 A.A.U.P. Declaration make it as different from freedom of speech as it is from freedom of business.

Another major step forward was achieved in academic freedom by the 1940 Declaration of the A.A.U.P. The new Declaration creates a major difference from the first one, not only in the sense that it redefines some of the principles of the 1915 Declaration, but also in that this latter Declaration is the result of a joint work of the A.A.U.P. and the American Association of Colleges (that will later become the American Association of Colleges and Universities). That was a major step in the acceptance of academic freedom as a major principle of academic life and achievement in scholarship by both parties—employers and employees. The declaration was mainly a revision of the principles defined in the 1915 declaration along with some corrections in gender related issues. In fact, in 1940, after many previous meetings between the A.A.U.P. and the A.A.C., a joint declaration was agreed upon and signed by the two organizations as a sign of their shared intention and dedication to protect and defend academic freedom. Both associations came to realize that it was their mutual responsibility to promote a public understanding and support of academic freedom and tenure, defend, and enforce them in institutions of higher education. Both parties realized that colleges and universities serve not only the cause of the teachers and institutions, but also the cause of the community as a whole, and that both the institution and faculty share this responsibility. It is important to note that although many universities had accepted and ensured academic freedom for faculty before the joint signature of the 1940 document, the defense of the concept had been until then the sole task of the A.A.U.P. For the first time, both parties agreed that the common good for which they were

endeavoring could not be achieved without making the search for truth and its publication free and open. This restatement of the principles of academic freedom is known to the academic world today as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. However, this is not to imply that after the joint signature academic freedom was definitively secure and, therefore, no longer violated.

Tenure in America

When talking about academic freedom in the United States, there is a necessity to talk about tenure as well. Tenure comes as the main sustainer of academic freedom in the sense that it ensures economic security and independence to faculty by securing permanent employment for them. With the status of permanent employees, faculty members are likely to give their best to their teaching and research duties. Also, tenure makes faculty more confident and less vulnerable in the exercise of its profession. The 1940 Declaration says the following about tenure:

After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause, except in the case of retirement for age, or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.

The American Association of University Professors

It would be a major omission to talk about academic freedom in America without giving credit to the A.A.U.P., the American Association of University Professors. The association was created in 1915 at a meeting organized by Arthur O. Lovejoy and John Dewey which gathered representatives of most American institutions of higher education of the time. Nearly a century after its creation, the association still remains the most famous and successful body in the defense of academic freedom and other rights of both member and non-member university professors all over the country. The main purpose of the association, upon creation, was to ensure academic freedom for university professors, something it has basically achieved through present time. Specifically, Committee A of the association deals with academic freedom and tenure.

One of the most important achievements of the association is the creation of the academic freedom fund to support faculty members who have lost their jobs as a result of an abuse, and to pursue research on academic freedom. The association has distributed nearly \$500,000 to members since its inception fifty years ago.

Interpretations of Academic Freedom

Although originally academic freedom was meant to protect university professors from some abuses and threats both from the inside of the institution and the outside, the term has come to get a broader meaning throughout time. For instance, it has also been interpreted on occasions as freedom for institutions to govern themselves, automatically covering the defense of the rights of administrators against whom it is partly used as a shield. Recently, the Solomon Amendment^{2*} is a good illustration of this interpretation, although for many people, it is a problem of non-compliance with a federal Act. Marshall (2003) reports that in 2003, teaching adjuncts at CUNY (City University of New York) used their right to academic freedom to complain about their extremely hard work conditions rewarded by low pays.

2 * The Solomon Amendment denies certain federal funds to universities and colleges that do not allow military recruiters on their campuses along with assistance in their recruiting mission.

Threats to Academic Freedom

Throughout history some political or social situations have become serious threats to academic freedom: religious fundamentalism, public paranoia, and hostility to schools of thoughts created or promoted by politicians or historical events. In modern American history, there have been at least two such instances. The first one is the McCarthy era and the second one is the aftermath of September 11, 2001.

Probably, the only times of real religious fundamentalism known in American history were the colonial days. But since universities were not very developed at that time of history, records have few mentions of violations of academic freedom based on religious fundamentalism.

In 1947, two years after World War II, Truman's Administration instituted the New Loyalty-Security Program. The program was meant to protect the country against outside aggressions among which communist philosophy. Joseph McCarthy, a Republican Senator of the time who was one of the principal backers of the doctrine—which ended up taking his name—endeavored to develop a public paranoia about Communism. People were made to believe that a band of communists were going to take over the country, that they could have nuclear weapons, and that they were a serious threat to national security. As a result many people belonging to the Communist Party were subjected to suspicion or investigation. Their freedoms of association and speech were frequently violated or restricted. University professors who were members of the Communist Party at that time constituted the bulk of the victims. Many of them lost their positions or were imprisoned.

Very often, scholars were asked to give names of people with whom they secretly worked and were persecuted when they failed to do so. The zealous senator held public hearings of university teachers and other people among whom government officials who were accused of being communists. The consequences of the paranoia that he developed in the American society those days by the ideas he gave people about communism and communists to justify his violations of individuals' liberties and integrities are still felt by the American people. The McCarthy era was a sad one in terms of academic freedom in the U.S.A. Fortunately, the American people discovered later that communism was less a threat than Joseph McCarthy and his indoctrinated followers had made them to believe. This is just to say that some politicians need this kind of public paranoia to survive because they will die (politically speaking) otherwise, having nothing better to offer. McCarthy was one of those people. He ruined many careers and lives and at the same time laid the biggest discredit on American government in history.

Misinterpretations made by the press and public hostility to certain streams of thought can also be sources of threat to academic freedom.

The September 11 events created a great deal of both emotion and fear in the nation. Security agencies, quite a few political leaders, and military officials have leaned on these emotions and fears to create a public paranoia—similar to what happened in 1947 with the McCarthy era—to justify many violations of academic freedom and freedom of speech of many people in the country. In the next section many of these violations will be detailed.

Academic Freedom in the US in the September 11, 2001 Aftermath

This section accounts largely for the status of academic freedom in the USA in the September 2001 aftermath. The events of September 11, 2001 led American authorities to take more rigorous national security measures. The implementation of these measures inflicted a serious blow to academic freedom in many forms—again the academic world seems to be the

biggest victim of the situation. How did the September 11 tragedy impact academic freedom in the country?

One year after the tragedy the AAUP identified six areas of possible danger to academic freedom. They were listed in the May 1, 2003 issue of *Academe*, the association's official periodical:

Adverse personal actions against individual professors, government actions that might impair teaching, research, and scholarly communication, including international collaboration among scholars; government policies affecting academic freedom of graduate students, visiting scholars, and others within the academic community; government policies that impair academic freedom by denying or curbing access to information vital to scholarship, government policies or statements that could chill the climate for free inquiry and scholarship; and institutional actions or policies (whether or not governmentally compelled) that threatened to inhibit or impair free inquiry and academic freedom at the campus level.

According to O'Neil (2003), author of the report, the A.A.U.P was right worrying about these issues. Indeed, he reports that the USA Patriot Act adopted in the late fall 2001 is a real threat to academic freedom and free inquiry in many of its aspects. Some of these aspects are discussed here. This Act, in its implementation, will violate the privacy of library users. The Act demands that librarians help government intelligence agencies to put some users under surveillance without the knowledge of users. Government intelligence agencies hope to be able, this way, to know what sites those users visit and even read users' e-mail for instance.

According to the same report, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and the Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS) were then asking institutions to keep records on foreign students and provide information about students to intelligence and law enforcement agencies. This state of fact creates a climate of suspicion and fear that are incompatible with the ideas of exchange and free participation in programs which are fundamental principles of scholarship. It is also important to mention that the measure violates the students' privacy in some ways.

The US Department of Justice's issued limits on Freedom of Information Act definitely limits the access of both national and international students' access to information that falls under those limits and consequently affects the research of students who are interested in this kind of information. Since the Act limits their free inquiry, it automatically limits their academic freedom. Many research areas like microbiology and nuclear physics have been subjected to restrictions that make them not fully accessible to some categories of foreign students: hence, limiting the ways those students and some of their national counterparts can expand their horizons.

Also, all over the country, the report says, pressure is being put on university administrators to silence faculty and students who have critical views on American foreign policy and security measures. Foreign students are being excluded from many study programs especially in domains like bioengineering and nuclear physics.

Glenn (2005) reports that since April 2004, an idea that was first initiated by Moos, a professor of anthropology at the University of Kansas has been put in practice. American scholars have been sent to universities to study anthropology and languages undercover. These future intelligence analysts could have the undercover mission of reporting fellow students and professors' political affiliations and political views to their colleagues of the FBI and the CIA.

Critics worry that campuses will be “infested” by the presence of intelligence services. In addition to violating academic freedom, the program also violates many other academic principles.

These are just what may be called the theoretical violations. In practice many of these measures have not yet produced flagrant instances of violation. Such flagrant violations are reported in the next section whether they pertain to September 11, or not. In fact, most of them do.

Violations of Academic Freedom

The outstanding efforts of the A.A.U.P to defend and promote academic freedom have not prevented violations over time. The first instances of reported violations of the principle go back to the early times of higher education in the country. Some of them are mentioned in the *Historical Overview* section of this paper. The cases mentioned in this section are the most recent ones. Some of the mostly publicized cases of violations of academic freedom are the following: the Mohamed Yousri case at City University of New York, the Miwood Motley and Larry Williams’ case at Benedict College, and the very famous Ward Churchill case at the University of Colorado.

The Ward Churchill case is definitely the most controversial case today. The professor of Ethical Studies at the University of Colorado is facing threats of all kind including death threats for his declaration about the September 11 tragedy. Among other things, the Professor treated the victims of the World Trade Center as little *Eichmanns*, comparing their responsibility in the expansion of the American economic domination of the world to the role Adolf Eichman, head of the Department of Jewish Affairs in the Gestapo, played in the deportation and extermination of more than three million Jews in Nazi Germany. In its entirety, Dr. Churchill’s article is a diatribe of American foreign policy in the Middle East.

Academe (2005 Vol. 91 Issue 1) reports that in the summer of 2004, professors Milwood Motley and Larry Williams were dismissed by President David H. Swinton of Benedict College in Columbia South Carolina after they had refused to grade students according to a new grading system promulgated by the President. The new grading system imposed by the President and opposed by the two professors demanded that faculty evaluate not only achievement, but also effort made by students. The two professors thought that was an irrelevant evaluation method, and refused to comply with it.

Finkin, Nails, and Uviller (2004), report that Professor Mohamed Yousry was relieved of his teaching duties at C.U.N.Y in 2002, following some federal charges against him. He served as an Arabic translator for the attorney—who is actually the main subject of the indictment—of a notorious terrorist. The professor was charged of assisting a terrorist organization for facilitating communication between the terrorist and his attorney. The terrorist is linked to the September 11 hijackings.

Violations of academic freedom are not limited to these only instances, nor are they limited to what has been reported by the AAUP. There are surely cases about which no one has ever spoken. However, the A.A.U.P reports will always be a relevant reference document to evaluate academic freedom in the country. Only from 1970 to 1980 the AAUP reported a total of 1356 cases in the country. The AAUP has also issued a censor list that is regularly updated.

Academic Freedom in the Future

Now that the United States and the rest of the world have entered the United Nations’ Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, higher education and issues in higher education deserve special attention. One of the biggest issues in higher education today, is indis-

putably academic freedom. Academic freedom being vital to the progress and success of scholarship, it is essential that it be given real and full attention. Academic freedom has become a very important issue in the sense that its implications go far beyond the academic setting only. Many aspects of academic, social, political, and economic life will be impacted by the future status of academic freedom: recruitment and diversity in universities and colleges, national security, foreign policy, national politics, and international scientific and technological research. For all these reasons, academic freedom should be regarded as both a national and international issue.

Saving Academic Freedom in America

Lessons learned in America from the past must be enlightening for the future. The hostility developed towards communism after World War II and its ensuing consequences which reached their peak with the McCarthy era are sufficient data to alert the common good sense of Americans about this type of political errors.

If academic freedom is to be saved and preserved in the future, there are at least five parties which will have determining roles to play. These parties are: the American Association of University Professors, the institutions of higher education and their faculty, the community served by universities and colleges, the higher education lobbyists, and the media.

The Role of the A.A.U.P

President J. F. Kennedy said in his 1961 Inaugural Address that, “In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hours of maximum danger.” The current leaders of the A.A.U.P. will be one of these generations—at least with regard to the defense of academic freedom for the coming years. There are many reasons why the A.A.U.P. will be in the lead of the defense of academic freedom. The first reason is that no other organization has been more dedicated to the defense of academic freedom than the A.A.U.P. which has gained both experience and success in doing so for nearly a century now. The association also seems to have more credit on the part of other partners: government, university administrations, and faculty. With its human and financial resources, the AAUP will be adequately equipped to face the new challenge. As the AAUP will play the bulk of the role in defending academic freedom in the future, its duties will encompass moral, legal, and financial support to faculty members who will lose—or have lost—their jobs as a result of their unwanted utterances or publications.

- The Financial Role: It will be the duty of the A.A.U.P. to financially support professors who have lost—or will lose—their jobs because of their utterances, before they get another job. Fortunately, there are already existing funds for this purpose. University faculty members should also feel the moral duty to constantly supplement the existing funds.
- The Moral Role: University professors who have lost—or will lose—their jobs or pay because of their views will also need moral support from colleagues. Such moral support will consist in permanently denouncing the violations of which they have been victims.
- The legal support will consist in engaging lawsuits against violators of academic freedom, which should normally result both in punishing the violators and rehabilitating the victims.

The Role of Lobbyists

Lobbyists should include academic freedom in their agenda. They must struggle to have

academic freedom legally accepted as a major component of the First Amendment. Once academic freedom becomes explicitly a constitutional right, it will be easier to defend the victims of its violation. The current legal void that surrounds the concept is not a comfortable status for academic freedom.

The Role of Community

Communities should be aware of the fact that colleges and universities are operated for the public good. In order for universities to be successful, they need productive faculty. For faculty members to be really productive, they need empowerment. Faculty empowerment begins with security, protection, and freedom to express itself and do research. Community must support and protect its faculty against all types of aggression by influencing decision making and denouncing violations done to the rights of faculty members—the lights of society.

The Role of the Media

The media have the moral duty to provide society with accurate, objective, and instructive information. Television and radio must endeavor to inform the American people about the rest of the world, about American foreign policy, and the conflicts that oppose the United States to some countries. The media must say the reality of the events, not what they are made to say or what the public wants to hear. Politicians and intelligence services will never come forward and tell the American people the reality of the wars America is waging against other countries and the dark sides of American foreign policy. It is, therefore, the duty of the media to do it.

The Role of Institutions and Faculty

The light of every society is its learned people. Institutions and their faculty must be aware that they make the citizens of tomorrow. Since 9/11 many people have agreed that there is a large deficit of global information in educational programs. To eliminate this deficit, there should be strong emphasis on multicultural education, history, globalization (and its stakes for the United States) in schools and universities, and more exchange programs.

On the other hand, librarians and university administrators should be fully respectful of the ethics of their occupations. They should be permanently aware that their primary duty is to serve society—not government. They should never comply with demands originated from governmental or intelligence services and asking them to provide data that violates the privacy and rights of their foreign students and customers.

The Importance of the Teaching of History and Multicultural Education

As Doug Kramer (2001) put it in the aftermath of 9/11 “Time will calm our emotions, but only knowledge will reduce our confusion.” This simple phrase shows the importance for Americans to know, not only what happened on 9/11, but also why it happened. Politicians will (accurately) tell the American people what happened on September 11, 2001, but maybe not why it happened. Some “demagogues” and “televangelists”, as Alan Singer (2002) calls them, even “denounced liberal left-wing treachery and conspiracy in the 9/11 events”. Singer pursues that others accused “American educators who wanted to teach habits of tolerance and knowledge and awareness of other cultures” to American children. The American Council of Trustees and Alumni, which is opposed to “liberal tendencies in academia,” accused many American scholars of “being unpatriotic for their attempt to understand the reasons of the attacks or for criticizing American foreign policy.” Alan Singer also reports that Diane Ravitch, a

former official at the federal Department of Education, used the events of 9/11 in “her campaign against multicultural education.” In an essay that was widely publicized, her words quoted by Singer were, “We must not teach our children to tolerate those who hijack commercial jetliners and kill innocent victims. We must not teach children to tolerate fanaticism, be it political or religious” (Ravitch, 2001). But Alan Singer notes that she never identified anyone who was doing this, because no one was doing it. Ravitch called the attacks mass murders, but the American actions abroad since World War II were not accounted for in her essay. She should have said whether or not the bombings that almost destroyed Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Afghanistan, and Baghdad were mass murders or not.

Furthermore, according to a Rand Institute study reported by Singer, the Islamic world feels itself “under siege from the Western world in numerous vital political, military, cultural, social, and economic realms.” It is essential, as Singer says it, to “distinguish between fact and opinion, substantiated information and rumor, reason and emotion, Islam as the religion of over a billion of believers, many of whom live in the United States, and the actions of one organized group of people or a few individuals.”

American foreign policy has many dark sides that American citizens ought to know in order to understand why the United States (not other developed or Christian majority countries like Japan, Germany, or China, for instance) is the main target of terrorist attacks.

It is essential to teach the future American citizens the origins of the conflicts in which their country is involved. They should know about the foreign policies of their country and how these policies have impacted other nations. It is only when Americans know the truth that they will be able to objectively make a judgment, and it is only then that they will not view all those who criticize American foreign policies as enemies of the country—an idea that the Bush Administration has largely spread and cultivated. I do not think that patriotism means that a person should think that his or her country is always right, no matter what it does.

Possible Future Developments

Predicting the future of an issue like academic freedom can be very difficult. However, in one year my expectations are that very little will change in the general status of academic freedom. Many of the measures taken by the Bush Administration after 9/11, for pretended or justified national security reasons, were in effect for a relatively short period of time. Most proved to be not just ineffective, but counterproductive, in the sense that they only prevented American scholars from having fruitful exchanges with some of their foreign counterparts who posed no threat to the security of the United States. Unfortunately, after eight years of what looked like a happy break for academic freedom, another Administration is now in place with immigration measures with the potential of being detrimental to academic freedom. Also, the attempts to silence people who denounce American foreign policy can only be expected to increase. Some areas of study have been definitively labeled as being highly sensitive in America, and have been declared to be sources of possible terrorist threats. Therefore, many foreign students who would like to carry out research in such areas would not be allowed to do so.

As mentioned earlier, the evolution of academic freedom will impact many aspects of academic life. The productivity of faculty is expected to decrease if professors and researchers are not given full opportunity to do their work. The measures enacted in the PATRIOT Act against foreign students, if they are not abolished, will affect recruitment, retention, and diversity in American universities and colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* in its March 18, 2005 issue, reported that international applications had dropped by 5 % in the 2004 -2005

academic year which followed a decline of 28% in 2003-2004. Two of the three major reasons for this continuous drop were, according to *The Chronicle*, “tougher US visa policies and perceptions abroad that the USA was less welcoming of foreign students.” There are checks for foreign students and scholars in “200 specific specialties on the government’s Technology Alert List that are deemed to have potential military implications.” These reasons have strong academic freedom implications as well.

The institutions may lose financially and culturally. If less and less foreign students enroll in American universities, diversity in these institutions will also decrease, which also has drawbacks for the country in an era of globalization. Also, the United States is seeing its technological advantage over the rest of the world continuously eroding.

For faculty, the consequences can be very detrimental as well. Research has always had better results when it is done in group and across boundaries. US researchers and faculty members will have less collaboration with their foreign counterparts—at least in some designated countries.

Conclusion

The free society that this nation has always endeavored to build will be an illusion—to be pursued but never attained—if university professors continue to be threatened for their opinions on matters of public interest. The defense of freedom, democracy, and social justice that its leaders advocate everyday will be nothing but propaganda, demagoguery and deception if in practice they order violations of scholars’ right to express themselves or do research freely. The pretended national security reasons are not strong enough to silence scholars to the point that they can no longer publish their ideas and opinions without fear. In the twenty-first century, the most powerful country of the world should be a model of democracy and liberty. The free society of this nation must be able to accommodate various thoughts. Besides, for the progress of science, research, and learning, scholars must be granted the freedom to pursue their scholarly work without threats from inside or outside the university. Those in quest of knowledge must also be given full latitude to expand their horizons.

References:

- Academe (2005). Academic freedom and tenure: Benedict College (South Carolina), *Academe*, 91 (1), 51
- Aptheker, Bettina (1972). *The Academic Rebellion in the United States*. Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press.171-184
- Bollag, Burton (2005). Graduate school applications from overseas decline again, survey finds. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51 (28), A40
- Glenn, David (2005). Cloak and classroom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51 (29), A14
- Kennedy J. F. (1961). Inaugural Address.
- Kramer, Doug (2001). Terrorism and 9/11. In Singer, Alan (2002) Defending multicultural education, academic freedom, and democracy in the wake of 9/11/01. *Issues for the Twentieth Century: Social Science Docket*, 2 (2), 53. Retrieved May 1, 2005, from the ERIC database.
- Mach, Daniel (2005). A blow for academic freedom. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, (51) 18, B14
- Marshall, Eric (2003). Victims of academic freedom in a contingent academy. *Academe* (89) 3

Menand, Louis (1996). *The Future of Academic Freedom*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

Metzger, Walter P. (1960). Academic freedom in delocalized academic institutions. In Philip G. Albach and Robert O. Berdahl (Ed.), *Higher education in American society*. (pp 59-75). Buffalo, N.Y: Prometheus Books

O'Neil, Robert M., (2003). Academic freedom and national security in times of crisis, *Academe* (89), 3.

Ravitch Diane (2001). in Singer, Alan (2002). id. 7-8.

Roger, Bowen (2005). Funding academic freedom, *Academe*, (91) 1, 88

Singer, Alan (2002). Defending multicultural education, academic freedom, and democracy in the wake of 9/11/01. *Issues for the Twentieth Century Social: Science Docket*, 2 (2), 7-8. Retrieved May 1, 2005, from the ERIC database.

St. Louis Journalism Review Feb (2005). New bill threatens intellectual freedom. . *Louis Journalism Review* 35 (237), 33 <http://www.aaup.org>